

COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY BOARD

REGULAR MEETING

June 13, 2018

MINUTES

Present:

Arlene Schwartz
Lesa Peerman
Joanne Simone
Anthony Caggiano, Vice Chair
Tommy Ruzzano, Chair

Also Present:

Samuel A. May, Executive Director
David Tolces, Cherof, Doody & Ezrol, P.A.
Robert Massarelli, Assistant Executive Director
Stephen Williams, Keith & Associates
Jamilee Lahey, Keith & Associates
Diana Scarpetta, CRA Project Specialist
James Nardi, Advanced Asset Management

The regular meeting of the Margate Community Redevelopment Agency having been properly noticed was called to order at 7:01 p.m., on Wednesday, June 13, 2018, by Chair Tommy Ruzzano. Roll call was taken followed by a moment of silence and the Pledge of Allegiance.

1A. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM THE APRIL 11, 2018 REGULAR CRA MEETING

After Chair Ruzzano read the item title, Mrs. Peerman made the following motion, seconded by Ms. Simone:

MOTION: SO MOVE TO APPROVE

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

2. PUBLIC DISCUSSION

No one came forward to speak during Public Discussion.

3A. PRESENTATION: STREETSCAPE CONCEPTS – ATLANTIC BOULEVARD AND WINFIELD BOULEVARD

WINFIELD BOULEVARD

Stephen Williams, Keith & Associates, introduced Jamilee Lahey, landscape architect, and explained that they were looking for feedback from the Board on the streetscape improvements along Atlantic Boulevard that they previously presented in February, 2018. He said they would also be looking for their input and ideas on the Winfield Boulevard roundabout.

Jamilee Lahey proceeded with a PowerPoint presentation that showed 3-dimensional conceptual images of the roundabout. She explained that a manhole located in the middle of the roundabout was an issue that they had to work around. She showed several slides and explained the placement of the landscaping and the incorporation of a water feature that included a pond edge, bronze statues, water jets, and falling water.

Mr. Williams commented that the purpose of the roundabout was to slow traffic along Winfield Boulevard but to also provide improved aesthetics for a more pleasant drive.

Sam May, Executive Director, spoke about the location of the roundabout noting that three-quarters of the roundabout was located within the City and one-quarter was within the MCRA. He said discussion would need to be held with the City Commission before proceeding with the project. Mr. Caggiano asked whether the roundabout could be moved more into the MCRA area. Mr. Williams explained briefly why it would be difficult to move it around.

Mrs. Peerman commented on the tree heights and said the design incorporated the elements that they had previously discussed. She commented that she had always understood it would be a City and CRA project. She said seven people came out when asked for input on Winfield Boulevard. She suggested asking them again before spending the

money. She noted that there was one person who expressed opposition to it. She also suggested the inclusion of flowering trees.

Mr. Caggiano said it was gorgeous and it would definitely beautify the area.

Ms. Schwartz said she recalled that none of the roundabout was in the MCRA and she assumed the project would not be proceeding.

Robert Massarelli, Assistant Executive Director, commented that several intersections had been reviewed but this particular one had one-quarter of it located in the MCRA.

Ms. Schwartz commented that she was aware of a second person who had vocalized their opposition and that putting a roundabout over a manhole and sewer was not the best choice. She asked how the MCRA would go about holding a town hall meeting to hear from people in that area. Mrs. Peerman said that MCRA staff went door to door and handed out more than 450 flyers about the public meeting at the time, and only seven people attended. Ms. Schwartz suggested a flyer with check boxes that was postage paid or an online voting option. Mr. May said a mailing with an attached survey could be done. Ms. Peerman suggested that it include pictures of the proposed roundabout.

Ms. Schwartz asked if a cost estimate had been provided. Mr. Williams said that once they had approval on the concept, they would be able to provide a cost estimate. He commented that the project was initially for traffic calming to reduce speeding only and the idea of a roundabout was the result of that public meeting. He said it was clear from that meeting that traffic calming was needed, and how it would be achieved was what was currently being discussed.

Ms. Simone commented that the design was gorgeous and unique, and that it captured everything that the Board wanted. She said she felt certain the neighborhood residents would love it.

Mr. Caggiano agreed with Ms. Simone and he said the Board should move forward with getting a price and moving ahead with it. He said there would always be some naysayers but he felt the majority of the people would support doing it as long as it was maintained.

Mrs. Peerman commented that legal direction was needed because it would require that the City be a partner with the MCRA on the project.

David Tolces, Board Attorney, advised that the proper procedure would be a type of interlocal agreement between the City and the MCRA to identify the responsibilities of each party, funding, etc.

Mr. Caggiano made the following motion, seconded by Mrs. Peerman:

MOTION: TO AUTHORIZE THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO WORK WITH LEGAL COUNSEL FOR THE MCRA AND THE CITY TO DEVELOP AN INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT WITH RESPECT TO THE FUNDING OF THE ROUNDABOUT ON WINFIELD BOULEVARD.

Chair Ruzzano said approval to do the project was needed from the City and then it would come back before the MCRA and City with a cost estimate for approval. Ms. Schwartz asked if the neighbors would be polled. Chair Ruzzano said he thought the design was great and he suggested it be put on the City's and MCRA's Facebook.

Chair Ruzzano asked about the water cascading over the edge and Ms. Lahey said the water could either cascade into a trench drain or be held in a basin. He commented that he would like to see more color. He said the fountain was a more contemporary design and the kids fishing in the pond did not fit; other statue choices might work better. Also, he said the white rocks looked fake.

Ms. Simone said she agreed with Mr. Caggiano that the Board should move forward with it.

Mrs. Peerman commented about incredible liquid fireworks that she saw in Las Vegas that could be done on a small scale. Mr. Williams said they needed to be careful about getting the fountains too high which could result in water getting onto the street. He said there were some things that could be done with dancing lights.

Mr. May added a word of caution about not having anything too visually distracting when people are driving.

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

Amanda Ruzzano, 116 East Palm Drive, commented that the white rock was not consistent with the rest of the look. She asked if the water could flow down the back wall of rock in a light sheeting to create a wet look on the rock. Ms. Lahey said that from a maintenance standpoint, they needed to be careful about the materials used because the water flow could create mold on the natural rock.

ATLANTIC BOULEVARD WALL AND MEDIAN SIGNAGE

Mr. Williams said they were coming back before the Board as a follow-up to an earlier presentation they had given on the Atlantic Boulevard wall. He said they would be presenting some ideas on what could be done with the wall for which their feedback was needed. Ms. Lahey said they would also be speaking about the entranceway signage in the median.

Ms. Lahey spoke about how they utilized the wave element from the entry signage and incorporated it so that it danced through the median which she showed on a PowerPoint slide. She showed both horizontal and linear versions.

Mrs. Peerman asked whether the medians would have height. Ms. Lahey said there would be mounding features to create height and texture.

Mr. Williams explained that there were two elements to the Atlantic corridor being discussed: the signage in the median; and, the wall.

Mr. Ruzzano asked if the waves would be constant along the entire median. Ms. Lahey said there would be areas where there would be mounding and artistic features, as well as lighting.

Ms. Schwartz asked about the location of the two entrance signs. Mr. May said the scope of this project was limited to State Road 7 west to N.W. 80th in Coral Springs.

Mr. Williams commented about the use mounding and artwork as a way to discourage people from crossing mid-block particularly near the school. Ms. Schwartz said one of the difficulties was the distance between the traffic lights, as well as the location of a convenience store directly across the street. Mr. Williams said, as a safety feature, medians could be designed to really discourage people from crossing midway.

Ms. Schwartz asked about the length of the waves. Ms. Lahey said they would vary between 10-15 feet.

Mr. May said while the design being presented was for this particular project, the intent would be to take the design elements and expand them to other areas of the City.

Mrs. Peerman commented about putting up on a sign on Southgate Boulevard as people left North Lauderdale as well as doing the landscaping.

Ms. Schwartz asked about the height of the waves. Ms. Lahey said they would range from five to ten feet in height so that they could be visible from people driving by and have an impact.

Mr. Caggiano asked if they would be lit. Ms. Lahey said they would be lit.

Ms. Schwartz asked whether the waves were made out of concrete. Ms. Lahey said it was similar to a colored acrylic type material that could be lit up. May said it was some type of composite material.

Ms. Schwartz asked the number of entrances into the City. Mr. May said he believed there were 14 entrance signs currently in the City. She said when she visualized the signs in all the various places, it was not her idea of what she wanted. Mr. May said the sample sign would not necessarily be placed in all 14 places. He said there may be some places that might not work; they could determine the location of the signs. Ms. Schwartz said she did not want a carnival atmosphere. She said the size and location might be an issue given that people turning onto State Road 7 now were already having problems seeing with the current median. Mrs. Peerman clarified that there would be landscaping done there, but the entranceway sign would be on N.W. 80th and not on State Road 7. Ms. Schwartz said the entranceway feature was not as classy as she would like.

Chair Ruzzano said he agreed with Ms. Schwartz. He said the design was too tacky and that it looked like something that should be down by the beach area. He said he loved the landscaping. Mr. May explained that it was being brought to the Board for their input.

Ms. Lahey asked for the Board's thoughts on a less dramatic and more vertical design. Mr. Ruzzano said he did not care for any of it. He said he would be happy with just the landscaping.

Mrs. Peerman asked about the possibility of being able to change or "switch out" the art periodically. She said she liked the height of the landscaping. She said she also liked to see signs and artwork lit up.

Mr. Williams said he appreciated receiving their input because the better they understood what the Board wanted, the happier everyone would be at the end of the project.

Mr. May noted that the entranceway sign included a water feature built into it and Ms. Lahey pointed it out on the slide.

Chair Ruzzano commented that the Board was all in agreement with the landscaping. He said after the landscaping was put in, the Board could decide next steps. Mrs. Peerman asked about the monument sign and both Chair Ruzzano and Mr. Caggiano said they liked the monument sign. She said the Board was in favor with proceeding with the landscaping and the entryway sign, but not the art. She suggested they bring back different types of art.

Ms. Lahey showed two slides that included possible wall enhancement design options for the existing wall on Atlantic Boulevard. She pointed out the inclusion of stone veneer on either the columns or on the face, the use of etchings, and the addition of color.

Ms. Simone said she did not like any of the wall treatments shown on the second slide. She said she preferred the wall on Commercial Boulevard that she had previously mentioned which was partially stone and partially painted. Chair Ruzzano and Mrs. Peerman both agreed with her choice.

Ms. Schwartz commented that the bottom image on slide one would be easy to maintain. She said if the wall had half stone on the bottom, it might not be seen if shrubs were planted in front of it. Ms. Simone said the wall on Commercial Boulevard did not have any shrubs; rather, it had pavers in place of grass or shrubs. Mr. Williams commented that the plant bed was only 18 inches wide and anything planted would need to be very hardy. Ms. Lahey suggested the use of grasses. Mrs. Peerman disagreed, noting that anything planted against the wall became a collection point for trash. She said she liked the wall on Commercial Boulevard.

Ms. Schwartz said she liked the top image that showed swirls, but she would like to have something that was close to being maintenance free.

Mrs. Peerman suggested, as an alternative to landscaping the wall, the possibility of adding landscaping to other areas such as where the wall curves into the side streets.

Mr. Caggiano said he preferred the bottom image on slide one which had stone veneer and plain columns. Chair Ruzzano referenced a photo of the Commercial Boulevard wall and noted that the columns were capped. Board members had varying opinions about the column caps.

Ms. Schwartz pointed out that the wall on Commercial Boulevard was about one-third stone versus one-half. Ms. Simone agreed.

Based on the Board's favorable comments about the use of stone, Chair Ruzzano recommended that the Board give direction to Mr. Williams to come back with a stone selection so that the process could move ahead. None of the Board members opposed. He also recommended that the Atlantic Boulevard landscaping and the wall projects be bid separately.

Mr. May agreed with the separate bids and he said the MCRA wanted to have the wall done as quickly as possible. Mrs. Peerman asked if the project would include the additional walls from N.W. 80th. Mr. May said this scope would not include the new walls; it would be for the façade on the existing wall. He said the MCRA could look at a separate project for the new walls.

4A. **RESOLUTION 552:** AUTHORIZING AN AGREEMENT WITH ZAMBELLI FIREWORKS MANUFACTURING CO. FOR THE FOURTH OF JULY FIREWORKS DISPLAY.

After Board Attorney David Tolces read the resolution title, Ms. Simone made the following motion, seconded by Mrs. Peerman:

MOTION: SO MOVE

Ms. Schwartz said she always thought the fireworks display was for 30 minutes instead of 20 minutes and that the MCRA spent more than \$27,000 for them. Sam May, Executive Director, responded that the budget was \$40,000 for the entire July 4th event, and the fireworks had always been around \$25,000.

Ms. Simone said she was not a fan of spending \$26,500 for 20-minutes of fireworks. She said she did not share the love for fireworks that many others had and she wished that they were not so costly. She said, however, she hoped Margate residents would come out to watch the Margate fireworks rather than stay home and blow off illegal fireworks.

Ms. Schwartz said she did not agree with the 10-15 percent upcharge that the vendor would impose should the fireworks have to be rescheduled to the following day. She said she did not understand why the MCRA should be liable for an additional cost due to bad weather.

Chair Ruzzano commented that it was likely standard, but it could be questioned. Mr. May stated that it was likely due to the fact that they would have to pay to have their personnel to come out on the following day. Though bad weather could be forecasted, Mrs. Peerman added that they also had to set up in advance. Ms. Schwartz asked whether they would have to take it down or whether they could cover it in the event of bad weather. Mr. May said he did not know, noting that there may be other incidental expenses. Ms. Schwartz directed that the question be asked. He asked whether the MCRA wanted to move forward with the contract. Chair Ruzzano said he did not want the contract to be contingent upon them removing it, but he said they should provide a reason for future contracts. Mr. May said he would ask if they could take it out or reduce it.

Based on the comments made, Board Attorney Tolces assisted in having the motion amended as agreed to by Ms. Schwartz as follows:

MOTION: SO MOVE FOR APPROVAL AND TO REQUEST THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SEE IF HE COULD HE GET THE POSTPONEMENT FEE REMOVED OR PROVIDE A VALID EXPLANATION

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

4B. **RESOLUTION 553:** AMENDING THE FISCAL YEAR 2018 BUDGET BY TRANSFERRING FUNDS FROM CONTINGENCY TO PROPERTY MAINTENANCE-ACE PLAZA FOR ACCIDENT REPAIRS.

After Board Attorney David Tolces read the resolution title, Mr. Caggiano made the following motion, seconded by Mrs. Peerman:

MOTION: SO MOVE TO APPROVE

Chair Ruzzano commented that the MCRA was planning to put a new façade on the shopping plaza and he said he hoped the intent was to go with impact glass. He said he saw several of the estimates for the repair work and impact glass was not included.

James Nardi, Advanced Asset Management, explained that the accident occurred in November, 2017, and he had been working with Liberty Mutual to arrive at a settlement. He said there was nothing in the quotes received for an upgrade through them and the maximum coverage for the policy was \$50,000, and the MCRA received \$42,000. He said about a year and on-half ago, a different tenant had requested a quote for impact glass and it was approximately \$29,000 at that time.

Mr. Nardi said the quotes for this job included the removing the existing storefront, removing the damaged knee wall, covering the structure work needed including permitting, providing security while under construction, and re-installing the existing glass.

Sam May, Executive Director, asked how many other windows would not be impact glass, if they replaced this storefront with impact glass. Mr. Nardi said there was a total of 22 there, and seven of them would be removed to make this repair but it would be the same glass going back in.

Chair Ruzzano asked whether the MCRA planned to install impact glass in the future. Mr. May said he was not aware of any plans to do so, however, he had asked Mr. Nardi to speak with Mr. Michelson [Saltz Michelson] prior to making the repair to ensure that the same thing would not be done twice. Chair Ruzzano said he hoped the façade improvement plans would include impact glass. He asked whether this request would need to come back before the Board if the decision was to move ahead with impact glass. Mr. May said it would come back to them for approval of the additional expense for impact glass.

Chair Ruzzano asked Mr. Nardi if he could have the vendors re-quote the job with impact glass and negotiate the price. He said he could but he thought the dollar amount might take it above the threshold. Mr. May said he would check into it with the Purchasing Department.

Chair Ruzzano asked the other Board members whether they thought impact glass should be installed as part of the façade improvements being done at the plazas. Mr. Caggiano said it was a wonderful idea because it would protect the businesses from hurricanes. Ms. Schwartz said it would be throwing good money after bad if the MCRA were making it look the way it had before. Mr. Nardi said he agreed to a certain point, however, the current situation was hazardous. He said he had been fighting with Liberty Mutual for eight months to provide the funds for the repair. He reiterated that the quotes for this job did not provide for the replacement of any glass. He said the repair needed to occur quickly because it was not a safe situation.

Chair Ruzzano said if impact glass were put in, the whole window frame would need to be redone. He questioned the decision to put the same frame back in. Mr. May said he would need to be given the authority to move ahead and replace it with impact glass.

David Tolces, CRA Board Attorney, suggested making a separate motion to authorize the change in the improvement, in addition to the current resolution. He said if the Executive Director needed to come back at a later date to transfer additional funds, he could do so.

Mr. Nardi said the first phase of this job would be for the engineer to meet with the City to review the requirements needed to rebuild the knee wall. At that time, he said exact requirements could be obtained from the City, such as whether the rest of the building would need to have impact glass or whether certain bays could be done.

Chair Ruzzano said he was not sure if the new façade concept would have knee walls, noting that some of the other bays had floor to ceiling glass. He said maybe it would not be necessary to have floor to ceiling glass with the new façade, depending on what the architect was planning. Mr. Nardi said he did want to waste any money, but certain repairs needed to be made. He said it was likely the job would need to go back out for sealed bids because of the dollar amount.

Mrs. Peerman said she wanted to wait until after the money was transferred. Ms. Schwartz said the budget transfer should take place and then there could be a follow-up conversation about the repairs.

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

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

MOTION: TO DIRECT THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO LOOK INTO
IMPACT GLASS AS WELL AS THE FAÇADE IMPROVEMENTS

Mrs. Peerman said maybe it would be possible to make the repair without putting up something that would need to be torn down. Mr. Nardi said he definitely felt the conditions required that the repair be made. Ms. Schwartz suggested having the architect to come up with something more visibly pleasing at the same time the engineer was doing their review. He said that could be done and that a concrete knee wall could be done without doing a finishing veneer. Mrs. Peerman agreed. She said a new frame for the impact windows would need to be added in too.

Mr. May said a meeting would be held with Mr. Michelson as soon as he was available.

Mrs. Peerman clarified her motion, seconded by Ms. Schwartz, and Board Attorney Tolces refined it to read as follows:

MOTION: TO DIRECT THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO LOOK INTO IMPROVEMENTS AND ALTERNATIVES WITH RESPECT TO THE SHOPPING CENTER REDEVELOPMENT AT THE SAME TIME AS REVIEWING CORRECTIVE ISSUES CAUSED BY THE CAR ACCIDENT.

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

4C. **RESOLUTION 554:** AMENDING RESOLUTION 531 AND DESIGNATING ROBERT MASSARELLI AS ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR AND DESIGNEE OF THE MARGATE COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY

After Board Attorney David Tolces read the resolution title, the following motion was made by Mrs. Peerman, seconded by Mr. Caggiano:

MOTION: SO MOVE

Ms. Schwartz asked whether it was an additional paid position as it was prior to Mr. Massarelli's hiring or whether it was part of his job responsibilities.

Sam May, Executive Director, said it was not part of his job responsibilities when he was hired as the Development Services Director. He said after he was hired, it was realized that he had a wealth of experience in the CRA area and he was asked if he would be interested in the position. He said it was his recommendation that he receive the same compensation that Mr. Reichbach received.

Ms. Schwartz said she believed that the MCRA should be part of Development Services job responsibilities and no additional salary was warranted. She suggested that Mr. Massarelli be made the Executive Director because Mr. May's plate was overfull, and he had a background in CRA's.

Mrs. Peerman commented that the City and the MCRA were two separate government entities and that he should be paid for being the Assistant CRA Director. She said she would like to see how he performed as an Assistant CRA Director before being promoted to CRA Director. She said she was opposed to the City Manager being the CRA Director but she worked with Sam in Public Works and was confident of his abilities.

Ms. Schwartz said others in the department were paid one salary, in part from two separate funds. Mr. May advised that Paul Robinson was the only person in the department paid by two funds. Ms. Schwartz said a portion of Mr. Massarelli's salary could be paid by the MCRA. She disagreed that past performance necessarily predicted a person's future ability to perform considering there would be a learning curve and lack of experience in a particular area. She said Mr. Massarelli's resume included CRA experience. Ms. Schwartz said it was time to take the responsibility from Sam and give it to Mr. Massarelli who had a proven background. She said she would entertain paying an additional amount for that position but she did not agree with paying two additional salaries.

Mrs. Peerman commented that Sam had worked hard to learn the CRA. She said the Board might decide in six months to move him [Mr. Massarelli] up but for now she wanted to keep Sam as Executive Director and to pay Mr. Massarelli for being the Assistant CRA Director.

Ms. Schwartz commented that Mr. May had too much to do. She said it was never meant to be Mr. May's permanent job, and the intent was always to hire someone. She said he needed to direct more time to his other role which is far bigger and more far more important, especially since he was the only person doing it.

Ms. Simone agreed with Ms. Schwarz in that she said she was never in favor of making Mr. May the CRA Director because the City Manager was a full time job. She said she was in favor of making Mr. Massarelli the CRA Assistant Director. She said he was very knowledgeable and he would do well. She agreed that Mr. May's plate was overflowing, especially since he did not have an assistant. She made the following amendment:

AMENDMENT: TO MAKE ROBERT MASSARELLI...(not completed)

Mr. Caggiano asked to make a comment prior to the motion because it might alter it. Board Attorney Tolces directed Ms. Simone to withdraw her motion which she agreed to do.

Mr. Caggiano agreed that Mr. May had a lot on his plate, especially since he did not currently have an assistant. He asked if they would consider giving Mr. Massarelli a two month training period prior to making him the Director immediately so Mr. May could wean him into the position. Ms. Schwartz said she did not think he needed a training period.

Ms. Schwartz suggested the Board ask Mr. Massarelli.

Robert Massarelli, said he appreciated the confidences presented by the Board members. He said he was not interested in being the Director. He said his passion was on the planning side and addressing the planning and economic development issues that existed in the City. He agreed that there was an overlap between economic development and the MCRA. He noted that the MCRA would be coming to an end soon and there would be a lot of work involved in closing it out. He said he would assist Mr. May with a lot of the grunt work that currently needed to be done to get the projects moving forward and to terminate the program, but it was not his passion. He said he would not have applied for the position of the Executive Director of the MCRA had it been advertised.

Ms. Schwartz commented about the 37 acres in the MCRA that needed to be planned and developed which she said fell into the purview of Development Services. She pointed out that planning was not Mr. May's forte, but it was Mr. Massarelli's as he was a planner. She said the most important things currently being done in the City were within the MCRA and she asked him why it would not end up in Development Services anyway. Mr. Massarelli responded that the MCRA had a role in the current major activities but he said the planning role in the City was much larger. He said he would be presenting a work plan to the City Commission of the various things that needed to be accomplished and a plan on how to do so which included such things as the Comprehensive Plan, transforming the Transit Oriented Corridor (TOC), the Redevelopment Plan, and Design Standards. He said the work plan would show how all those items were interrelated. He said the MCRA was more the implementation of the planning elements and that the Development Services role was much broader.

Ms. Schwartz said a permanent CRA Director was needed and she asked what department that position would fall under. Mr. Massarelli said it needed to be completely separate from Development Services to avoid any conflicts of interest, just as the Board sat separately from the City Commission. She said ideally it should have a separate staff. She asked when that position would be advertised because it was a full time job for which the MCRA did not have a full time person. Mr. May said he would like to get the Assistant City Manager person in place first. He said the MCRA had a lot of projects in the works, including many that involved Jim Nardi that had been sitting stagnant under past directors. He said his institutional knowledge had enabled him to be a good MCRA Director and to provide direction and move projects forward quicker. He agreed that a permanent director was needed but he also did not want to see projects fall behind. He emphasized that running the MCRA was not a one person job and that the MCRA worked together as a team.

Ms. Schwartz asked Mr. Massarelli if he were interested in being the Assistant CRA Director. Mr. Massarelli reinforced what Mr. May had said about the team approach that the department followed. He said he was able to provide assistance to Mr. May in those areas where planning and the CRA interacted. She asked whether he would be doing so regardless of his title. Board Attorney Tolces said that he would but he would not be doing so on behalf of the MCRA. He said this would allow him to do work on behalf of the MCRA and to be paid for that work.

Mr. May explained that he held separate MCRA meetings every Wednesday morning where only MCRA business and projects were discussed.

Ms. Simone commented that Mr. Massarelli would be a tremendous support to Mr. May. She said she recognized that both positions were full time and she felt badly that he had to work double time. Mr. May said he was very thankful for Mr. Massarelli and the knowledge he brought to the City and MCRA.

Mr. Ruzzano said he appreciated Mr. Massarelli being here. He commented that the person at the top was only as good as his/her staff and team and he commended Mr. May on his performance. He told Mr. Massarelli to let the Board and Mr. May know if he ever reached a point where he felt a MCRA Director was needed.

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

5A. **DISCUSSION & POSSIBLE ACTION:** REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION – PROPOSED SHOPPING CENTER IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Robert Massarelli, Assistant CRA Director, referenced the meeting back-up which included a list of six questions in regards to the Shopping Center Improvement Program for which clarification was needed so the expectations would be clear once the program was released.

Question #1: Is the intent to only apply this program to “shopping centers” or to all commercial structures within the MCRA?

He said the program was being developed as a shopping center property improvement program but the Redevelopment Plan was more oriented towards businesses noting that it mentioned shopping centers once. He asked why the program was being limited to only shopping centers and not to all commercial operations in the MCRA. He said the individual commercial businesses could be under the existing façade improvement program, or he asked whether it should be merged with this new program to provide more opportunities. Mr. Caggiano thanked Mr. Massarelli for the great questions. He said the intent of the program would be that it would apply to all commercial structures with the existing program being applicable to smaller projects and greater funding for the shopping centers.

Question #2: If the program is limited to “shopping centers”, what constitutes a shopping center?

Mr. Caggiano said question one answered question two.

Mr. Massarelli asked the Board if the general consensus was that the program would apply to all commercial. Several Board members responded affirmatively; none expressed dissent. He noted that question two became irrelevant.

Question #3: If it includes all commercial structures, should the program include industrial structures, such as the areas along Banks Road?

Mrs. Peerman responded affirmatively, noting that many other CRA's had been able to make great improvements to industrial areas with facades and landscaping. Chair Ruzzano agreed. Ms. Schwartz suggested that standards be applied so the facades would have a consistent appearance with neighboring bays. Mr. Massarelli agreed about the importance of design standards and noted that there might need to be a subsection developed in the design standards for industrial.

Question #4: Should the program be limited to properties fronting arterial and collector roads or should it include local streets such as between Banks Road and U.S. 441?

Mrs. Peerman said it should encompass the entire area, noting that many people traveled down N.W. 15th Street, as well as others. She said it would attract more businesses. Ms. Schwartz commented that the funding might need to be different. She was in favor of spending more on the appearance of the major arterial roads where there were major shopping areas. Mrs. Peerman questioned why the MCRA would not want to improve N.W. 15th Street which went through the industrial park. Ms. Schwartz clarified that she would spend less money to refurbish areas not on the main roadways. She suggested having multiple tiers. Mr. Caggiano gave an analogy to point out that the bad areas needed to be improved as well. Mrs. Peerman agreed, noting that improvements should not be done piecemeal. Sam May, Executive Director, suggested breaking out a separate funding level for the major roadways and industrial areas.

Question #5: Should the improvements be limited to what is visible from the street or can it include improvements to the rear of the building, for example, improvements to address unsanitary or unsightly dumpsters or outside storage areas?

Mrs. Peerman said she embraced overall improvements. Ms. Schwartz said she was opposed to giving funding to anyone who had issues with code compliance. Mr. Massarelli noted that question number six pertained to that very issue. He stated that any code violations would need to be corrected prior to any grant. Mr. Caggiano said they needed to be corrected prior to qualifying. Ms. Schwartz said it needed to be a partnership. Mrs. Peerman said the code issues needed to be a part of the project but not that the MCRA would just pay for upgrades related to code issues.

Ms. Schwartz asked if whether this was a matching grant or whether the MCRA was funding 100 percent. Mr. Massarelli responded that it would be 80/20 with the MCRA funding 80 percent. Chair Ruzzano thought it had been changed to 50/50. Mr. Massarelli said the 50/50 split applied to the Business Incentive Program. Ms. Schwartz suggested a split of 75/25 which would enable the MCRA to do more. Mr. Massarelli suggested waiting to see how many businesses applied. He said a lot of money would be spent on the larger shopping centers on improvements other than just the building façade, i.e., lighting, parking lot improvements including drainage, landscaping and irrigation, etc. He recommended keeping the percentage at 80/20 to make it desirable. She asked if there would be stipulations for the businesses to maintain the improvements. Mr. Massarelli said he would be working with them and

Code Enforcement to review the program and it would be made clear to the grant recipients what the expectations were for maintenance.

Board Attorney Tolces said there would be language in the agreement that would outline the specific conditions regarding repayment or obligations to maintain, etc. He said their firm would work with staff on terms that would protect the MCRA's investment.

Mr. Massarelli asked the Board members if they had any further guidance or other items to consider as the commercial/industrial property improvement program was being finalized. Chair Ruzzano asked how much money was being budgeted for the program. Mr. Massarelli said it was \$1.5 million dollars. Mr. Massarelli said he was currently working on the 2019 budget and he anticipated that the amount would be increased.

Ms. Schwartz asked if the program would ensure that the signage and coloring would be consistent. Mr. Massarelli said that was why the design standards were so important. Chair Ruzzano asked if the program could be used for monument signs. Mr. Massarelli said it could be used for signs. Chair Ruzzano asked about the limited number of monument signs that were allowed on a property. Mr. May responded that it was a City code that would need to be addressed by the City Commission.

A SHORT RECESS WAS TAKEN AT 8:59 P.M.; THE MEETING RECONVENED AT 9:10 P.M.

6. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Sam May, Executive Director, provided the following updates:

-Colonial Drive-work had started.

-Copans Road-waiting on MOT (Maintenance of Traffic) approval from the County.

-ICSC Florida Conference in Orlando, August 26-28, 2018. He said the MCRA would like to have a booth there and have three staff members attend as well as any of the Board members. He said the booth fee was \$715.00 which included one person's registration. There was a short conversation about the benefits of attending, the cost, and marketing. Ms. Schwartz said attendees had asked for videos instead of cards and handouts. The Board gave consensus for staff members to attend the conference.

-Sports Complex-the scope of work and plans had been given to Purchasing for the Request For Proposal that would be going out. Chair Ruzzano said he had previously asked that the Board have an opportunity to review the projects before they were sent out to bid. Mr. May said it had not gotten to that point yet and the Board would be able to see it first.

6A. TENANT UPDATES

James Nardi, Advanced Asset Management, advised that five tenants owed rent for June; three of which owed for May as well, and they had been given three-day notices.

7. BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

Ms. Schwartz said she attended the Groove and Green event and the produce section was missing. She suggested that the food trucks be placed along U.S. 441 instead of Margate Boulevard so they would be more visible. She also suggested repositioning the placement of the tents so there would be less wet grass to cross. She said the lack of portable bathrooms was a big issue for attendee, and she expected there would be 50-85 vendors but there were only about 25 there. She said Chris Gaidry told her that it was due to the weather. Ms. Schwartz said she had an issue paying the full fee for the event.

Sam May, Executive Director, said he shared many of her concerns and he had shared them with Mr. Gaidry. He said the portolets were delivered to the wrong place. He said Mr. Gaidry had been let down by a produce vendor that had promised to be there, but he assured him there would be more produce at the next event. He said there were some good aspects to the event, but the lack of produce was a problem. Ms. Schwartz said the tent was large but it would not be big enough to accommodate the produce. Mr. May explained that his understanding was that most of the costs were pass-through. He said Mr. Gaidry would eventually make money on the vendors that participated but he was not making any money yet. There was a back and discussion between Ms. Schwartz and Mr. May about the various costs. Mr. May said the contract could be restructured if necessary to have everything be handled as pass-through items with

a percentage on top. He said he spoke with Mr. Gaidry about possibly having two tents. He explained that as the first event, it was a learning experience for everyone, and he expressed confidence that would grow.

There was a short discussion about the possibility of having a second tent and/or the MCRA purchasing a tent. Mr. May explained that the issue with the MCRA buying its own tent was the set-up and breakdown of it. He said the MCRA would explore the option of having the tent company set up and take down a MCRA owned tent.

Mrs. Peerman explained that the problem with getting local produce was that it was not the growing season which was also one of the reasons green markets ran during the winter months. She suggested that Mr. Gaidry reach out to Margate residents and open it up for them to sell their produce such as mangoes, coconuts, and lychees. Mr. May said he told Mr. Gaidry that he should also include commercial produce in addition to local and organic produce. Mrs. Peerman commented on the vendors and food trucks that she liked and some of the amenities. She said she thought the jazz band was great; however, she said local bands would play for free for the exposure. She suggested reaching out to the local jazz society that played at the library to see if they were interested. She also suggested that Mr. Gaidry reach out to farmer's market staples which included the bread lady, the fresh mozzarella guy in Pompano, and the pickle guy, noting that they were not seasonal.

Chair Ruzzano shared some feedback which included that the grass was too high, there needed to be more bathrooms, and that the number of vendors at the event fell short of his contract which stated he would have 50-100 unique, quality green market vendors.

Ms. Schwartz commented that jello shots were being offered at the event which was not approved. She said they were approved to sell mimosas.

Chair Ruzzano said he never wanted to see glass pipes at any of the events. He asked if the hours could be extended to run a little later. Mr. May said he spoke with Mr. Gaidry about possibly extending it to 3:00 p.m. Ms. Schwartz commented that she noticed that people left as soon as the music stopped. Chair Ruzzano suggested purchasing a tent and leaving it up after hurricane season. Mr. May said he would like to leave the frame up and take the canvas up and down.

Ms. Simone commented that having animal rescues and vendors selling pet related products had been previously discussed but none was at the event.

Mrs. Peerman suggested getting the vendor at the Walk who sold plants and fruit trees, as well as orchid vendors. Mr. May asked the Board to provide him with any vendor contact information they had and he would pass it along to Mr. Gaidry.

There was a short discussion about what Mr. Gaidry charged the vendors and food trucks. Mr. May said he was trying to get vendors interested in participating. Mrs. Peerman said he charged the food trucks. Chair Ruzzano said it was his understanding that he charged the vendors unless they were from Margate. He said he had an issue with that because MCRA was trying to build the event and Mr. Gaidry was trying to make money on it. Mr. May explained that the vendor fees were the only way Mr. Gaidry made money because all the other costs were pass-through costs. There were questions about what those pass-through costs were. Chair Ruzzano said Margate businesses that he told to contact Mr. Gaidry were not receiving return calls. He suggested reaching out to businesses and give them one month free, and if they liked it, then they could negotiate with Mr. Gaidry.

Mrs. Peerman said the Board had previously asked Mr. Gaidry to provide a list of vendors that were scheduled to participate. She said there were some good aspects to the event including the bean bag chairs, the music, and the tent. She asked about the pass-through costs. Mr. May said the MCRA had not yet received an invoice for the event. She commented that running a market was not easy, particularly during rainy season and she said she was willing to help him to reach out to other people but not if he was going to charge them \$100 to attend.

Mrs. Peerman said she had not been privy to letter that had been sent by Mr. Artner regarding the Las Vegas conference in which he referred to a session concerning outlet malls. She said she had attended the outlet mall session and the trend for outlet malls was changing and outlet stores were now going to smaller urban areas and strip malls. She said Margate residents had long said that they would like to have outlet stores. She said she brought back some tools for Mr. May that would help in attracting businesses. She said having a hotel in Margate would help make travel baseball possible. She said she spoke to a few hotels including Cobblestone and LaQuinta.

Ms. Simone asked about the status of the utility art boxes.

Diana Scarpetta, CRA Project Specialist, said staff was waiting for art selections from some of the Board members. She said she was in the process of researching ownership of the different boxes, i.e., County, or State, or Florida Power & Light (FPL). Ms. Simone commented that she thought the research had already been done. Ms. Scarpetta responded that the previous research contained some mistakes. Ms. Schwartz asked for another copy of the proposed images; Mr. Ruzzano said he had them and he would review the images. Ms. Scarpetta said that once the art was approved, the permitting process could be started with the County.

Mr. Caggiano had asked if the MCRA could sponsor the Chamber of Commerce's June breakfast for \$500 which would be held at McDivot's. He said the MCRA would have the opportunity to speak at the breakfast and talk to businesses about some of the MCRA's initiatives. He said there were between 40-70 people who attended, depending on the month. Mr. Caggiano made the following motion, seconded by Ms. Simone:

MOTION: TO APPROVE \$500 FOR CHAMBER BREAKFAST BEING HELD ON JUNE 28, 2018

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

Chair Ruzzano asked if the MCRA was responsible for the trees on Coconut Creek Parkway because there were several dead palm trees. James Nardi, Advanced Asset Management, said he had requested quotes to replace them.

Chair Ruzzano asked about the possibility of extending the band for one more set on July 4th after the fireworks when everyone was leaving. Mrs. Peerman suggested having taped music played instead of the band. He agreed.

Chair Ruzzano asked the CRA Board Attorney whether the MCRA was being sued by New Urban Communities. David Tolces, CRA Board Attorney, responded that the MCRA was currently in litigation.

There being no additional business, the meeting adjourned at 10:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Transcribed by Rita Rodi, CRA Coordinator

Tommy Ruzzano, Chair