



CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE

REGULAR MEETING APPROVED MINUTES
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE
CENTRAL CITY REDEVELOPMENT ADVISORY BOARD
WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 7, 2024 – 6:00 PM
CRA CONFERENCE ROOM
914 SISTRUNK BOULEVARD, SUITE 200
FORT LAUDERDALE, FL 33311

Cumulative Attendance
September 2023-August 2024

Board Members	Present/Absent	Present	Absent
Troy Liggett, Chair	P	7	0
Carlton Smith, Vice Chair	P	10	1
Edward Catalano	P	12	0
Linda Fleischman	P	11	1
Justin Greenbaum	A	10	2
Thomas Mabey	P	2	0
Christina Robinson	P	10	2
Nikola Stan	P	12	0
Bobby Tinoco	P	5	0
Kimber White	P	2	0
Antoinette Wright	P	4	0

Staff:

Anthony Fajardo, Assistant City Manager
D'Wayne Spence, Deputy City Attorney
Cija Omengabar, CRA Planner/Liaison
Tania Bailey-Watson, CRA Senior Administrative Assistant

Others:

Robin Martin, Rebuilding Together
K. Cruitt, Recording Secretary, Prototype Inc.

Communication to the City Commission:

None

I. Pledge of Allegiance

Board members recited the Pledge of Allegiance.

II. Call to Order & Determination of Quorum

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m. Roll was called, and it was noted that a quorum was present.

III. Approval of Meeting Minutes

Motion by Mr. Catalano, seconded by Mr. White to approve the minutes of the July 24, 2024 regular meeting as corrected. In a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

IV. Discussion with Deputy City Attorney

D'Wayne Spence, Deputy City Attorney answered questions; discussion topics included:

- Informational presentations, handling of motions, need for respectful exchanges, points of order, structure and implementation of other procedures to streamline future meetings.
- Mr. Spence addressed the comprehensive re-zoning process and clarified that this advisory Board is not expected to know land use and planning or to have the same viewpoint as the Planning and Zoning Board which does not have the same redevelopment goals that CCRAB has. He also thanked the Board for their service in this redevelopment area.
- Mr. White asked about individual member liabilities and insurance. Mr. Spence explained the advisory boards have no liability, that the City Commission is the Community Redevelopment Agency Board. He explained the structure and that the City Commission would make the final decisions with regards to the CRA; individual members are protected.
- Ms. Wright asked whether there are legal, documented or other regulatory requirements for members to survey the public in the decision-making process. Mr. Spence explained that the statutory process requires that Planning and Zoning as well as City Commission have public hearings; recommendations made by this Board are not part of that process.
- Mr. Stan asked whether re-zoning cases that involve lawsuits with the City could involve lengthy delays while proceedings were ongoing. Mr. Spence said it could, it would depend on the length of the challenge; that the suit would have to seek an injunction, would generally be a regulatory taking, and not affect the effectiveness of the zoning being put in place.
- Ms. Fleishman inquired whether the Planning and Zoning Board and CRA can override the Board's recommendations. Mr. Spence advised that they could. Ms. Fleischman also asked if the Board could meet stakeholders involved; Mr. Spence explained that planning staff could set up public meetings or workshops. Mr. Fajardo added context with regards to cost and process.
- Ms. Wright inquired whether there was in fact a challenge and if the request was submitted to the Planning and Zoning Board. Ms. Omgenbar clarified that there was no legal challenge, that staff is still in the proposal phase, and the interested parties would be coming to the Board. Mr. Spence recommended the Board attempt to resolve the issue prior to forwarding their document to the Planning and Zoning Board and added the Board was doing a good job for the community.
- Mr. Liggett outlined the history on re-zoning being considered for an area partially zoned for commercial business up to 150 feet. He requested guidance as current zoning is not amenable to development and that the Board's intent is to implement incentives for the smaller heights desired in certain locations, and up to 15 stories with parking and other things. Mr. Spence said that question was diving into land use law, that comprehensive re-

zoning is deemed to be more legislative and recommended seeing whether those plans could accommodate some of the community's concerns.

- There was additional discussion and clarification on procedural matters led by Mr. White relative to the Board, interactions with neighborhood associations, and Robert's Rules which Mr. Spence indicated is a recognized guide on parliamentary procedures.

V. Informative Presentation Rebuilding Together

Mr. Robin Martin, Executive Director of Rebuilding Together Broward County provided a PowerPoint presentation, a copy of which is attached to these minutes for the public record. He added that their waitlist has over 100 people and is prioritized by need.

Ms. Fleischman inquired about the criteria for a person to be eligible for grant funding and whether the home had to be paid off. Mr. Martin advised that the criteria is based on the funder; owners must have taxes paid, may have a mortgage or reverse mortgage in good standing, and that their general requirements are listed online.

Mr. Stan asked about bandwidth to service people in the CRA soon if the Board were to partner on a program. Mr. Martin advised if funding was approved, they would be able to service them sooner because they outsource to home technicians.

Mr. Smith inquired about the potential for partnering with Rebuilding Together. Ms. Omengabar advised they had partnered with the organization for the Northwest CRA previously, the difference being that this CRA allocated \$5,000 for the homestead and \$2,500 for rental properties, adding that the majority of the homes are multi-family. Ms. Robinson added that the neighborhood is primarily tenant occupied with South Middle River being at 75%; the program would give \$2,500 to the majority so those owners would be required to match funding.

Ms. Wright asked whether they should discuss the CRA's existing program, the potential for a partnership opportunity or create something new. Mr. Smith felt it would be a good opportunity to partner with someone that could stretch those funds further than the CRA alone. Ms. Omengabar pointed out that the CRA's program was a pilot and had not been advertised; while the Board asked to expand to the entire area, she had not had the outreach to inform everyone and those that she had reached out were not ready to invest the \$2,500.

Mr. Catalano reminded the Board that they are required to get three bids from entities that must be insured and licensed; this could eliminate all of that.

Mr. Liggett asked what was done for the Northwest CRA, and about the cost. Mr. Martin advised it was a beautification program; they painted and landscaped 40 homes at an average cost of \$5,000 per home. Mr. Martin added they average \$3,000 to \$5,000 per home, would add value through partners, and had also done block rebuilds with volunteers.

Ms. Robinson stated they also address health and safety issues inside homes.

Ms. Wright asked whether the Board could take an existing program and change it, sunset it or charter another one. Mr. Liggett advised the Commission acting as the CRA Board has approved the CRA's program; they would have to request approval to change it. Mr. Martin advised they

have a template and process to work with landlords, that they are ready to work with the CRA on a program.

Mr. Tinoco asked if the Board can set the rules as to who qualifies. Mr. Martin said yes, as long as the parameters make sense, and they are helping the community; they can help anyone in Broward County or the CRA districts.

Mr. Stan asked if Rebuilding Together would reach out to people since one of the challenges had been getting through to people and deciding who would participate. Mr. Martin said yes, that they would be asked to contact his organization which would go door to door with flyers and explain what would be provided.

Mr. White asked whether their program could be customized if they considered consolidating it into the CRA's existing program which included homes valued at \$750,000, and whether the CRA could prioritize the work. Mr. Martin said it could be customized and his organization would work with the CRA's waitlist if there was one; they would work with City staff to inspect homes and determine priorities.

Mr. Fajardo asked how much would go to overhead out of any funds allocated. Mr. Martin said their general overhead is less than 15% since they outsource and layer partners.

VI. Discussion of the Façade & Landscape Program

Ms. Robinson stated that based on feedback from neighbors, the Board should consider including driveways and fencing within the parameters of the program.

Mr. White agreed. Mr. Stan also agreed and suggested they include hardscape where owners do not have sprinklers.

Mr. Fajardo pointed out that in some cases, fence and driveway work could need permits and hit thresholds. Ms. Omengebar added that this is a beautification program.

Ms. Wright asked why sprinklers and irrigation are not included. Ms. Omengebar said it had been a rule since the program had been established. Mr. Fajardo added that landscaping must be drought tolerant, and the City follows the Florida Friendly requirement.

Ms. Omengebar asked whether the Board was considering increasing the allowed funding for each applicant. Ms. Wright said \$5,000 was insufficient in the current economy; Mr. White suggested they raise it to \$7,000.

The Board discussed partnering with Rebuilding Together. Mr. Fajardo suggested considering parallel programs for a while since the program was already advertised. Mr. Catalano agreed a

combination program would be best, at least initially, and they needed to simplify the paperwork. Mr. White did not recommend turning the CRA program over 100% to Rebuilding Together.

There was also discussion on whether to continue the requirement for a contractor to be hired, as well as adding consideration for the disabled and elderly.

The Board asked staff to come back with a proposal for adjustments. Mr. Fajardo said based on their discussion, staff would work on three options and associated costs for consideration.

Motion by Mr. Smith, seconded by Mr. White, to table additional conversation on this subject to a future meeting. All were in favor by a voice vote.

VII. Old/New Business

- **Miscellaneous**

Ms. Omengabar provided an overview of what staff had done so far with the Capital Improvement Project; she is working on the scope and will bring it back in September.

- **Streetscape & Infrastructure Design Standards and Guidelines Update**

Ms. Omengabar is in the planning and preparation phase; by the time it goes to procurement it will be about 3 months.

- **September Agenda Recommendations**

1. Programs Outreach Discussion
2. Incentive Program Presentation – Eligibility
3. Scope Discussion: Streetscape and Infrastructure Design and Guidelines
4. NE 4th Ave Update

VIII. Nomination and Selection of Positions

- **Chair Position**

In the initial roll vote, nominees Mr. White and Mr. Liggett were tied 5-5. In the second, Mr. White was elected Chairman with a 6-4 vote at 8:13 p.m.

- **Vice Chair Position**

Ms. Wright was elected Vice Chair at 8:16 p.m. in a 7-3 roll vote.

IX. Communication to City Commission

None.

X. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:16 p.m.