

COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY BOARD

REGULAR MEETING

May 8, 2019

MINUTES

Present:

Arlene Schwartz
Antonio V. Arserio
Joanne Simone
Anthony Caggiano, Vice Chair
Tommy Ruzzano, Chair

Also Present:

Sam May, Executive Director
David Tolces, Goren, Cherof, Doody & Ezrol, P.A.
Robert Massarelli, Assistant Executive Director
Diana Scapetta, 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 7:04 p.m., on Wednesday, May 8, 2019, by Chair Tommy Ruzzano. There was a moment of silence followed by the Pledge of Allegiance. Roll call was taken.

Chair Ruzzano asked the Board if a prospective tenant could introduce himself to the Board following Item 2, Public Discussion; the Board members gave general consent.

1A. MINUTES FOR APPROVAL - (3/13/19 Regular)

After David Tolces, Board Attorney, read the item title and Mr. Caggiano made the following motion, seconded by Ms. Schwartz:

MOTION: SO MOVE TO APPROVE

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

2. PUBLIC DISCUSSION

No one came forward to speak.

Jeff Saunders stated that he was interested in acquiring the tenant space at 5801 Margate Boulevard. He said he had been asked about his experience and he held up a document that showed proof of it in his archives. He spoke about what he considered one of his biggest accomplishments relative to the restaurant business. He said there was an alcohol problem in Clinton, Missouri and he started a delivery service for beer and wine to residents in an effort to reduce DUI's and deaths. He said then he opened up a restaurant in 2005. He said he also owned a non-profit organization, Helping Hands USA, which assisted causes such as Wounded Warriors, cancer, and diabetes. He said he was excited about the opportunity to be a part of the community. He said he had been watching the property for four years and he knew a lot about it. He said he planned to offer an open menu similar to Aruba's and to serve American style food with a Latin influence. He said they planned to serve breakfast, lunch, and dinner. Mr. Saunders said he planned to offer outside seating and to open up the side glass area. Ms. Schwartz commented that his changes might require American Disabilities Act (ADA) compliance. Mr. Saunders said he hoped to be able to open before July, 2019.

3A. RESOLUTION 598: AUTHORIZING AN AGREEMENT WITH ZAMBELLI FIREWORKS MANUFACTURING COMPANY FOR THE FOURTH OF JULY FIREWORKS DISPLAY

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

MOTION: SO MOVE TO APPROVE

Mr. Caggiano referenced page 2, item 8, and asked what an acceptable failure rate would be for unexploded fireworks. Samuel A. May, Executive Director, said he did not have that information.

Mr. Arserio asked if the fireworks display had been 20-minutes in the past. Mr. May said it had always been 20-minutes but an upgraded fireworks display was requested this year. He said the additional \$5,000 would provide a more intense display with less gaps in between. Mr. Arserio referenced page 1, item 1, and asked if Zambelli had submitted the program mentioned. Mr. May said he would follow up with Mike Jones and get back to them.

Ms. Simone commented that she was not in favor of spending anymore on fireworks and she would rather see the additional \$5,000 be put to a better use such as assisting a Margate business.

Chair Ruzzano said he would prefer to have 10 minutes of bang than 20 minutes of drag time.

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

3B. **RESOLUTION 599:** AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO NEGOTIATE AN AGREEMENT WITH THE HIGHEST RANKED FIRM, MBR CONSTRUCTION, INC., FOR RFQ 2019-02 DESIGN/BUILD-SPORTS FIELD COVERED PLAY STRUCTURE PROJECT; PROVIDING THAT IF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR CANNOT REACH AN AGREEMENT WITH THE HIGHEST RANKED FIRM THAT THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR MAY NEGOTIATE WITH THE NEXT RANKED FIRM, IN SUCCESSION, UNTIL AN AGREEMENT IS REACHED

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

MOTION: SO MOVE TO APPROVE

Mr. Caggiano said he reviewed the ranking sheets and he asked why there was so much variance between them. Sam May, Executive Director, explained that typically each individual ranked differently and that was fine as long as each one ranked each firm consistently. A short discussion ensued about the ranking process. Mr. May commented that the two top ranked firms had done a lot of work in the type of construction being requested and either would be a solid choice.

Chair Ruzzano asked if the agreement would come back to the Board for approval; Mr. May said it would come back to them. David Tolces, Board Attorney, pointed out that the resolution authorized the Executive Director to both negotiate and execute the agreement. It was agreed that it should come back to the Board for approval.

Chair Ruzzano commented that the project would provide a multitude of uses. Mr. May commented that the City of Sunrise had indicated that a lesson learned was that they wished they had more power put in their facility for concerts and vendors. He said staff would ensure this project had enough power supply for a variety of uses.

Attorney Tolces said the caption of the resolution needed to be amended to remove the reference to the execution of the agreement and to remove Section 3. He asked Mr. Arserio if he agreed to amend his motion to reflect the noted changes and he asked Mr. Caggiano if he also agreed with the changes. Both agreed to the changes.

AMENDED MOTION: SO MOVE TO APPROVE WITH THE REMOVAL OF THE REFERENCE FOR THE EXECUTION OF THE AGREEMENT AND THE REMOVAL OF SECTION 3.

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

4A. **DISCUSSION & POSSIBLE ACTION:** COMMON AREA MAINTENANCE (CAM) CHARGES FOR IMPROVED SHOPPING PLAZAS

David Tolces, Board Attorney, read the item title.

James Nardi, Advanced Asset Management, stated that several Board members had asked about Common Area Maintenance (CAM) charges as it related to what the MCRA charged and that of neighboring plazas. He said his research of surrounding plazas similar to the MCRA's averaged between \$5.00 to \$10.50 per square foot, and base rent rates ran between \$13.00 to \$23.00; Lakewood Plaza was \$24.00 per square foot. He said he did a

quick summary of the MCRA's current common area charges and Ace Plaza was about \$4.38 per square foot, and Chevy Chase was \$4.75 per square foot. Mr. Nardi said the basic expenses including landscaping, waste management, taxes and insurance at Ace Plaza were approximately \$185,000 and \$200,000 at Chevy Chase Plaza.

Mr. Arserio asked how the rent charged for the MCRA's plazas compared. Mr. Nardi explained that the MCRA's leases started at \$12.00 per square foot and since the MCRA did very little with the build-out of the spaces and it relied on the tenant to do them, the rate might vary. Mr. Arserio commented that the MCRA should continue to offer incentives to attract businesses but it was missing out on revenue and he was open to introducing CAM charges. Mr. Caggiano asked Mr. Nardi to provide a few scenarios over the following month to better understand the financial impact on the tenants.

Ms. Schwartz asked about the type of repairs that a tenant might be required to do, other than a water heater or air conditioner. Mr. Nardi spoke about buildout costs which he said might include the kitchen equipment for a restaurant, flooring, or the costs to expand.

Discussion ensued about the fact that the MCRA was investing a lot in the plazas to help the businesses and that the improvements would require upkeep, and what the suggested CAM charge should be, as well as and whether it would be phased in or apply to tenants only. Mr. Nardi commented that the improvements had generated a lot of interest. He said the research had shown that the immediate area could support a CAM charge of \$4.50 per square foot but there were differences in the MCRA's lease terms and tenant repair policy versus other plazas so further evaluation was needed. He said it would be up to the Board's discretion to decide if and how to apply CAM charges. Until directed otherwise, he said the standard lease terms would continue to apply. Chair Ruzzano commented that the MCRA already charged low rent and he would like to keep the CAM low as well for new tenants. Mr. Nardi commented that an adjustment based on the longevity of a lease should be factored in. He said he would put together a summary of neighboring plaza's lease terms for the Executive Director's review. Mr. Arserio said he would like see a few scenarios using varying CAM charges and also some ideas on how to phase in CAM charges over time. Mr. Nardi said he would also put together a list of when leases were expiring to help with the decision.

Ms. Schwartz commented that a lease was a legal contract and she questioned whether it could be renegotiated. David Tolces, Board Attorney, said if the Board were to decide to impose CAM charges, he would work with Mr. Nardi to include a clause in future leases. Mr. Nardi suggested working with the existing tenants on a phased-in approach. Mr. Caggiano explained that the purpose of the CAM would be to help maintain the beauty of the newly renovated plazas.

4B. DISCUSSION & POSSIBLE ACTION: MARGATE CRA INCENTIVE PROGRAMS

Robert Massarelli, Assistant Executive Director, explained that MCRA staff had been reviewing the various incentive programs that it offered for their efficiencies and weaknesses. He said the Development Infrastructure Assistance (DIA) program which had only been used once was found to be confusing and it was not working well. He suggested considering its elimination. He explained that the other incentive programs were for existing buildings except for the Business Incentive Grant which dealt with interior improvements for new construction and was capped at \$25,000. He said the MCRA lacked an incentive program for new buildings. He mentioned there were currently several new projects being proposed in the City including Culver's and Popeyes.

Mr. Massarelli said the Board might want to consider something like a 5-5-5-15 program. He explained that the program would pay up to five percent (5%) of construction costs up to \$500,000. The recipient would need to remain in the building for five years, and create a minimum of 15 jobs. He explained that the 5-5-5-15 program was not fixed, rather it would be a policy decision on how a program could be organized.

Mr. Massarelli proposed a series of questions to the Board to assist in defining the program.

Question #1: Should the program be limited to the construction of the building and have the interior improvements covered by a different program, or should it be a combination of both the building and interior improvements? He pointed out that it might be difficult for the general contractor to keep the cash flow separated for the interior and exterior improvements.

Chair Ruzzano commented that it should be for the general construction of the building. Ms. Schwartz commented that she preferred helping local businesses and was opposed to helping pay for a nationally franchised store. She also was not in favor of giving a business two grants. Samuel A. May, Executive Director, advised that many franchises were individually owned and the owners paid franchise fees to build a location. Chair Ruzzano said he was opposed to the

current program that paid up to \$750,000 for an existing shopping plaza and he explained that this new program was an incentive to bring new businesses and jobs to Margate. Ms. Schwartz questioned how the MCRA would recoup its money if a business went bankrupt. Attorney Tolces said it would depend upon the payment structure where the funds would get paid out over time; Mr. May added that a lien could also be put on the property. Mr. May commented that improvements made to shopping plazas brought businesses and better businesses into the City. Mr. Arserio said he preferred offering one grant program. Mr. Caggiano asked Attorney Tolces whether the MCRA could discriminate for a franchise store over a corporately owned store. Attorney Tolces said there could be language included in the guidelines for the ability to fund locally owned franchises versus nationally owned franchise stores. Ms. Simone said she also agreed with not sharing two grants and she asked whether the new program would be for stand alone buildings or shopping centers. Mr. Massarelli said it could be for either. Mr. Arserio commented that the program could be customized for different size businesses with different incentive tiers. Attorney Tolces said that the guidelines could provide certain criteria on which businesses could participate, and that the decision to award any grant was subject to the Board's approval.

Question #2: Should the program be available to all new construction, including restaurants, retail, car dealers, auto repair, self-storage, or limited to specific types of businesses?

Mr. Arserio said he would like to see it geared towards the types of businesses that the MCRA wanted to bring to Margate which included entertainment, shops, and restaurants. Ms. Schwartz said there were certain uses that should be excluded. Chair Ruzzano said that he would not exclude certain uses; rather, the Board could decide to not approve the grant.

Question #3: Should the program be limited to the construction of a completely new building or does it include the expansion of an existing building?

Chair Ruzzano said it should not include expansions; the program was meant to bring businesses in. Mr. Arserio agreed.

Question #4: Does "new construction" include buildings that are completed but not occupied, i.e., the building in front of Burger King? Does it include buildings that are currently under construction but have not received a final Certificate of Occupancy? Does it include buildings that have received a building permit but have not started construction? Does it include projects that have been approved by the DRC but have not received a building permit? Or is it limited to projects that have not started the permitting process?

Chair Ruzzano said if the building was already constructed, it would be eligible if the final Certificate of Occupancy (CO) had not been issued. There was a short discussion about architectural design standards and the DRC process. Mr. Caggiano asked about the empty Burger King building. Chair Ruzzano explained that when a building was built, there was a final and a CO, and since there was no business there, there was no CO.

Mr. Massarelli said he would take the guidance they had provided, draft it and bring it back for further discussion and refinement. Chair Ruzzano asked if it would be possible to see something before some of the Board members left for the conference in Las Vegas. He said a special meeting could be held so they could have something to take with them. Mr. May said staff would work with the attorney to see if they could help put something together.

Question #5: Is the concept of the business being there for five years reasonable? In some cases, such as the proposed Culver's or Popeyes, the building is for a specific business. But in others, such as the building in front of the Burger King, the building will be rented out to a tenant which could change periodically. If it is a building that is rented, should the applicant be required to not sell the property for a period of time, 5, 10, or other number of years so that the grant money is not used as a way to increase the profit on the building in order to flip the property?

Chair Ruzzano said it should be by the sale of the building and not by the CO, otherwise there would be a penalty.

Question #6: What should be included in eligible costs? Is it strictly the brick and mortar and labor costs? Or does it include the design and permitting costs?

Chair Ruzzano said it should be building costs of the brick and mortar building because it was a hard number for which the MCRA could get a back-up number. He advised staying away from underground, soil borings, etc. Mr. Caggiano agreed.

Question #7: Is requiring a minimum number of jobs desirable? Should the jobs be tied to a living wage?

Chair Ruzzano said he was in agreement with there being a minimum number of jobs and 15 made sense. Mr. Caggiano agreed. Mr. Arserio asked how a job was defined. Mr. Massarelli said he thought it should be equivalent full time positions that would be reported on an annual basis. He said there was criteria that needed to be defined. Mr. Arserio commented that basing it on W-2's would exclude many high paying contractual jobs that used 1099's. Ms. Schwartz recommended that it be anything that was reportable to the Internal Revenue Service (IRS).

Question #8: Should the Business Incentive Grant Program be revised to limit it to existing buildings?

Chair Ruzzano said his thought was to get rid of the old program and to give a \$25,000 grant to businesses coming from other cities in addition to a \$25,000 property improvement grant. Ms. Schwartz said for \$25,000, she was okay with new and existing. Mr. Arserio said he would like the program to be for new businesses or for businesses to invest in their business as opposed to helping to update the entire shopping center. Mr. Massarelli said the grant was strictly for interior improvements.

Ms. Schwartz commented about the need to have some buy-in from the plaza owner because they were benefiting from the tenant's improvements. She suggested that instead of the business investing 50%, perhaps it should be shared 15% and 25% because the plaza owner had no investment in keeping the business there but they reaped all the benefit of the MCRA's grant. Chair Ruzzano said the tenants that applied for the grant had to already have a signed lease. He said it was the City's responsibility to ensure that the plaza owner was maintaining their plaza. Mr. Caggiano noted that the enhanced code enforcement that the MCRA was looking at would address Ms. Schwartz's concerns.

Discussion ensued about the enhanced code enforcement position. Mr. Massarelli advised that he had been working with the police chief and the intent was to have the position filled at the start of the fiscal year. He explained that the position required an additional skill set and that the position could not duplicate work that the City was already doing. Ms. Schwartz asked whether Dan Topp could be trained to do the enhanced work prior to October and fund his position through the MCRA.

Mr. Arserio said he would like to see the process expedited. He suggested an educational period for the public prior to October. Mr. Massarelli spoke about monthly meetings that had been being held with shopping plaza owners in an effort to create partnerships and to update them on things that were happening in the City such as the updates to the Comprehensive Plan, the Land Development Code, the Zoning ordinance, grants programs, and enhanced code enforcement. Mr. May spoke about the site plan review process that would be involved. Mr. Caggiano said he would like to see the enhanced code enforcement happen sooner. Ms. Schwartz spoke about the need for a guide book for new businesses that explained the codes, grants, etc. Mr. Massarelli advised Paul Robinson was in the process of putting finishing touches on a guide and it should be done in a few weeks.

Mr. Massarelli said he received direction from the Board and he would work with Attorney Tolces to put together a program for their consideration at a special meeting to be held prior to going to Las Vegas.

Mr. Caggiano thanked Mr. Massarelli for the questions and commented on the importance of making tweaks to the grant programs.

Discussion ensued about the grant program for \$750,000 and whether it should be eliminated. Mr. May commented that the program could not be eliminated yet because there was one plaza that was very close to moving ahead with the grant. He said the Carolina Plaza had engineers working on their site plan and the required documentation for the application. Several Board members agreed to give the plaza 60 days to apply for the program or the program would be eliminated. Mr. Massarelli clarified that the program being discussed was for new construction while the other programs were for existing buildings. He said the recommendation was to eliminate the DIA program. He asked what grant programs, if any, they wanted for existed buildings noting that the façade program helped enhance the look of a shopping center which attracted new businesses. Chair Ruzzano said he was fine with a new business moving into Margate and receiving a \$25,000 grant but he was not in favor of subsidizing other people's businesses. He suggested eliminating all the grant programs for existing businesses and keep the \$25,000 Business Incentive Grant and the new 5-5-5-15 program that was being discussed. Several Board members expressed displeasure with the fact that grants were awarded to the owner of the former IHOP business.

Mr. Arserio asked why the program had not been effective and Mr. Massarelli said the reason was that it had not been marketed adequately, but it was being promoted in their recent meetings with the shopping plaza owners. He spoke about the need for business incentive grants for facades, noting that most of the plazas in the MCRA did not have anchor tenants and there was no incentive for the shopping center owners to make improvements. Ms. Simone agreed with Mr. Massarelli that grants were needed to help improve the appearance of the plazas. She agreed that two grants should not be given to the same business and reducing the grant amount might be another option. She noted that the enhanced code enforcement effort would not fix the problem because owners would be only required to bring their properties up to code but not to improve them. Mr. Arserio suggested changing the program offerings from time to time and creating a sense of urgency with them. Ms. Schwartz suggested changing the \$750,000 grant program to 50/50 if it remained. She commented about how the storefronts for Beall's and Presidente had been renovated but not the rest of the plaza. She said the rest of the plaza would have benefited from a grant program and she questioned whether the program had been discussed with the plaza owner. Mr. Caggiano expressed a concern that under the current \$750,000 grant program an owner could decide to only fix a few units. Ms. Simone asked if criteria could be set that require that an owner fix a certain number of stores. Attorney Tolces said the Board could determine the criteria that was part of the guidelines. Ms. Simone recommended that, based on the concerns expressed, Mr. Massarelli tweak the programs and come back to the Board rather than throw them out. Chair Ruzzano named three plazas in the City that looked great through private investment. He said the program was not fixing the problem; rather, it was giving money to tenants that were not keeping up their properties. Mr. May explained the purpose of the MCRA was to assist with slum and blight, and the City would reap the benefits through an increased tax base and increased jobs.

Mr. Caggiano asked Mr. Massarelli to put together some thought provoking questions to help flush out the programs. Discussion ensued about the status of Carolina Plaza and ending the \$750,000 grant program. Attorney Tolces said it was at the Board's discretion. The majority of the Board members agreed to give the Carolina Plaza 60 days to apply. Mr. Massarelli explained that large investments took time to put together.

5. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Sam May, Executive Director, provided the following updates:

Chevy Chase Plaza - Improvements were moving along. The first improvement would be updating the exterior and parking lot lighting.

Ace Plaza - The plaza improvements at Ace Plaza were on track for a July 4th completion.

Winfield Boulevard Entry Sign-The Board had approved the conceptual design and it had been given to multiple contractors for design/build quotes. Three quotes had been received and reviewed and MCRA staff was waiting for revised quotes from two of the three. Chair Ruzzano asked the Board if they thought the signs would be aluminum or concrete with stone and all of them said they thought they would be concrete. Mr. May explained that the future sign would be design/build and made out of the material that the sign contractor thought was the most suitable material and that would meet the State's sign requirements. He said the sign being discussed was for Winfield Boulevard only and the sign would look the way the MCRA wanted it to look. Discussion continued about the look and functionality of various sign materials. Mr. May commented that the signs in Margate and the City Hall building were Styrofoam. Chair Ruzzano commented that it was easier and cheaper to use concrete than aluminum. He said he did not recommend using aluminum and having two different materials. Mr. May commented that it was unlikely that the Department of Transportation would allow concrete signs on State Road 7.

Appointment of new CRA Director - Mr. May said he spoke with several of the Board members about the possibility of bringing in a former City Manager and Executive Director, Frank Porcella. He said he would be interested but only if he could speak to each Board member individually. Ms. Schwartz agreed and also suggested advertising for an Executive Director. Chair Ruzzano said he did not think a full time Executive Director was needed at this time. He said he wanted to have a 5-0 vote on bringing him on. He asked the Board members to let the Executive Director know if they knew of anyone else to consider. Ms. Simone suggested advertising for a part time Executive Director and the majority of the Board members agreed on doing both, i.e., speaking with Mr. Porcella and advertising for a part time position at an hourly rate. Chair Ruzzano said he would like to have someone experienced and familiar with the area.

5A. TENANT UPDATES

James Nardi, Advanced Asset Management, provided an update on rents at both plazas. He advised that rents at the Chevy Chase Plaza were up to date for 2018.

He spoke about the spaces that were available for rent and he indicated that Flynn's Arcade, a prospective tenant, had signed a Letter of Intent.

Mr. Arserio asked about the schedule for the new landscaping at Ace Plaza. Mr. Nardi said he had a revised quote and was ready for a purchase order but he needed to wait until the asphalt permit had been closed. Mr. Arserio spoke about his recommendations for landscape plants. He said he had received a phone call about drainage issues at the plaza after the pipes had been lined. Mr. Nardi said the plaza drained within 15 minutes.

Chair Ruzzano asked Mr. Nardi if he ever encountered issues with new tenants in regards to the City's codes, specifically with Change of Occupancy. Mr. Nardi commented that there have been requests for uses such as daycare that required drop-off/pickup lanes but he had steered away from them because of their magnitude.

Ms. Schwartz asked about the status of the wall on Atlantic Boulevard. He said a meeting had taken place with Craven Thompson to write a comprehensive scope for the project including landscaping and irrigation for the grass. Discussion ensued about different options included pavers, artificial turf or natural grass. Mr. Nardi said several options had been discussed and he understood the decision had been to go with grass between the sidewalk and the wall. Mr. Arserio said he preferred either pavers or artificial turf and he asked about the difference in price. Mr. Nardi said the scope had been finalized but it could be changed if necessary but it would delay the project. Chair Ruzzano asked the Board members if they preferred artificial turf and they agreed to go forward with the artificial turf. Mr. Nardi said the sprinklers would be capped. Mr. Arserio commented that it might be beneficial to keep the sprinkler heads uncapped to rinse away evidence left by animals. Mr. Nardi said the maintenance of artificial turf would need to be investigated, noting that the irrigation was on a well system which might not be acceptable. Chair Ruzzano showed an image on his phone of a neighborhood entry sign. Ms. Simone said she was fine with natural grass as long as it was maintained well. Chair Ruzzano gave direction to change the scope of the project to include artificial turf.

Richard Zucchini, 380 Lakewood Circle East, commented that solar LED lighting would be a nice addition on the columns.

There was a short discussion about the role of an engineer in this project.

Mr. Arserio asked if there were other projects planned for landscaping of the Atlantic Boulevard median. Robert Massarelli, Assistant Executive Director, responded that funds had been budgeted for streetscape improvements along Atlantic Boulevard but the direction had been to focus on the wall first and then revisit the medians.

Discussion ensued about cracks in some areas of the wall. Mr. Massarelli responded that it was discussed with the engineer as part of the scope and they would walk the entire wall and identify any problems. Ms. Schwartz pointed out that the cracks were on the property owner's side and she suggested sending letters. Mr. Nardi said he met with resident Mr. Pinney and reviewed the issues on his area of the wall and they did not affect what the MCRA was doing with the painting or the stonework. David Tolces, Board Attorney, commented that going onto private property often posed a liability issue which was why an easement was needed. Ms. Schwartz said the wall could not have been built without an easement. Sam May, Executive Director, commented about using the drone to take pictures of the backside of the wall.

6. BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

Ms. Schwartz – commented that the new Sign Code went into effect over a year ago and none of the tenants had complied. James Nardi, Advanced Asset Management, said he had met with Dan Topp, Community Development Inspector, and they walked through both plazas and identified five areas of concern. He said they spoke to each tenant about taking care of the issues and none resisted. He assured Ms. Schwartz that the signage issues would be resolved.

Mr. Arserio – said he liked the discussions that had been held that evening regarding the proposed program and that he would like to have those type of conversations at workshops so there would be more time for open dialogue.

He commented that the Copans Road median still looked horrible with large areas of grass without any landscaping. He said the irrigation system had been damaged by another contractor for Wawa and he asked who would pay for the dead landscaping. Samuel A. May, Executive Director, said it would ultimately be the Copans Road contractor and if he had damage claims, he would need to go after Wawa. He said the landscaping was done as per the plan and sodded areas were part of the plan. Mr. Arserio said he would like the Board to readdress the large grass areas. He commented about the need to address projects as a whole and to include pressure cleaning of the curbs and sidewalks. He said the robellini palm trees by the City's entranceway sign had not been pruned in a year or more.

He said he liked the direction the MCRA was heading but he would like to have improved communications with more regular one-on-one meetings for the MCRA, in addition to the City's agenda review. Robert Massarelli, Assistant Executive Director, asked if the other Board members desired an agenda review. Ms. Schwartz and Mr. Ruzzano said they would prefer a workshop with all members present. Mr. Arserio said he would like to have both, maybe a monthly workshop to discuss projects as well as one-on-ones. He suggested incorporating a drive around meeting as well.

Mr. Arserio asked about the status of the maintenance agreement for Colonial Drive improvements. Mr. Massarelli said the hospital would be responsible for the maintenance of the irrigation and landscaping for that area. Mr. Arserio said the irrigation they would be maintaining also fed into the State Road 7 median and he asked if they would be responsible if the landscaping in the median started to die. Mr. Massarelli said that it was the original intent. Mr. Arserio asked if they were also responsible for the swale because the grass on the west side of the sidewalk looked good but the east side was full of weeds. Mr. Massarelli said they were responsible for maintaining the swale per Code and it would need to be looked into.

Ms. Simone – commented that there had been good conversations and she liked the direction the MCRA was moving in. She acknowledged that it took a team to make it possible and she thanked everyone for their hard work.

Mr. Caggiano – stated that he also agreed.

Mr. Ruzzano – said that he also agreed that the MCRA had a great team.

He asked if the lighted RPM's on Colonial Drive had been addressed. Mr. May said the lighted RPM's were replaced with the lighted crosswalk.

He asked if the bounce houses for July 4th could be set up in the morning so the kids could use them after the parade.

He referenced Mr. Arserio's comments about the frontage road and he said he thought it was a City-owned road. Mr. May said it was a State service road. He said he thought the area between the service road, and the median strip between the service road and State Road 7 was the responsibility of the State, but the agreements would need to be checked. Chair Ruzzano asked that it be looked into because the grass started dying past Toscana. Mr. May said the area between the service road and the hospital would be the hospital's responsibility. He said the small median was either the State's or the City's, depending on how the interlocal agreement was set up.

He mentioned that the Margate Police Department started a new app with the Ring security. He asked whether the MCRA could purchase 20 Rings for National Night Out. He suggested asking Margate residents what they would like to see in the City and enter them into a raffle. He said it would be a good partnership with the MCRA. Chair Ruzzano asked the Board members if it were something they had an interest in doing. Mr. May said the MCRA would need to make sure it complied with its Plan and State Statutes and, if so, a budget transfer might be needed. Mr. Arserio said a certain percentage of forfeiture needed to be spent on crime prevention. He said the Riveria Beach CRA had purchased crime prevention products. Chair Ruzzano said Best Buy was selling the Ring doorbell for \$99 and he suggested asking them to donate them to the MCRA.

There being no additional business, the meeting adjourned at 10:38 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Transcribed by Rita Rodi, CRA Coordinator



Tommy Ruzzano, Chair