

APPROVED
MEETING MINUTES
NORTHWEST PROGRESSO – FLAGLER HEIGHTS
REDEVELOPMENT ADVISORY BOARD
FORT LAUDERDALE
CRA CONFERENCE ROOM
914 NW Sistrunk Boulevard, Suite 200
DECEMBER 13, 2016 – 2:00 P.M.

Cumulative Attendance
May 2016 - April 2017

<u>Members Present</u>	<u>Attendance</u>	<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
Ron Centamore, Chair	P	8	0
Sonya Burrows, Vice Chair	P	8	0
Jessie Adderley	A	5	3
Leann Barber	P	7	1
Alan Gabriel	P	7	1
John Hart	P	3	1
Mickey Hinton (arr. 3:40)	P	7	1
John Hooper	P	5	3
Dylan Lagi (arr. 2:33)	P	8	0
Steffen Lue	A	4	4
Scott Strawbridge	P	7	1
John Wilkes (arr. 2:23)	P	7	1

Currently there are 12 appointed members to the Board, which means 7 would constitute a quorum.

Staff

Jonathan Brown, Northwest CRA Manager
 Bob Wojcik, Planner II
 Glendon Hall, Housing and Economic Development Manager

Communications to City Commission

Motion made by Mr. Wilkes, seconded by Ms. Burrows, to have the City of Fort Lauderdale assign and transfer, for \$10 and other good and valuable consideration(s), all of the surplus properties owned by the City and located within the Northwest Progresso-Flagler Heights CRA, to be included as incentives for programs consistent with the CRA's purpose. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

I. Call to Order / Roll Call

Chair Centamore called the meeting to order at 2:08 p.m. It was noted that a quorum was present.

II. Approval of Minutes from November 7, 2016 Special Meeting and October 26, 2016 Regular Meeting

Motion made by Mr. Gabriel, seconded by Mr. Hart, to approve [the minutes of both meetings]. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

III. Discussion – Mosaic Agreement

Chair Centamore recalled that he had addressed this issue at an earlier meeting. He explained that his objection was not to the continuation of the agreement with the Mosaic Group, but to the approval process. The Board did not receive documentation on this topic in sufficient advance, despite the cost of the contract. He did not feel the process used at that time was appropriate.

Mr. Brown stated that the City Manager has requested that the Board review the tasks included in the scope of work of Mosaic's contract, as well as the number of hours proposed to complete these tasks. The City Manager wishes to ensure that the Redevelopment Advisory Board (RAB) understands the tasks identified, and if they are not satisfied with the proposed number of hours in which to complete these tasks, that they recommend an appropriate number of hours.

The Board members' information packets include the minutes of a City Commission/CRA Board meeting at which the contract was discussed so they may have a clearer idea of what the Commission may expect. Mr. Brown distributed copies of the tasks with line item costs attached. The proposal is expected to go before the CRA Board the following week with a recommendation from the RAB.

Motion made by Mr. Hart, seconded by Mr. Hooper, to reconsider the last vote that the Board took on Mosaic.

Mr. Gabriel pointed out that two to three meetings have taken place since the vote to renew the contract. Mr. Brown advised that today's meeting would be the first official Board meeting since that vote was taken, as other meetings since that time were special or joint meetings or did not have a quorum.

Mr. Brown explained that the current year represents the third year of the RFP response. While the scope of work is similar, some aspects of the contract are subject to change, such as goals. He stated that the contracted amount and scope of services are consistent with the original RFP: the question before the Board is whether to continue with these same tasks or to modify them, as well as what the Board perceives as an appropriate number of hours. Mr. Gabriel expressed concern that it would be very difficult for the Board to determine how many hours a task might require.

Mr. Hart noted that the City Manager appears to be seeking greater specificity from the contract for the coming year, and agreed that the Board may not be able to adequately address this question. Ms. Barber pointed out that the current contract is already quite specific regarding what might be accomplished. Mr. Brown replied that the City Commissioners have raised questions regarding the product the CRA hopes to receive from the Mosaic Group in relation to the overall contract. Chair Centamore clarified that the cost, rather than the tasks, appears to be at issue.

Mr. Brown explained that while the CRA Board will make the final determination on how to proceed with the contract, they have requested a recommendation from the RAB regarding the contract's scope of work and its costs. The current scope of work is supported by CRA Staff: Staff receives an hour-by-hour invoice from Mosaic in relation to the scope of work, which they review. The final dollar value of the contract may not be exceeded.

Mr. Gabriel reiterated that it can be very difficult to look at an invoice and determine the appropriateness of the number of hours spent on certain tasks, citing the task of "Team Strategic Marketing and Development" as an example. Mr. Brown replied that there have been no issues thus far, and additional documentation and/or clarity may be requested by Staff in response to the contract submission.

Mr. Brown added that Mosaic has provided a year-end presentation and report on their accomplishments. He noted that it is not typical for a City contract up for renewal to seek the input of an advisory body.

Chair Centamore asked what the Board would like to see accomplished by Mosaic within the next year. Mr. Hart stated that Mosaic's presentation was very thorough and demonstrated the impact they have made on the CRA, although the CRA Board may have questions regarding the number of hours spent on the contract. He felt that the CRA Board was asking for greater specificity by Mosaic, and that this specificity could address any concerns the CRA Board may have regarding the hours within the contract.

Chair Centamore continued that he would like to see greater outreach to locations outside the City to encourage participation in rebuilding the neighborhood. While community events encourage local participation, he felt it would be best to bring in stakeholders who have the financial ability to improve the area.

Mr. Strawbridge characterized this issue as micromanaging the contract, which he did not feel was appropriate for the Board. He pointed out that the members have made their wishes clear and Staff must administer the contract effectively, rather than suggesting that the Board play a role in further negotiating the contract. He felt this is unfair to the vendor, as the City has the option to either simply renew the contract or cancel it.

It was pointed out that Mosaic regularly attends Board meetings for the purpose of providing updates, although at times these updates have been postponed due to time constraints.

Mr. Hart withdrew his earlier **motion**, adding that the Board should instead make a recommendation to Mosaic that they provide additional materials to the City Commission to ensure their comfort with the contract.

Chair Centamore asked if the contractual amount was subject to change. Mr. Brown replied that the RFP amount of \$247,500 is the maximum cost of the contract for the level of services listed. The Board may not request a lesser amount unless the scope of work is changed, as this would change the RFP under which the contract was executed.

Mr. Hart stated that he would not withdraw his earlier **motion** to reconsider, as previously stated, but would instead allow the **motion** to come to a vote.

In a voice vote, the **motion** failed 0-9 (Chair Centamore, Ms. Barber, Ms. Burrows, Mr. Gabriel, Mr. Hart, Mr. Hooper, Mr. Lagi, Mr. Strawbridge, and Mr. Wilkes dissenting).

The Board agreed by unanimous consent to stand by their original vote of 11-0 from the October 26, 2016 meeting, at which they recommended renewal of the Mosaic Group's contract at the same contractual amount. They also agreed by consensus to request that Mosaic provide greater specificity reflecting the number of hours and the scope of work.

Mr. Brown confirmed that he would update the Agenda Item that will go before the City Commission to reflect the Board's discussion of this Item.

IV. Discussion – Discontinuing Funding – Flagler Village Projects

Mr. Brown explained that the CRA Board/City Commission has requested direction from the RAB regarding whether or not their funding efforts should continue for projects in Flagler Village. The concern is due to the number of projects underway in Flagler Village, while there are fewer projects in the Progresso and Sistrunk communities.

Chair Centamore recalled that at a recent joint meeting between the Redevelopment Advisory Board (RAB) and the CRA Board, there was discussion of establishing greater priority for the Progresso area rather than discontinuing funding within the Flagler area.

Ms. Barber stated that very few projects have been brought before the Board from the Progresso or Sistrunk areas during her tenure on the Board; when projects are proposed, they are from external developers and focus on "prime areas" within the CRA. She asked if the Board can take a more active role to incentivize or structure projects within these target areas.

Mr. Wilkes stated that the Board's approach toward development within the CRA has focused on projects they feel will be successful and generate substantial tax increment financing (TIF) revenue. He emphasized that these projects are driven by the economy rather than by CRA programs, and that projects that work in some areas will not work in others. He advocated for the use of different programs and new ideas to attract the type of development the neighborhoods want.

Mr. Strawbridge agreed that the areas outside Flagler Village require a different approach. He pointed out that there is very little slum and blight in Flagler Village, and that the City's Department of Transportation and Mobility is planning extensive streetscape projects for that area over the next few years.

Mr. Strawbridge continued that redevelopment funds should not be used in Flagler Village when federal and capital improvement funds are available, and that the CRA's Charter states it should focus on low- and moderate-income housing rather than units for individuals earning high incomes. He did not feel it would be inappropriate to discontinue funding for Flagler Village. He urged the Board to take a more active role in bringing projects to the Progresso and Sistrunk communities, while he felt it would be sufficient to wait for additional projects to come to Flagler Village.

Mr. Strawbridge concluded that it should also be acknowledged that race plays a role in addressing development and the success of the CRA. He felt the Board should seek a way to move forward with improved equity in mind for the entire CRA community.

Ms. Burrows stated that there seems to have been a lack of political will to redevelop the CRA community. She pointed out that the Urban Land Institute's (ULI's) Technical Advisory Panel (TAP) report identifies reasons for the lack of economic development in the CRA area, and offers specific next steps on how to address this, including outreach to identify a trained facilitator with expertise in developing blighted areas.

It was suggested that recognition of the need for development in underused areas of the CRA may show that the current political will is shifting, and that the recommendations of the ULI TAP report may provide a way forward. It was also noted that one option is prioritizing the Progresso and Sistrunk areas ahead of Flagler Village may be more appropriate than eliminating funding to Flagler Village altogether.

Chair Centamore advised that if the Board makes a decision to cut off all CRA funding for Flagler Village, the County is likely to remove Flagler Village from the CRA altogether, which would mean its TIF revenue would go directly to the City and County rather than the CRA. He felt the best option would be prioritization of CRA neighborhoods rather than discontinuing funding entirely.

At this time Chair Centamore opened public comment.

Chad Cherry, owner of Refresh Live Café and Refresh Live Foundation, pointed out that projects are not being developed from within the CRA community due to the guidelines of the CRA's incentive programs. He recommended that the Board discuss the establishment of business incubators for small businesses as defined by the community rather than by the CRA, as he did not feel the CRA's definition of "small business" was accurate. Mr. Cherry encouraged the CRA to find creative ways to help businesses within the community.

Mr. Brown advised that the CRA is currently working with a number of businesses within the community, noting that Mr. Cherry's characterization of the CRA's incentive programs may refer to the programs that were in place before recent revisions. He asked what types of programs or enhancements the public felt would be more helpful to the community.

Hope Gary, CEO of the Fort Lauderdale Community Center, suggested that another issue may be the existence of meetings within the CRA of which the local business community is not aware or unable to attend. She asserted that the community has many ideas to offer with respect to the creation of new business. Mr. Brown noted that the Advisory Board vetted the recently updated incentive programs for up to three months before they advanced to the City Commission for approval in July 2016.

Ms. Burrows again recommended that the Board implement the suggestions from the ULI TAP report, such as seeking a professional facilitator with experience in rebuilding neighborhoods in need. She agreed that the existing incentives, while improved, still do not address the needs of the CRA areas located across the train tracks. She continued that the Board should consider establishing an incentive program that ties development west of the train tracks to development in the Flagler Village area.

Mr. Brown reiterated that he would like to hear more feedback from the community, as some of the CRA's recent incentive programs provide up to 100% of funding. He asked if these new programs have been considered by the public to determine if they will be more successful than the previous CRA incentive programs.

Mr. Wilkes noted that the ULI TAP report points out that incentives which succeed for other objectives may not be applicable to all: for example, commercial development is triggered by different stimuli than residential development. He advocated for a program that would provide incentives for landlords to make improvements, as the CRA currently has a disproportionate number of non-property owners residing within the community. He concluded that the goal should not be a new neighborhood, but a better one.

Ms. Barber observed that one contributing factor to slum and blight within CRA neighborhoods is the prevalence of external control, such as absentee landlords. She felt one objective should be greater local control, including encouragement of both

home and business ownership. She did not feel, however, that the current incentives were robustly designed, funded, or clearly communicated.

Mr. Hart addressed Ms. Gary's comments, stating that there should be no barriers between the Board and the community at large. He asked that members of the public help spread the message that the Board wants to hear feedback from the community.

Shakia Burton, founder of Florida All Star Youth, urged the Board members to reach out to the community themselves, as not all interested individuals can attend meetings or are aware of them. She emphasized the importance of grassroots efforts, and agreed that the west and east sides of the CRA do not receive the same levels of attention.

Jasmen Rogers, representing Dream Defenders and the Black Lives Matter Alliance of Broward, agreed that many members of the community and small business owners are unable to attend Board and other meetings due to the meeting times. She asserted that these hours must be adjusted if the Board is truly interested in hearing community input.

Mr. Brown noted that the next CRA Open House is scheduled for the evening of January 29, 2017. He encouraged members of the community to attend, pointing out that no members of the public had attended a previous Open House, which led to the scheduling of a second event.

Easton Harrison, also representing the Black Lives Matter Alliance of Broward, felt the issue is a lack of transparency between the Redevelopment Advisory Board and the larger CRA community. He asked how members of the public may help to improve outreach from the Board at the grassroots level.

Marie Huntley, CEO of On-Call Leadership, addressed Ms. Burrows' suggestion to encourage development outside Flagler Village as well as inside, stating that her nonprofit organization participates in several community events and engages the public, particularly young residents. She urged the Board to participate in community events and make themselves aware of opportunities for improvement.

Neil Ramsay, founder of ARTS Up, asked if the Board has directly or indirectly suggested the rezoning of the CRA district.

Chair Centamore requested that members of the public wishing to receive email updates from the CRA provide their email addresses to Ann Marie Sorrell of the Mosaic Group, stating that Mosaic oversees outreach by the CRA. He also recommended that they join or contact their neighborhood or civic associations, which can also provide a platform for feedback from the public.

Ms. Sorrell of the Mosaic Group advised that members of the public may also wish to attend meetings of the Historic Sistrunk Community Council, which includes businesses,

neighborhood associations, and other organizations. This group addresses issues such as the branding of the historic Northwest and Sistrunk areas, development of communications, event launches, and many other community issues. Mosaic also manages social media pages such as Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram, and has constructed a website, FortLauderdaleCRA.com, where members of the public may share news about events.

Ms. Sorrell continued that she has worked closely with CRA Staff to discuss different programs and incentives, including a possible business incubator program. She reiterated that while new incentives were approved in July 2016, these may not address all the concerns of the broader community. This is one reason behind programs such as Small Business Week, which seek to be more inclusive and offer financial incentives.

As there were no other members of the public wishing to speak at this time, Chair Centamore closed public comment and brought the discussion back to the Board.

Ms. Burrows added that another way to reach the broader community could be through the *West Side Gazette*, a newspaper distributed at many African-American churches, as individuals who have moved out of the CRA itself may attend these churches or visit other establishments within the CRA. Mr. Brown confirmed that while this is a possibility for certain events, not all CRA events can go through the newspaper, and there must be additional means of communication.

Mr. Strawbridge commented that the CRA's new website, FortLauderdaleCRA.com, is linked to the City's website, FortLauderdale.gov. He pointed out, however, that there are no links to CRA meeting agendas, minutes, or other documents, such as the ULI TAP report, on this site. He recommended linking to this and other CRA-related documentation through these websites.

Mr. Brown requested additional feedback on what is lacking in existing programs, so Staff will have a clearer focus on what should be developed. He pointed out that in the past, Staff has presented applications that are exceptions to the existing incentive programs, including an application for the residential rehabilitation program. It was stated that if exceptions to existing incentive programs are granted to one applicant, it could be expected that they will be granted to all applicants, leaving the program open to abuse.

It was noted that one area of untapped potential within the CRA is the cultural tourism market, as visitors will want to visit the historically African-American area of Fort Lauderdale. While efforts are underway to attract more visitors to the community, it was pointed out that absentee owners in the area are not engaged in this effort.

Mr. Brown advised that Staff must hear from the community whether or not existing programs are working so they will have a clear idea what must be changed and what needs are not being met.

It was determined that this discussion on how to address funding for the Flagler Village area would be brought back to the next Board meeting, along with suggestions of how to improve CRA incentive programs and prioritize funds. Mr. Brown also directly requested programming ideas. Chair Centamore thanked the members of the public for their input.

Ms. Burrows recommended greater transparency between the RAB and the CRA Board/City Commission. She pointed out that if the RAB votes on an issue, and the CRA Board votes in a different manner, this should be discussed at RAB meetings.

V. Discussion – ULI TAP Report

Ms. Burrows noted that p. 19 of the ULI TAP report outlines some of the recommendations presented to the RAB in May 2016. She pointed out that the presentation clearly identified a vision for the community, including emphasis on history and cultural arts.

Mr. Brown observed that the CRA must determine what is to be done with its assets, as these will bring capital into needed areas. He advised that the shared vision for the area must be further developed so all parties are on the same page and can communicate a single message or plan for the CRA.

It was noted that the CRA's zoning, particularly to the west of the train tracks, ties into the district's focus areas and affects the capital that can be attracted to these areas. Some areas, such as Progresso Village, may have facilities that can be re-used.

Housing and Economic Development Manager Glendon Hall stated that the ULI TAP report addresses re-branding, as well as the identification of environmental issues within the industrial area of the CRA. The South Florida Planning Council (SFPC) has expressed interest in the assessment of these issues, which can serve as a first step toward possible redevelopment.

Mr. Hall identified the industrial zone within the CRA, advising that SFPC will conduct an environmental survey and inventory of the area. They will be looking for Code issues, crime statistics, tenants and occupancy, parking, and other areas within the CRA that require additional attention.

While areas such as FAT Village have been redeveloped nearly to capacity, Mr. Hall advised that others must now generate activity, including jobs and productivity. The plan will be to become more creative in the zoning of certain properties, particularly those

located across the railroad tracks. He pointed out that some development has been priced out of FAT Village and similar areas and can be encouraged to expand to other communities, where they may be able to buy rather than rent properties.

It was observed that environmental issues in these areas are of significant concern, as it can be difficult to identify the parties responsible for pollution and cleanup can be an extensive process. Mr. Hall advised that brownfield programs may be initiated within the CRA. If an individual wishes to purchase this property, they may be eligible for cleanup funds from the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), which will help rehabilitate the property to commercial standards. These new businesses may also provide apprenticeships so residents may learn new skills.

Mr. Strawbridge commented that while there is vibrant street life within the CRA's warehouse district, parking and drainage both present significant challenges in this area. The City has expressed little interest in addressing these difficulties due to the area's proximity to the end of the sewer line. He concluded that these may both be detrimental to new development. Mr. Hall replied that SFPC is engaged in addressing these difficulties.

It was noted that a "one-off" project within the warehouse district could be problematic due to the potential cost of cleanup. Mr. Hall replied that the intent is not to push reputable businesses out of the area, but to address specific uses that are problematic for development and contribute to environmental issues. He stated that designating one to two properties as areas where positive change may happen can create opportunities for the future.

Mr. Hall continued that some property owners perceive the potential for brownfield designation as a move to lower property values so the City may purchase them. He advocated beginning with specific sites to develop by purchasers who may have been priced out of FAT Village. Mr. Brown added that these plans will be brought back before the Board and the community and discussed before these proposed steps are taken.

Mr. Hinton emphasized the importance of addressing environmental issues within the CRA. He stated that the federal government cannot oversee cleanup efforts unless certain areas are designated as Superfund sites, and the City will not undertake cleanup using its own resources.

Mr. Strawbridge observed that when the ULI TAP report was adopted by the City Commission, the Board was prepared to move forward with the report's recommendations. He emphasized that the report's goals should be adopted specifically for the Sistrunk and Midtown areas, not for areas such as Flagler Village where there has already been success. He felt the report would help with the prioritization of projects.

Motion made by Mr. Strawbridge, seconded by Mr. Gabriel, for the Advisory Board to use the framework of these 11 topics and subject matter related to them in [the ULI TAP] report as a companion metric to their analysis of the work that they contemplate in these districts.

Ms. Burrows pointed out that rezoning within the CRA included identification of permitted uses on the Sistrunk Corridor. Mr. Brown asked if this meant the Board was open to bringing in any or all of these uses. He continued that if the CRA introduces a business incubator program, a CRA-owned building in which to house it must first be identified. He asserted that the CRA's greatest asset is its land.

In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

Mr. Strawbridge suggested revisiting the 11 topics listed in the ULI TAP report at subsequent meetings to assess the CRA's progress and priorities.

VI. Transfer of City-Owned Lots to the CRA

Mr. Brown distributed copies of a map of the City-owned lots located within the CRA, stating that he and City Manager/CRA Executive Director Lee Feldman have discussed this topic in some detail. Mr. Feldman would like the Board to consider purchasing all these properties at their fair market value. These values were reflected in a spreadsheet also provided to the members.

Mr. Brown continued that the City's Affordable Housing Advisory Committee (AHAC) is currently working on an Ordinance whereby the proceeds generated by the sale of any City-owned residential lots would be placed in an Affordable Housing Trust. This Trust would provide additional dollars to fund affordable housing projects within Fort Lauderdale in general and the CRA area in particular. While dollars from the sale of residential lots would go into the Affordable Housing Trust, dollars from the sale of commercial lots would go to the City's General Fund.

The documents provided to the members list the City's costs to acquire the subject properties, the values according to the Broward County Property Appraiser's Office, and the appraised value. Mr. Brown concluded that the question before the Board is what to do with City-owned lots within the CRA. He added that if the CRA chooses to purchase these lots from the City, it means funds spent to purchase lots may not be used to build on those lots or assist developers who may wish to build on them.

Mr. Wilkes advised that he was not certain of the value of the properties, which could result in a loss to the CRA if they purchase the lots and later sell them to developers. He asked what constituted the "City costs and expenses" listed on the documentation. Mr. Brown replied that these were City-expended costs. It was noted that in some cases,

these costs were higher than the value of the lots themselves, as not all lots are buildable unless they are combined to result in a buildable area.

Mr. Wilkes continued that buying lots at market values did not seem to be appropriate for these purposes. He felt the CRA should take these lots into the open market and ensure that they become buildable. Mr. Brown noted that Commission District 3 includes the most residential infill lots, and that the District 3 Commissioner would like to see these lots developed.

Mr. Wilkes recalled that this issue has been discussed in detail by the Board in previous years, including the inferior or unusable size of some lots. He referred to a February 2012 memorandum from a previous CRA Director, which provided options for the classification of 137 City-owned lots at that time. In March 2012, the Board voted to adopt three of these four options and modify the fourth option, which would mean the CRA might purchase City-owned lots at substantially less than fair market value.

Mr. Wilkes stated that the Board also called for an analysis of the different categories in which the City-owned lots were placed at the time, as well as the possibility of an incentive program for adjoining property owners along the Sistrunk Corridor. They also touched upon the zoning of City-owned properties during these earlier discussions.

Mr. Brown advised that the CRA has assisted the City by repaying the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) for some lots in 2009 and 2010. HUD prohibits the purchase of lots without developing them in a timely manner, which the City had done over a number of years. Once CRA funds were paid to HUD, they were once again added to the City's line of credit and spent on CRA projects under other programs, such as the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program.

At this time Chair Centamore opened public comment.

Frank Schnidman, former member of the Broward County Housing Council, asserted that most Florida CRAs receive City-owned property at no cost. CRAs are able to negotiate the sale of these properties with greater freedom than the City itself might have, as the City is bound by certain procurement processes. He did not feel it made sense for the CRA to pay the City for these properties in light of the CRA's flexibility, nor did he believe it was reasonable to ask the CRA to pay market value for these lots.

Mr. Schnidman continued that because the market has already recognized the value of lots in Flagler Village, any CRA funds going toward projects in this area simply go toward the developer's bottom line. He pointed out that there is no slum and blight to overcome in this area. He recommended using the ULI TAP report criteria strictly within the area west of the railroad tracks, where slum and blight continue to be addressed.

Mr. Brown confirmed that the RAB may offer a separate recommendation if they do not wish to adopt the Executive Director's recommendation for disposal of the property. Mr. Wilkes advocated for adopting the Board's previous position on these properties once more, noting that once the CRA obtains title to a property, it will assume maintenance and other obligations until the lots can be disposed of.

Mr. Brown stated that the Board has recommended an Affordable Housing Purchase Program, which was approved by the City Commission. Staff has begun meeting with both nonprofit and for-profit developers, although both have expressed concern with the likelihood that they will be able to sell properties after building upon them. He also noted that the property values in these areas are significantly lower than the values in other areas.

Mr. Strawbridge characterized the Executive Director's role in this proposed transaction as indicative of a conflict of interest, with the City's General Fund as the more important of the two sides. Mr. Brown clarified that while the Executive Director has made a recommendation, there has been no direction or recommendation from the CRA Board/City Commission itself.

Motion made by Mr. Strawbridge that [the Board not] purchase these properties. [The **motion** died for lack of second.]

Motion made by Mr. Wilkes, seconded by Ms. Burrows, that [the City] assign the properties to the CRA to be used as part of its program for development.

Mr. Hart recommended that in subsequent discussions, the Board take care to avoid use of potentially inflammatory language. He pointed out that this language could impugn the reputation of the Board and affect the good work they hope to achieve.

Mr. Wilkes restated his **motion** as follows: that the City of Fort Lauderdale assign or transfer all the lots in question to the CRA for \$10 and other good and valuable consideration for the purpose of [the Board] utilizing it appropriately.

Mr. Wilkes continued that if the transfer of these properties cannot be achieved in a fully legitimate manner, the Board should not consider it in a manner that could undermine the overall credibility of the CRA.

Mr. Brown added that there are Charter issues related to some of the subject properties, which could hinder the City's ability to use them for affordable housing. He reiterated that the District 3 Commissioner had intended the Board to be able to review City properties within the Northwest CRA, as the blight that affects vacant properties may continue to occur if they are not developed. While he did not support the payment of market value for these properties, he felt they could be better disposed of in the hands of the CRA than by the City.

In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

Mr. Brown encouraged the Board members to attend the next scheduled CRA Board meeting so they may communicate directly with the City Commission/CRA Board on this issue.

VII. Communication to CRA Board

It was determined that the Board wished to send the **motion** from Item VI as a communication to the CRA Board, with the clarification that the properties were to be included as incentives for programs consistent with the CRA's purpose.

VIII. Old / New Business

Mr. Brown reported that the ID Flagler project was approved by the CRA Board during the first week of December 2016. Triangle Services will go before the CRA Board at the next scheduled meeting.

i. 2017 Meeting Dates

Mr. Brown advised that the City Attorney's Office has expressed concern with the possibility of holding advisory board meetings outside City property, as suggested at previous meetings. He acknowledged that there has been greater public participation in the meetings held at the CRA Conference Room.

Mr. Schnidman, private citizen, suggested that the Board consider scheduling its meeting times at 5:30 p.m. to encourage greater community participation. The Board agreed by consensus to meet on the second Monday of each month at this time, depending upon the availability of professional services.

IX. Public Comment

It was noted that public comment was provided on individual Agenda Items.

X. Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the Board at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 5:28 p.m.

Any written public comments made 48 hours prior to the meeting regarding items discussed during the proceedings have been attached hereto.