

ITEM II

DRAFT
MEETING MINUTES
NORTHWEST-PROGRESSO-FLAGLER HEIGHTS
REDEVELOPMENT ADVISORY BOARD
FORT LAUDERDALE
8TH FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM, CITY HALL
December 12, 2017 – 3 :00 P.M.

Cumulative Attendance
May 2017-April 2018

<u>Members Present</u>	<u>Attendance</u>	<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
Ron Centamore, Chair	P	5	1
Leann Barber (arrived at 3:15 p.m.)	P	6	0
Brad Cohen	A	3	3
Alan Gabriel	A	5	1
Rhoda Glasco Foderingham, Vice Chair	A	5	1
John Hart	P	5	1
Mickey Hinton	A	3	3
John Hooper	A	4	2
Dylan Lagi	P	5	1
Steffen Lue (arrived at 3:11 p.m.)	P	6	0
Diane Randolph	P	3	0
Scott Strawbridge	P	6	0
Tina Teague	P	6	0
John Wilkes	A	4	2

Staff

D'Wayne Spence, NPF-CRA Manager
 Vanessa Martin, CRA Business Manager
 Sandra Doughlin, NPF-CRA
 Bob Wojcik, Housing and Economic Development Manager
 Glendon Hall, Housing and Economic Development Manager
 Lian Chan, Prototype-Inc.

I. Call to Order/Roll Call

NPF CRA Chair

Chair Centamore called the meeting to order at 3:10 p.m. and roll call was called.

II. Approval of Minutes

NPF CRA Chair

- November 14, 2017

Mr. Lagi referenced Page 3 and noted that \$350,00 should be \$350,000.

Mr. Hall mentioned Page 3 and stated that the funding request is \$350,000 not \$365,000.

Motion made by Mr. Lagi, seconded by Mr. Hart, to approve with corrections. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

III. Project Funding Update

**Vanessa Martin,
 Business Manager**

Ms. Martin provided a brief project funding update and noted that nothing has changed. Approval was received for the Sistrunk Market project at the last Commission meeting; \$400,000 this fiscal year and moving forward the other portions will be disbursed. There is still \$698,000 available.

IV. Update Draft RFP – River Gardens Single Family Residences

CRA Staff

Mr. Wojcik tried to incorporate comments from Board members and members of the Civic Association.

Mr. Spence indicated that as Mr. Wojcik mentioned, the redlined changes will reflect changes to the document to incorporate changes. The first change was the 2.25 award of contract. The pages are not numbered; however, that is the paragraph number. This explains the awarding of the contract and the CRA's intent to enter into the development agreement with the top rate developer and carry on negotiations regarding the benchmarks and it tells the process of the negotiation. The language is standard. Section 3.1 was referenced. Mr. Spence clarified that the residences are owner occupied so the language will be corrected. Section 5.1 of the development plan was source of the language of concern to the neighbors with regard to specifying areas. The language in Section 3.2 was basically the same type of changes. There were some editorial changes regarding the legal description. Section 3.5 was mentioned and feedback was requested on this area. Currently, this agreement requires the developer to submit for building permits within 90 days of execution of the development agreement with the CRA and to close project financing within 180 days with commencement of construction within 60 days thereafter. The initial goal was to have a quick turnaround on these lots; there are about 12 lots and only 11 are buildable. There has been some feedback from community small builders suggesting that they would like to have an easier "bite at this apple" and that the carrying costs of these homes and turnaround would not be advantageous to them. Mr. Spence requested whether the time period should be removed and let it be a part of the proposal or if it should be left as is.

Mr. Lue questioned if it would hurt if it were extended.

Mr. Spence advised it is a question of how long the CRA wants to carry these lots. There is an eight-year limitation; seven years ten months. The chief concern was that the lot would remain vacant for an extended period of time; however, the desire to be more open to local builders is understood.

Mr. Strawbridge questioned if having a fixed schedule and a process for extensions would help. Mr. Strawbridge would like to see some fixed deadlines and if the builders need an extension they could come back to the CRA Board to make a public record as to why an extension is needed. Extensions would have to be granted by the CRA Board. If there is a clear path, that question should be asked six to eight weeks ahead of time and then get on the agenda.

Mr. Spence asked if Mr. Strawbridge would be opposed to the development community having this as one of those items that the Evaluation Committee evaluates to determine whether to go with that developer and how long of an extension is needed.

Ms. Barber questioned the reason for choosing one developer and if there has been any response from local developers as to whether they think this is making it suitable for a larger builder.

Mr. Spence stated it was the idea of getting it done quickly. One developer, Anything Bob, believes that would be the case.

Mr. Wojcik stated there was a series of meetings and this project has always been marketed as a single development project. The intent is to get a uniform product. A lot of nice proposals were received. Having one developer with a lot of models from a consistent product makes a big difference and it is believed that is what the CRA is looking for.

Ms. Teague questioned if that is the normal timeframe it takes a builder to get the project done, small, medium, or large.

Mr. Wojcik believed there would be many proposals and the developers will give a timeframe. In the end, the agreement would be a negotiation. The timeframe is consistent with what the CRA had last time and with what has been seen in the past.

Mr. Spence stated that the only variable heard from the development community is whether there is a purchaser for the home site. The timeframes can be met easily but the question is whether they can sell the home, which is the chief concern. Some developers prefer to have the home sold prior to constructing. Meeting the timetable is not an issue, the concern is whether there will be someone to occupy the residence or if there will be a vacant home on the parcel.

Mr. Hart questioned if there will be a pre-qualification process available.

Mr. Spence replied there will be.

Mr. Strawbridge questioned what would happen if the successful bidder failed to deliver timely.

Mr. Wojcik advised that the developer would be operating under the parameters of the bank in terms of construction. Perhaps that can be put into the agreement. It is not uncommon for things to take longer than anticipated.

Ms. Teague suggested giving a range, 180 days, and if the developer could not work within the parameters then an explanation would be required.

Mr. Lue did not believe the timeframe would be changed for one company.

Mr. Strawbridge mentioned Mr. Spence's first suggestion to take the specified timelines out and ask the developers to come up with their own proposed timeline. There is value in getting done quicker. These parameters are kind of boiler plate and it was suggested that the boiler plate be removed and ask the developer what their best offer is time and cost.

Ms. Barber questioned if that is done it would have to be part of the evaluation criteria.

Mr. Spence agreed.

Mr. Strawbridge thought it would be a good thing to have the developers compete on their time schedule.

Mr. Spence mentioned the next area, 3.6, which is the area where neighbors said this Board was unimaginative in providing criteria. Many proposals were reviewed and everyone's criteria was in line with what is being presented except for some going into details with the bedrooms and restrooms. One change inserted is the suggestion of two and a half restrooms. Mr. Spence believed the Board should go with the minimum and let those who know the market decide. Mr. Spence would like to see more flexibility and what the market can entertain. The concern is creating a project that will not sell in the market.

Mr. Lagi questioned if any other cases covered the details of restrooms.

Mr. Spence advised that Miami Dade went into depth as to the dimensions of the restrooms. Perhaps the size of the sink should be discussed as to whether it is a single or double.

Mr. Lagi mentioned the better than minimum required landscaping and questioned minimum required in what.

Mr. Spence clarified better than the City minimum imposed requirement.

V. Old/New Business

(a) July 10th Meeting Date Change

Mr. Spence mentioned a conflict with the City Commission meeting date; therefore, action is needed from this Board to change the July 10th date. Mr. Spence recommended July 17th.

Motion made by Mr. Hart, seconded by Mr. Lue, to change the July meeting date from the 10th to the 17th. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

Mr. Hall advised that a few projects are coming. Hoover Awning was moving some of their operations to a location in Palm Beach and after discussion, a decision was made to stay and expand. Details are being worked on. There is a possibility of creating 15 technical jobs. Staff is trying to convince businesses to stay and reinvest. A couple of projects in the \$50,000 range such as churches in the area and a family owned business that does car refurbishment are next.

Mr. Lagi questioned if the area could be enhanced in a different way if people are trying to buy.

Mr. Hall provided a few examples of rundown properties that are purchased and cleaned up. Hoover Awning is something to retain as there are high tech jobs and they have been around for a long time and are sustainable.

VI. None

NPF CRA Board

VII. Public Comment – None.

XII. Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the Board at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

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

[Minutes prepared by C. Guifarro, Prototype-Inc.]

ITEM III

Northwest Progresso Flagler Heights Project Tracking

As of 1/30/2018

COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY (Beginning Balance as of 10.1.2017)

FY 2018 REPORT SUMMARY



Color indicates process was completed FY 2018 FUNDS
 Color indicates assistance will be paid in FY 2019/FY 2020
 Color indicates PROPOSED FY 2018 Incentive Projects

NPI Incentive Summary	Fiscal Year 2017	Fiscal Year 2018
Beginning Incentive Bal.	\$ 12,390,000	\$ 5,953,727
Less FY 17 Obligated/Spent & FY 18 Projected Incentive Spend	\$ (10,728,116)	\$ (5,330,500)
FY 17 Remaining & FY 18 Projected Remaining Funds	\$ 1,661,884	\$ 623,227

TOTAL APPROVED INCENTIVE AMOUNT	BUSINESS INCENTIVES	Assignee	CAM #	CAM DATE	BASIS	% Done	FY 18 PROPOSED Incentive Projects	Advisory Board Recommended Funding	CRA Board Approved Funding	Total \$ Approved / Encumbered for Payment to Date	Total \$ Paid to Date	Appropriated Balance	FY 18 Obligated & Proposed Obligated Funds	Actual (Paid)	Proposed FY 18 Remaining Funds
	Property Tax Reimbursement CRA091805				Annual reduction based on approval							\$ -			
	Development Incentive CRA091804				Terms based on approval							\$ 4,000,000		\$ -	
\$ 10,000,000	YMCA - Year 2	G. Hall	17-0875	8/22/2017	Funding Assistance	0.0%		\$ 1,250,000					\$ 4,000,000	\$ -	\$ -
\$ 7,000,000	The SIX13 - Year 2	G. Hall	17-0633	6/6/2017	Funding Assistance	0.0%		\$ 2,000,000							
\$ 1,400,000	Sistrunk Market Project	B. Wojcik	17-1331	12/5/2017	Forgivable Loan	0.0%		\$ 400,000							
\$ 350,000	StartUps.Club	B. Wojcik	17-1140	10/3/2017		0.0%		\$ 350,000							
	Howard's Upholstery	G. Hall				0.0%		\$ 350,000							
	Hoover Architectural Products	G. Hall				0.0%		\$ 1,000,000							
	Streetscape Enhancement CRA091803				Up to 70% or 90%/\$500,000							\$ 453,727			
	Dales Tires	G. Hall			Funding Assistance	0.0%	\$ 350,000						\$ 408,000		\$ 45,727
\$ 50,000	Urban North LLC	G. Hall			Funding Assistance	0.0%		\$ 8,000							
	15th Avenue Church of God	G. Hall			Funding Assistance	0.0%	\$ 50,000								
	Property & Business Improvement CRA091802				Up to 75% or 90%/\$500,000							\$ 777,500			
	Solid Soccer LLC-MAS Café Project	B. Wojcik			Funding Assistance	0.0%	\$ 225,000						\$ 775,000		\$ 2,500
	Gail Hyatt - Sistrunk Retail Center	B. Wojcik			Funding Assistance	0.0%	\$ 225,000								
\$ 350,000	CHDS LLC (Smitty's)	B. Wojcik			Funding Assistance	0.0%		\$ 225,000							
	Rechter Holdings (835 LLC)	B. Wojcik			Funding Assistance	0.0%		\$ 50,000							
	Rechter Holdings (837 LLC)	B. Wojcik			Funding Assistance	0.0%		\$ 50,000							
	Bo Persaud	B. Wojcik			Funding Assistance	0.0%		\$ 50,000							
	MAR Holdings LLC	B. Wojcik			Funding Assistance	0.0%		\$ 50,000							
	Joelo Holdings	B. Wojcik			Funding Assistance	0.0%		\$ 50,000							
	GFC Enterprises LLC	B. Wojcik			Funding Assistance	0.0%		\$ 50,000							
	Argyle Coffee	B. Wojcik			Funding Assistance	0.0%		\$ 37,000							
	Builders Bargain	B. Wojcik			Funding Assistance	0.0%		\$ 50,000							
	European Auto Specialty	G. Hall			Funding Assistance	0.0%	\$ 50,000	\$ -							
	New Hope Church	G. Hall			Funding Assistance	0.0%		\$ 50,000							
	Dan Levy	B. Wojcik			Funding Assistance	0.0%	\$ 50,000								
	Commercial Façade Improvement CRA091801				Up to 75% or 90%/\$125,000							\$ 722,500			
	Aero Tech	B. Wojcik			Funding Assistance	0.0%	\$ 7,500								
	Rechter Holdings	B. Wojcik			Funding Assistance	0.0%	\$ 7,500								
	CHDS LLC (Smitty's)	B. Wojcik			Funding Assistance	0.0%		\$ 125,000							
	Scott Hoffman- Aero Tech Labs	B. Wojcik			Funding Assistance	0.0%	\$ 7,500								
	*** BUSINESS INCENTIVES FUNDING TOTAL:										\$ 5,953,727	\$ 5,330,500	\$ -	\$ 623,227	
TOTAL APPROVED INCENTIVE AMOUNT	RESIDENTIAL INCENTIVES	Assignee	CAM #	CAM DATE	BASIS	% Done		Advisory Board Recommended Funding	CRA Board Approved Funding	Total \$ Approved / Encumbered for Payment to Date	Total \$ Paid to Date	Appropriated Balance		Actual (Paid)	FY 18 Remaining Funds
	Residential Rehabilitation Program (Single-Family homes) CRA091806				Up to \$55,000/\$75,000										\$ -
	Purchase Assistance Program (Single-Family homes) CRA091807				Up to \$45,000/Affordability need										\$ -
	*** RESIDENTIAL INCENTIVES FUNDING TOTAL:										\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
	NPI CRA INCENTIVE FUNDING TOTAL:										\$ 5,953,727	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	



Color indicates process was completed



Color indicates assistance will be paid in FY 2018/FY 2019

UNSPENT FUNDS as of 9.30.2017 \$ 1,661,884 FY 2017 REPORT SUMMARY

Anticipated Date of Project Completion	BUSINESS INCENTIVES	Assignee	CAM #	CAM DATE	BASIS	% Done	Advisory Board Recommended Funding	CRA Board Approved Funding	Total \$ Approved / Encumbered for Payment to Date	Total \$ Paid to Date	*Date Paid	Beginning Balance	FY 17 Obligated Funds	Actual (Paid)	FY 17 Remaining Funds
Property Tax Reimbursement CRA091705															
Annual reduction based on approval												\$ 2,040,000			
9/30/2017	Land Acquisition of 2 properties	B. Wojcik	17-0444	5/16/2017	purchase of two residential properties from the City of Fort Lauderdale(accept the instruments of conveyance)	0.0%	\$ -		\$ 190,000	\$ 190,000	9/1/2017			\$ 862,291	\$ 727,709
9/30/2017	Land Acquisition of 55 properties	B. Wojcik	17-0199	3/7/2017	purchase of fifty-five residential properties from the City of Fort Lauderdale(accept the instruments of conveyance)	0.0%	\$ -		\$ 612,291	\$ 612,291	6/30/2017				
9/30/2017	Land Acquisition of properties	B. Wojcik	17-0371	5/16/2017	purchase of residential properties from the City of Fort Lauderdale(accept the instruments of conveyance)	0.0%	\$ -		\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000	9/1/2017				
Development Incentive CRA091704														\$ 5,950,000	
Terms based on approval															
3/30/2018	LPF Realty FL LLC(Triangle Services)	B. Wojcik	16-1313	12/20/2016	Funding Assistance	0.0%	\$ -		\$ 1,500,000	\$ 496,001	8/25/2017		\$ 6,719,092.99	\$ 546,001	\$ 34,906
9/1/2017	All Aboard Florida	G. Hall	17-0818	8/22/2017	Funding Assistance	0.0%	\$ -		\$ 281,274						
9/1/2017	Brightline	G. Hall	17-0821	8/22/2017	Funding Assistance	0.0%	\$ -		\$ 183,820						
9/1/2020	The SIX13	G. Hall	17-0633	6/6/2017		0.0%	\$ -	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 4,000,000						
9/1/2017	Wine Watch, LLC	B. Wojcik	N/A	N/A	Funding Assistance	0.0%	\$ -		\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	8/21/2017				
9/1/2017	SGS Investments	B. Wojcik	N/A	N/A	Funding Assistance	0.0%	\$ -		\$ 16,381						
9/1/2025	YMCA	G. Hall	17-0875	8/22/2017	Funding Assistance	0.0%	\$ -		\$ 1,250,000						
Streetscape Enhancement CRA091703														\$ 1,500,000	
Up to 70% or 90%/ \$500,000															
9/7/2019	Quantum	B. Wojcik	16-0810	9/6/2016	Approved prior to the new incentive requirements	0.0%	\$ -		\$ 500,000				\$ 751,078	\$ 62,000	\$ 686,922
3/30/2017	Moody Insurance (725 Prog. Dr.)	B. Wojcik	15-1376 & 16-1213	11/17/2015 & 11/01/2016	Funding Assistance	90.0%	\$ -		\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	3/16/2017				
1/30/2019	ID Flagler Village - Triangle	B. Wojcik	16-1332	12/6/2016	Funding Assistance	0.0%	\$ -		\$ 251,078						
1/1/2018	Urban North LLC	B. Wojcik			Funding Assistance	0.0%	\$ 8,000		\$ 42,000						
Property & Façade Improvement CRA091702														\$ 1,000,000	
Up to 75% or 90%/ \$500,000															
8/30/2017	Rechter Holdings (913 NE 4 Ave)	B. Wojcik				50.0%	\$ -	\$ 100,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	4/3/2017		\$ 719,432	\$ 114,625	\$ 165,943
3/30/2017	Moody Insurance (725 Prog. Dr.)	B. Wojcik	15-1376 & 16-1213	11/17/2015 & 11/01/2016	Funding Assistance	100.0%	\$ -		\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	3/16/2017				
12/30/2017	726 Ave LLC/ Invasive Species	B. Wojcik	17-0588	6/20/2017	Funding Assistance	0.0%	\$ -		\$ 85,557	\$ 14,625	9/28/2017				
9/1/2018	The Provident - FPA III	G. Hall	17-1034	9/6/2017	Funding Assistance	0.0%	\$ -		\$ 225,000						
	The Pharmacy - FPA II	G. Hall	17-1035	9/6/2017	Funding Assistance	0.0%	\$ -		\$ 373,500						
	Italian Artisans; Inc	B. Wojcik			Funding Assistance	0.0%	\$ -	\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000						
Commercial Façade Improvement CRA091701														\$ 1,000,000	
Up to 75% or 90%/ \$125,000															
8/30/2017	728 NW 7 Terr.	B. Wojcik			Funding Assistance	50.0%	\$ -	\$ 15,000	\$ 7,500	\$ 7,500	3/29/2017		\$ 874,796	\$ 78,800	\$ 46,404
11/30/2016	723 NE 2 Ave	B. Wojcik			Funding Assistance	100.0%	\$ -		\$ 15,000	\$ 15,000	12/13/2016				
11/30/2016	731 NE 2 Ave	B. Wojcik			Funding Assistance	100.0%	\$ -		\$ 15,000	\$ 15,000	12/13/2016				
11/30/2016	737 NE 2 Ave	B. Wojcik			Funding Assistance	100.0%	\$ -		\$ 15,000	\$ 15,000	12/13/2016				
8/30/2017	Rechter Holdings (913 NE 4 Ave)	B. Wojcik			Funding Assistance	50.0%	\$ -		\$ 7,500	\$ 7,500	4/3/2017				
3/30/2017	Moody Insurance (725 Prog. Dr.)	B. Wojcik	15-1376 & 16-1213	11/17/2015 & 11/01/2016	Funding Assistance	100.0%	\$ -		\$ 7,500	\$ 7,500	3/16/2017				
9/30/2017	The Provident - FPA III	G. Hall	17-1034	9/6/2017	Funding Assistance	0.0%	\$ -		\$ 125,000						
5/30/2017	CHDS, LLC (1740 NW 3 Ct)	B. Wojcik			Funding Assistance	0.0%	\$ -		\$ 11,300	\$ 11,300					
12/30/2017	726 Ave LLC/ Invasive Species	B. Wojcik	17-0588	6/20/2017	Funding Assistance	0.0%	\$ -		\$ 24,796						
9/1/2017	Craig Brody Warehouse	G. Hall	17-0937	9/6/2017	Funding Assistance	0.0%	\$ -		\$ 350,000						
	The Pharmacy - FPA II	G. Hall	17-1035	9/6/2017	Funding Assistance	0.0%	\$ -		\$ 375,000						
*** BUSINESS INCENTIVES FUNDING TOTAL:												\$ 11,490,000	\$ 9,064,399	\$ 1,663,717	\$ 1,661,884


Anticipated Date of Project Completion	RESIDENTIAL INCENTIVES	Assignee	CAM #	CAM DATE	BASIS	% Done	Advisory Board Recommended Funding	CRA Board Approved Funding	Total \$ Approved / Encumbered for Payment to Date	Total \$ Paid to Date	*Date Paid	Beginning Balance	FY 17 Obligated Funds	Actual (Paid)	FY 17 Remaining Funds
	Residential Rehabilitation Program (Single-Family homes) CRA091708				Up to \$55,000/\$75,000							450,000			
On HOLD	CRA Housing Rehab Asst. - Antonia Bailey	B. Wojcik	17-0246	7/11/2017	Housing Assistance	0.0%		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -					\$ -
	Purchase Assistance Program (Single-Family homes) CRA091707				Up to \$45,000/Affordability need							450,000			
						0.0%		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -					\$ -
*** RESIDENTIAL INCENTIVES FUNDING TOTAL:												\$ 900,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
NPF CRA INCENTIVE FUNDING TOTAL:												\$ 12,390,000	\$ 9,064,399	\$ 1,663,717	\$ 1,661,884

ITEM IV



CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE
COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY

MEMORANDUM

DATE: February 13, 2018
TO: Northwest Progresso Flagler Heights Redevelopment Advisory Board Members
FROM: D'Wayne Spence, NPF CRA Manager 
SUBJECT: Proposed Modification to Incentive Programs

RECOMMENDATION

Fort Lauderdale Community Redevelopment Agency staff recommends that Northwest-Progresso-Flagler Heights Redevelopment Advisory Board forward a recommendation of approval to proposed modifications to the NPF-CRA Incentive Programs.

BACKGROUND

On June 7, 2016, the Fort Lauderdale Community Redevelopment Agency ("CRA") approved revisions and additions to its incentive programs. (See Exhibit 1). Among the CRA staff recommendations was a proposal to provide authorization to the CRA Executive Director to administratively approve awards from the Commercial Façade Improvement, Housing Rehabilitation and Purchase Assistance Incentive Programs to simulate uses of these funds. (See Exhibit 2). The CRA Board approved recommendations, but capped the administrative approval to a threshold of less than \$50,000 based on the recommendation of the advisory board and expressed an interest in revisiting the issue as a later date.

The June 7, 2016 modification to the incentive programs were well received by the small business owners and property owners within the CRA. The CRA experienced a marked increase in the number of individuals seeking assistance through our incentive programs that previously were intimidated by the process or thought that their relatively minor proposed improvements were too insignificant for consideration. Small business owners and property owners have also expressed similar interest in smaller projects that would assist in interior renovations that would tackle the issue of vacancies that contribute to slum and blighted conditions. Recommended changes are as follows:

- **Recommendation 1:** Extend Administrative approval authorization to the Property and Business Improvement Program and the Streetscape Enhancement Program.
- **Recommendation 2:** Clarify that the Commercial Programs are intended for use on non-residential project.

- **Recommendation 3:** Modify the Property and Business Improvement Program to permit the funding of any renovations that address obstacles to occupancy rather than just substantial renovations.
- **Recommendation 4:** Adopt Federal guidelines when considering awards to faith-based organizations.
- **Recommendation 5:** Increase the minimum award amount at which CRA board approval is required be equal to or greater than one hundred thousand dollars (\$100,000) consistent with the authorization granted to the City Manager under the City of Fort Lauderdale Procurement Ordinance.

CONSISTENCY WITH THE COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT PLAN: NPF-CRA

Section 8.C. titled "Other City and CRA Government Functions – CRA Incentives and Programming" provides that the CRA will establish incentive programs as deemed appropriate to address redevelopment obstacles and these incentive programs may be modified, expanded, eliminated, or added as a new program at any time. Details of each incentive program will be drafted as a policy and individually approved by the CRA Board.

Attachments:

Exhibit 1: Minutes of the June 7, 2016 CRA Board Meeting

Exhibit 2: CRA CAM 16-0556

Exhibit 3: NPF-CRA Incentives

COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY MEETING



City of Fort Lauderdale
100 N. Andrews Avenue
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301
www.fortlauderdale.gov

Meeting Minutes - APPROVED

Tuesday, June 7, 2016

City Commission Conference Room

Meeting was called to order at 1:00 a.m. by Chair Seiler.

ATTENDANCE ROLL CALL

Present: Chair John P. "Jack" Seiler
Vice Chair Dean J. Trantalis
Commissioner Bruce G. Roberts
Commissioner Robert L. McKinzie
Commissioner Romney Rogers

QUORUM ESTABLISHED

Also Present: Lee R. Feldman, Executive Director
John Herbst, City Auditor
Jeffrey A. Modarelli, Secretary
Cynthia A. Everett, General Counsel
Jonathan Brown, Area Manager, Northwest Progresso Flagler Heights Community
Redevelopment Agency (NWPF CRA)
Don Morris, Area Manager, Beach CRA

CRA-1 16-0706 Minutes for May 3, 2016 CRA Meeting

A motion to approve the Minutes for the May 3, 2016 CRA Meeting and the agenda for tonight's meeting was made by Vice Chair Trantalis and was seconded by Commissioner Roberts.

APPROVED

Aye: 5 - Commissioner McKinzie, Commissioner Rogers, Commissioner Roberts, Vice-Chair Trantalis and Chair Sailer

CRA-2 16-0456 Motion to Approve a Community Redevelopment Agency Streetscape Funding Agreement with Flagler Village Land Trust, Steven B Greenfield Trustee for The Quantum at Flagler Village Project - \$500,000.00

Executive Director Feldman requested a deferment on this item until June 21, 2016.

A motion to defer approval a Community Redevelopment Agency Streetscape Funding Agreement with Flagler Village Land Trust, Steven B Greenfield Trustee for The Quantum at Flagler Village Project - \$500,000.00 was made by Commissioner Trantalis and was seconded by Commissioner Roberts.

DEFERRED UNTIL JUNE 21, 2016

Aye: 5 - Commissioner McKinzie, Commissioner Rogers, Commissioner Roberts, Vice-Chair Trantalis and Chair Sailer

CRA-3 16-0556 Proposed Incentives for the Northwest Progresso Flagler Heights Community Redevelopment Agency (NWPF CRA)

Chair Sailer recognized Jonathan Brown, Area Manager for the Northwest Progresso Flagler Heights Community Redevelopment Agency (NWPF CRA), who addressed the Commission on this item. Mr. Brown stated this item seeks direction from the CRA Board on the proposed enhancements to the existing CRA incentives. He stated City Staff has met with the CRA Advisory Board in March, April, and May of 2016 to discuss these changes. Mr. Brown stated both Staff and the CRA Advisory Board are seeking direction on giving Staff the authority to make the final decisions on the CRA's Facade Program, the Housing Rehabilitation Program, and the Purchase Assistance Program, and is similar to the authority given to the City's Housing and Community Development Staff. He further stated that if the project meets the approved criteria, Staff will review and provide its decision to the CRA's Executive Director and General Counsel's office for review and signature. Mr. Brown stated the CRA Advisory Board would prefer that any project over \$50,000 go back to the Advisory Board for review.

Chair Sailer asked Mr. Brown why the NWPF CRA would not send any project over \$50,000 back to the Advisory Board for review. Mr. Brown gave the CRA Board an example of the Rehabilitation Program and Homebuyers Programs stating within the Housing Community Development Department it would be unusual to approve one house and then to have to go back for another level of authority to approve the house next door. Mr. Brown said the NWPFH CRA wishes to administer this program in the same

manner as the Housing and Community Development. He said this would allow Staff to expedite and complete projects in a timely manner and is consistent with the programs already in place.

Commissioner Rogers asked Mr. Brown about the focus area. Commissioner Rogers questioned if every single one of the City's incentive programs will be in the focus area. Mr. Brown responded stating these CRA Programs are within the NWPFH CRA. Commissioner Rogers stated the need for a focus area is essential. Secondly, Commissioner Rogers noted the City needs to tier CRA funds to entice first participants to receive the most and working its way down. His further comments included the budget needs to be assigned to prioritize development as the City wants to ensure it is enticing enough participants to attract the desired end result. Commissioner Rogers stated this is where the City needs to be precise and questioned other the effectiveness of other programs. He stated he would like the City to put its dollars into the prioritized focus areas to ensure the best results.

Chair Seiler noted Commissioner McKinzie has taken a very active role in turning the NWPFH CRA around but recognizes that the NWPFH CRA has underperformed though new personnel have been brought in and it has been restructured. Chair Seiler further stated he does not want to do anything inconsistent with the Advisory Board's recommendation until the City is safely on firm ground with the NWPFH CRA. Mayor Seiler further stated that, if necessary, the CRA Board and the CRA Advisory Board can meet more often stressing the importance of keeping two sets of eyes and ears on the NWPFH CRA and to change this would be a mistake.

Commissioner Rogers suggested waiting for the City Auditor's Office final audit before deciding on a final budget and the processes to be put in place. Vice Chair Trantalis concurred and Chair Seiler asked City Auditor Herbst what the timing will be regarding completion of the final audit. City Auditor Herbst stated his office is two months away from having a draft audit report ready noting the remaining steps and time required to prepare the final audit will be approximately two to three months. Further discussions ensued.

Mr. Brown stated the NWPFH CRA Staff does not want to request a match for façade, streetscape, or the property and business improvement programs for projects within the Focus Area. It was noted the CRA Board was in agreement with the CRA Advisory Board's recommendation that projects inside the focus area's streetscape projects should require a match.

Mr. Brown stated the CRA Advisory Board recommended having contractors who are within the CRA or within the City of Fort Lauderdale be given extra preference points for the award of contracts. He stated that if this is the case, the bid award would no longer be awarded to the lowest, most responsive bidder. Executive Director Feldman stated the City's current ordinance provides for a preference for City of Fort Lauderdale businesses, not CRA allocated businesses and is a nuance in this case. Further discussions ensued on what is legally permitted. Chair Seiler stated the Commission will revisit this issue later when they review the \$50,000 threshold issue and will continue with the current plan.

Mr. Brown stated with regard to the Commercial Façade Program, which addresses exteriors; the Advisory Board was in agreement with the recommended changes with the exception of owner's equity. The question was raised as to whether or not the owner's equity could include the land owned by the owner being part of the match in lieu of dollars on the table. Mr. Brown said there was a split decision on the Advisory Board regarding this issue. Mr. Brown stated Staff recommended it not include the land (owner equity) and the Advisory Board never came up with a consensus or a counter recommendation. Chair Seiler stated the Board will agree to approve Staff's recommendation on the Commercial Façade Program.

Regarding the Property Business and Improvement Program, which addresses interiors, Mr. Brown stated although the Advisory Board made a lot of effort, they could not come up with a vote to approve the

proposed changes. Further discussions ensued including the need for a job creation component or a job retention requirement, and a minimum property standards requirement to not only redevelop the building but set a tone for what the area should look like. Discussions ensued on how to enforce these requirements.

Executive Director Feldman stated the way to enforce this is through a mortgage on the property that is ultimately forgiven at a point in time. General Counsel Everett stated the details needed to be flushed out and need to be very specific. She stated if the Board approves these concepts, Staff may be coming back to the CRA Board with some further explanation and detail as to how the program is going to work. Vice Chair Trantalis asked why these details and explanations are addressed prior to requesting an approval from the CRA Board. General Counsel Everett stated it was not her department's item. Further discussions ensued.

Chair Seiler asked the Commission to come up with a threshold dollar amount to get things moving to present to the CRA Advisory Board and the CRA Board. The Commissioners recommended several amounts to set as a threshold amount and decided on a threshold amount of \$225,000 with the ability to submit a request to the CRA Board for additional funds from a company that has a greater need.

City Auditor Herbst noted the need for two points of clarity. He stated the Commission has had a policy that this would not cover repairs and was not designed to bring a business into code compliance. In order to be consistent, City Auditor Herbst asked if this policy has changed. Chair Seiler stated if the funding was bringing something into compliance with Code on an issue that was created by the owner, the CRA would not fund it. However, if someone new is coming in and purchasing the property and they inherit the Code issue, then CRA funding would be available.

City Auditor Herbst's second point related to job retention and the definition and measurement of job retention were it not for the CRA investment. Mr. Brown stated the HUD standard included fixing issues that would allow people to retain their positions.

Mr. Brown stated that the CRA Advisory Board and Staff are in agreement with the Streetscape Program and the Property Tax and Reimbursement Program.

Mr. Brown said the CRA Staff is proposing a new incentive that is consistent with the CRA Plan. It is the Incentive Development and Incentive Program which gives the Advisory Board some flexibility if the CRA funds a project that has a cost of in excess of \$5,000,000. Mr. Brown noted they are now talking to developers who are looking at \$30,000,000 - \$60,000,000 projects with the goal of using this to give the NWPFH CRA flexibility to utilize more than one of the incentive programs, i.e., combining two separate incentives giving flexibility due to the fact there are caps on these programs. Mr. Brown stated this would alleviate the need for two separate sets of document submissions by spelling out the programs in one incentive document submission.

Chair Seiler stated he had an issue with the Purchase Assistance Program as it relates to passing it on as a subsidy to an eligible family. Chair Seiler noted there should be a minimum timeframe that is not currently in the documents. Chair Seiler stated he would not approve this program without that condition due to previous situations where a program participant receives CRA funds and then "flips" the house. Mr. Brown clarified this and agreed to rewrite paragraph three. Executive Director Feldman stated Staff will make sure the detail in the program contains the same HCD requirements for the Purchase Assistance Program.

Mr. Brown stated the only difference in the Incentives for Rehabilitation and for the First Time Home Buyers is the request for the stated income go up from \$140,000 to \$160,000 for the Area Medium Income (AMI). This would allow not only funding of the low and the very low income households as is

being done in Housing and Community Development but would allow for the funding of moderate income households needs.

City Auditor Herbst asked for clarity about reducing any of the down payment assistance programs currently being done or supplanting current CRA dollars. Mr. Brown stated, "not at all."

Commissioner Rogers commented on the Residential Rehabilitation Program questioning what was being accomplished unless the NWPFH CRA was staying in the focused areas as opposed to picking and choosing locations. Mr. Brown stated he skipped over the Residential Rehabilitation Program and the NWPFH CRA is looking to use the Home Buyer Program and the Rehabilitation Program in conjunction with each other.

Mr. Brown stated they have been meeting with the City's loan consortium of nonprofits organizations and lenders to ensure they can sell the properties at a gain and not at a loss. Mr. Brown stated in his discussions with these entities, the CRA is pursuing the Home Buyers Program with the Rehabilitation Program, picking two or three blocks at a time to build infield in those lots. This will allow the rehabilitation of the houses in the area. Mr. Brown stated the goal is to get as close to Franklin Park as possible because the County is building there, and they are setting market for values for housing in that location. Mr. Brown proposed the NWPFH CRA will begin by going from west to east in the NWPFH CRA area because single family lots are located in the northwest area of the City.

Commissioner Rogers stated in terms of priority, the CRA must start with a focus area and should be restricted to the stated focus area. Mr. Brown stated the focus area is from Sistrunk from 24th Street to the FEC Railway. Commissioner McKinzie further outlined the focus area. Mr. Brown stated he was only addressing the City owned or CRA owned lots.

Chair Seiler confirmed with Mr. Brown that he had a clear record of the items approved by the CRA Board tonight, and Mr. Brown confirmed he had a clear record.

A motion to approve the proposed incentives for the Northwest Progresso Flagler Heights Community Redevelopment Agency (NWPFH CRA) was approved by the CRA Board as discussed during this meeting was made by Commissioner McKinzie and was seconded by Commissioner Roberts.

APPROVED – As Amended

Aye: 4 - Commissioner McKinzie, Commissioner Rogers, Commissioner Roberts, and Chair Seiler

Nay: 1 - Vice-Chair Trantalis

CRA-4 16-0610

Proposed Classification and Compensation Structure and Benefits Options for the Fort Lauderdale Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA)

Chair Seiler recognized Don Morris, Area Manager for the Beach Community Redevelopment Agency who addressed the Commission stating on May 3, 2016, the Board approved a Classification and Compensation Structure for six new Community Redevelopment Agency full time employees which the CRA Board had deferred. Mr. Morris stated in the interim, the CRAs are being staffed using existing City employees prior to the CRA Board's approval. Mr. Morris stated currently there are five existing City employees that need the Board's approval. They include an Administrative Specialist, an Economic Development Program Aid, a Project Coordinator, and Community Redevelopment Agency Managers, Jonathan Brown and Don Morris. Mr. Morris expounded on the Classification and Compensation Structure and Benefits Options and the amended Organizational CRA Chart submitted to the Board. Mr. Brown stated this Class and Compensation Plan is consistent with the City's Classification and Compensation Schedule and the CRA Organizational Chart was amended slightly from the original so the positions match up with the compensation classification as questioned at the last CRA Board meeting. Comments and discussions ensued and Commissioner Roberts asked if tonight's submission satisfies the questions at the April 5, 2016 meeting regarding the CRA's Organizational Chart approval. Mr. Brown confirmed this for Commissioner Roberts

Discussions ensued on the vacation and sick leave aspects of the benefits, and it was noted by Executive Director Feldman that these accrue over a period of time and was dependent on various factors. Mr. Morris stated tonight's submission regarding compensation and benefits for these new hires were based on the information received from the City's Human Resources Office. City Attorney Everett commented on the inability at this time to determine if the coding is correct and noted it may change over time. Mr. Morris stated the CRA By-Laws stipulate that the CRA follow all of the City's Personnel Regulations for compensation, vacation and benefit packages and are equivalent to City employees. Further comments and discussions ensued on this topic. Executive Director Feldman stated the intent is to make these benefits identical to the existing A Plan for City employees including all the changes made for new hires. Further discussions ensued.

Chair Seiler recommended running the proposed Classification and Compensation Structure and Benefits package for the full time CRA employees by Human Resources for review and confirmation. Mr. Brown stated the Classification and Compensation Structure and Benefits package was prepared by Human Resources in conjunction with the City Attorney's Office. Commissioner McKinzie stated that the City's Human Resources Office and the City Attorney's office need to be in agreement prior to presenting the CRA Classification and Compensation Structure and Benefits Package to the CRA Board for approval.

A motion to defer approval the proposed Classification and Compensation Structure and Benefits Options for the Fort Lauderdale Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA) was made by Commissioner Roberts and was seconded by Commissioner McKinzie.

MOTION TO DEFER UNTIL JUNE 21, 2016

Aye: 5 – Commissioner McKinzie, Commissioner Rogers, Commissioner Roberts, Vice-Chair Trantalis, and Chair Seiler

ADJOURNMENT

There being no additional business before the CRA Board, Chairman Seiler adjourned the meeting at 1:53 a.m.



John P. "Jack" Seiler
Chair

ATTEST:



Jeffrey A. Modarelli
Secretary



CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE
City Commission Agenda Memo
CRA BOARD MEETING

#16-0556

TO: CRA Chairman & Board of Commissioners
Fort Lauderdale Community Redevelopment Agency

FROM: Lee R. Feldman, ICMA-CM, Executive Director

DATE: June 7, 2016

TITLE: Proposed Incentives for the Northwest Progresso Flagler Heights
Community Redevelopment Agency (NWPF CRA)

Recommendation

It is recommended that the CRA Board of Commissioners approve the proposed CRA Incentives and decide whether the incentives will include certain recommendations from CRA staff or those from the NWPF Advisory Board.

Background

CRA staff presented new incentives and incentive revisions to the NWPF Advisory Board on March 23, 2016. Since then we have discussed what incentives at length, some things staff and the Advisory Board agree on and other things we did not.

The general things that we did not agree on and that we need direction on are as follows:

1. Staff Authority Level – for the Commercial Façade, Housing Rehabilitation and Purchase Assistance Programs

- Staff requests that the aforementioned programs be approved at the staff level, if the request meets the approved program guidelines.
- The Advisory Board would like all requests that exceed \$50,000 for these programs to be brought to them for recommendation and the CRA Board for final approval.

2. Focus Area – Sistrunk Boulevard between NW 24th Avenue and the FEC Railway, including one block north and south of Sistrunk Boulevard; as well as, 9th Avenue (between Sunrise Boulevard and Broward Boulevard), and 7th Avenue (between Sunrise Boulevard and Broward Boulevard)

- Staff does not want to include a dollar-for-dollar match requirement for façade, streetscape or the property and business improvement program projects within the Focus Area. Staff would prefer this be determined upon recommendation of the Advisory Board and approval by the Commission on a case-by-case basis.

- The Advisory Board would like to require a dollar for dollar match on the Streetscape program for all applicants regardless of where the work will take place.

3. Contractor Preference

- Staff recommends using an invitation to bid (ITB) process where the contractors on the Housing and Community Development (HCD) and CRA approved list be used where appropriate. Additionally, staff recommends that on all construction related opportunities where a bid is issued by the developer, that our contractors be invited to bid.
- The Advisory Board does not want to use an ITB process; they want to use a process where the construction opportunity is not awarded to the lowest most responsive bid. They would like to have a competitive scoring process where contractors that are located in the CRA and/or City is awarded more points in the selection process.

The more specific items that we need CRA Board direction on are listed below.

Over the past few years, the NWPF CRA was using four (4) incentives to provide assistance to the community. Those incentives are Commercial Façade, Business and Property Improvement, Streetscape and Property Tax Reimbursement. As we reviewed each of those programs, the following enhancements are recommended:

1. Commercial Façade Improvement Program:

This is an existing CRA approved programs. Enhancements to the program include the following:

- An identified Focus area,
- Requirement of a dollar for dollar match for projects outside of the Focus Area
- Additional eligible projects costs such as lighting, shade canopy, sidewalks, signage and parking lot,
- Added a possible job creation or retention requirement,
- Added obligations and covenants to the applicant, and
- Added special conditions.

The CRA Board’s direction is needed for the following:

There was discussion with the Advisory Board as to whether or not “*equity investment*,” should include the land owned by the applicant. If so, the land could be used in lieu of any cash match requirements within the Commercial Façade Program?

Does the CRA Board want to allow the land owned to be part of an applicant’s equity investment?

2. Property and Business Improvement Program:

This is an existing CRA approved programs. Enhancements to the program include the following:

- An identified Focus area,
- Requirement of a dollar for dollar match for projects outside of the Focus Area,
- Expanded the eligible project and included kitchen/restaurant related costs,
- Added a possible job creation or retention requirement,
- Added obligations and covenants to the applicant, and
- Added special conditions.

The Advisory Board made a few motions, but nothing passed. As a result, there was no affirmative vote to approve or deny the recommended changes. However, staff supports the recommended changes.

3. Streetscape Enhancement Program:

This is an existing CRA approved programs. Enhancements to the program include the following:

- An identified Focus Area,
- Requirement of a dollar for dollar match for projects outside of the Focus Area,
- Inclusion of CRA owned land being added as a possible incentive,
- Expanded the eligible project cost,
- Added a possible job creation or retention requirement,
- Added obligations and covenants to the applicant, and
- Added special conditions.

The Advisory Board and staff support the incentive program and the recommended changes.

4. Property Tax Reimbursement Program:

This is an existing CRA approved incentive program. Enhancements to the program include the following:

- Clarified that the eligible business has to contributing to the tax roll,
- Added a requirement for substantial renovation,
- Clarified what portion of the increment financing is eligible for reimbursement, and
- Added special conditions.

The Advisory Board and staff support the incentive program and the recommended changes.

In addition to the existing CRA Incentive Programs, staff proposes that we add three (3) new incentive programs, which are as follows:

1. Development Incentive Program:

This new CRA incentive provides the CRA Board with the ability to combine incentives in furtherance of development, if the project represents an total investment / total project cost of five (\$5,000,000) million dollars or more and creates a significant economic engine or destination project in the CRA.

The Advisory Board and staff support the new Development Incentive Program.

2. Residential Rehabilitation Program:

This new incentive allows the CRA to enhance the residential properties by correcting code violations and addressing a properties health and safety issues, such as electrical, plumbing, roofing, windows, ac/heating and structural items including emergency repair.

The Advisory Board and staff support the new Residential Rehabilitation Program.

3. Purchase Assistance Program:

This new incentive allows the CRA to provide assistance to for profit and not for profit organizations to construct single family homes on CRA and/or City owned infill housing lots. The assistance provided will be passed on as a subsidy to the eligible family when they purchase the single family home.

The Advisory Board and staff support the new Purchase Assistance Program.

Resource Impact

There will be no fiscal impact with this CAM.

Strategic Connections

This item is a *Press Play Fort Lauderdale Strategic Plan 2018* initiative, included within the Neighborhood Enhancement Cylinder of Excellence, specifically advancing:

- Goal 5: Be a community of strong, beautiful and healthy neighborhoods.
- Goal 6: Be an inclusive community made up of distinct, complementary, and diverse neighborhoods.

This item advances the *Fast Forward Fort Lauderdale 2035 Vision Plan: We Are Community*.

Attachment:

Exhibit 1 – CRA Proposed Incentives

Prepared by: Jonathan Brown, Northwest Progresso Flagler Heights CRA and Housing & Community Development

Executive Director: Lee R. Feldman, ICMA-CM, City Manager



COMMERCIAL PROGRAMS

COMMERCIAL FACADE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (CFIP)

Goals/Objectives: Eliminate slum and blight, remove deterioration, and update the exteriors of existing buildings, with an emphasis on improving the viability of healthy retail uses. Furthermore, the intent of this program is to create active walking areas by increasing the "curb appeal" of the business corridors in the CRA.

Eligible Area: All properties within the CRA. There is a designated Focus Area defined as Sistrunk Boulevard between NW 24 Avenue and the FEC Railway, including one block north and south of Sistrunk Boulevard; as well as, 9th Avenue (*between Sunrise Boulevard and Broward Boulevard*), and 7th Avenue (*between Sunrise Boulevard and Broward Boulevard*).

Eligible Properties: Existing commercial and mixed-use buildings with commercial elements in the CRA with uses permitted by applicable land use codes or approved conditional uses.

Eligible Project Costs: Generally, all costs associated with exterior improvements which include, but are not limited to: entry doors, windows, lighting, shade canopy, sidewalks, signage, parking, restoration, and/or rehabilitation are eligible for consideration (*including costs for associated with architectural, engineering, permit and application fees*). The proposed Project must comply with the CRA Plan, urban design guidelines, applicable land use regulations, and current code requirements, subject to review/approval by the City of Fort Lauderdale Planning Division, Code Compliance Division, and CRA staff.

Basis/Limits of Benefits: Throughout the CRA, a CFIP award will provide a forgivable loan for up to 75% of the eligible costs not to exceed \$125,000. In the CRA Focus Area, a CFIP award will provide a forgivable loan for up to 90% of the eligible costs not to exceed \$125,000. Commercial Properties located on Sistrunk Boulevard, between NW 24 Avenue and the FEC Railway will be awarded a forgivable loan for 100% of the eligible costs, not to exceed \$75,000. If the costs in the focus area exceed \$75,000, an owner's cash investment of 5% is required for the portion that exceeds the \$75,000.

In the case of multiple structures on a single property, the CRA Board (and/or designee), at its sole discretion, may consider a forgivable loan application for each structure subject to the terms, conditions, and limits applicable to location of the subject property. The Agency, at its sole discretion, may consider increasing the funding limits on a case-by-case basis.

Job Creation and Retention Requirements: Job creation and/or job retention or another approved performance indicator may be a requirement for assistance provided through this program.

Terms and Obligations: The program award will have ongoing obligations/covenants, which includes but is not limited to a lien on the applicant's property.

Special Conditions: There must be a documented selection process for the General Contractors selected for this project. The CRA recommends the use of General Contractors from its approved contractor list. A CRA / City approved contractor must be used for projects where 60% or more of the costs are paid by the CRA.

PROPERTY AND BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (PBIP)

Goals/Objectives: Eliminate slum and blight, remove deterioration, and improve the “energy efficiency” of existing buildings in the CRA, with an emphasis on bringing these buildings up to current building codes and making them more viable for occupancy. The program provides funding for interior and exterior improvements for mixed-use or commercial projects. Additionally, this program seeks to improve the operating efficiency of existing restaurants in the CRA and attract new restaurants to the CRA, with an emphasis on creating a dining destination within the City.

Eligible Area: All properties within the CRA. There is a designated Focus Area defined as Sistrunk Boulevard between NW 24 Avenue and the FEC Railway, including one block north and south of Sistrunk Boulevard; as well as, 9th Avenue (*between Sunrise Boulevard and Broward Boulevard*), and 7th Avenue (*between Sunrise Boulevard and Broward Boulevard*).

Eligible Properties: Existing commercial and mixed-use buildings with commercial elements in the CRA with uses permitted by applicable land use codes or approved conditional uses. Existing and new properties with retail/commercial food preparation uses within the CRA as permitted by applicable land use codes or approved conditional uses, with a particular emphasis on retail restaurants.

Eligible Project Costs: Generally, all costs associated with substantial renovation and new construction, including interior improvements, restoration, rehabilitation, and permanently attached fixtures/systems are eligible for consideration (Project). Additionally, eligible costs include *architectural, engineering, permit fees, application fees*, property taxes, tax liens, City liens and property insurance. The proposed Project must comply with the Plan, CRA urban design guidelines, applicable land use regulations, and current code requirements, subject to review/approval by the City of Fort Lauderdale Planning Division, Code Compliance Division, and CRA staff.

Substantial renovation means the cost of rehabilitation/renovation exceeds 50% of the current property value, as indicated by Broward County Property Appraiser or private appraisal.

Eligible Restaurant and Kitchen Related Costs: Generally, all costs specific to commercial kitchen improvements and permanently attached commercial-grade kitchen equipment/systems are eligible for consideration (Project). The proposed Project must comply with the Plan, CRA urban design guidelines, applicable land use regulations, and current code requirements, subject to review/approval by the City of Fort Lauderdale Planning Division, Code Compliance Division, and CRA staff. The kitchen design/engineering, construction materials, and equipment/systems must comply with applicable industry standards, such as: Dairy and Food Industries Supply Association, Inc. (3-A), United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), Food and Drug

Administration (FDA), American Welding Society (AWS), Occupational Safety and Health Association (OSHA), American Society of Testing Materials (ASTM), American National Standards Institute (ANSI), Current Good Manufacturing Practices (cGMPs), and National Electrical Manufacturer's Association (NEMA). The kitchen and its equipment will comply with all local health and safety requirements that apply to food produced for sale.

Job Creation and Retention Requirements: Job creation and/or job retention or another approved performance indicator may be a requirement for assistance provided through this program.

Basis/Limits of Benefits: Throughout the CRA, a PBIP award will provide a forgivable loan for up to 75% of the eligible costs not to exceed \$500,000. In the Focus Area, the program award will provide a forgivable loan for up to 90% of the eligible costs not to exceed \$500,000. In the Focus Area, owner's equity investment for funding requests that do not exceed \$150,000, will be determined on a case-by-case review. The CRA Board (and/or designee), at its sole discretion, may consider increasing the funding limits and equity investment requirements on a case-by-case basis.

In order to be eligible for the PBIP, the business/property owner must invest at a minimum, a dollar-for-dollar match of the CRA investment within the project, if the project is not located within the focus area. The CRA's project contribution cannot exceed the documented contribution of the business/project owner.

Terms and Obligations: The program award will have ongoing obligations/covenants, which includes, but is not limited to a lien on the applicant's property.

Special Conditions: There must be a documented selection process for the General Contractors selected for the applicants project. The City recommends the use of General Contractors from its approved contractor list. A CRA / City approved contractor must be used for projects where 60% or more of the costs are paid by the CRA. Contractors on the City/CRA contractor list, must be invited to bid on all work solicited by the project owner/developer.

STREETSCAPE ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM (SEP)

Goals/Objectives: Eliminate slum and blight by encouraging projects to demonstrate high quality urban and environmental design and sustainability, thus creating a higher quality environment and sense of place by enhancing the public realm across the CRA.

This program will also allow the CRA to provide land as an incentive via donation and/or purchase. In order to be eligible for the SEP, the business/property owner must invest at a minimum, a dollar-for-dollar match of the CRA investment within the project, if there project is not located in the focus area. The CRA's project contribution cannot exceed the documented contribution of the business/project owner.

Eligible Area: All properties within the CRA. There is a designated Focus Area defined as Sistrunk Boulevard between NW 24 Avenue and the FEC Railway, including one block north and south of Sistrunk Boulevard; as well as, 9th Avenue (*between Sunrise Boulevard and Broward Boulevard*), and 7th Avenue (*between Sunrise Boulevard and Broward Boulevard*).

Eligible Properties: All existing and new buildings in the CRA approved for commercial, multifamily, or mixed use.

Eligible Project Costs: Generally, all costs associated with enhanced (features/finishes beyond mandatory City requirements) streetscape improvements constructed on or within the public right-of-way are eligible for consideration (Project). The proposed improvements must comply with CRA design guidelines for the particular street on which the project is located, the Plan, the City of Fort Lauderdale Complete Street Guidelines, the CRA Implementation Plan, the Downtown Master Plan (as applicable), and the Fort Lauderdale Connectivity Master Plan. Design/engineering must be consistent with City, county and state requirements for roadway design/construction.

Job Creation and Retention Requirements: Job creation and/or job retention or another approved performance indicator may be a requirement for assistance provided through this program.

Basis/Limits of Benefits: Throughout the CRA, a SEP award will provide a forgivable loan for up to 70% of the eligible costs not to exceed \$500,000. In the Focus Area, the program award will provide a forgivable loan for up to 90% of the eligible costs not to exceed \$500,000. The CRA Board (and/or designee), at its sole discretion, may consider increasing the funding limits on a case-by-case basis.

Terms and Obligations: The program award will have ongoing obligations / covenants, which includes, but is not limited to a lien on the applicant's property.

Special Conditions: There must be a documented process for the General Contractors and sub-contractors selected for the project. The CRA / City encourage the use of

contractors from its approved contractor list. Contractors on the City/CRA contractor list, must be invited to bid on all work solicited by the project owner/developer.

DEVELOPMENT INCENTIVE PROGRAM (DIP)

Goals/Objectives: This program seeks to eliminate slum and blight by attracting new businesses to the CRA or existing businesses to expand within the CRA. DIP is a custom designed incentive to meet the appropriate needs of a specific development project in the CRA that represents an investment / total project cost of five (\$5,000,000) million dollars or more and creates a significant economic engine or destination project in the CRA.

This program will allow the CRA to use any of its incentive programs and options, including tax abatement, fee waivers, land donation and/or purchase, etc.

In order to be eligible for the DIP, the business/property owner must invest at a minimum, a dollar-for-dollar match of the CRA investment within the project. The CRA's project contribution cannot exceed the documented contribution of the business/project owner.

Eligible Area: All properties within the CRA. There is a designated Focus Area defined as Sistrunk Boulevard between NW 24 Avenue and the FEC Railway, including one block north and south of Sistrunk Boulevard; as well as, 9th Avenue (*between Sunrise Boulevard and Broward Boulevard*), and 7th Avenue (*between Sunrise Boulevard and Broward Boulevard*).

Eligible Properties: Commercial and/or mixed-use projects in the CRA with uses permitted by applicable land use codes or approved conditional uses.

Eligible Project Costs: Generally, all costs associated with the CRA desired redevelopment project (Project), including costs and fee's associated with acquisition, rehabilitation and fines. The proposed Project must comply with the Plan, CRA urban design guidelines, applicable land use regulations, and current code requirements, subject to review/approval by the City of Fort Lauderdale Planning Division, Code Compliance Division, and CRA staff.

Job Creation and Retention Requirements: Job creation and/or job retention or another approved performance indicator may be a requirement for assistance provided through this program.

Basis/Limits of Benefits: Throughout the CRA, a DIP award (*with no minimum or maximum amount*) will provide a forgivable loan or low interest loan to assist the eligible project. The CRA Staff will review the project and recommend a funding plan/strategy and amount to the CRA Advisory Board and CRA Board.

Terms and Obligations: The program award will have ongoing obligations/covenants, which may include, but is not limited to a lien on the applicant's property.

Special Conditions: Where possible, the developer will use best efforts to hire Fort Lauderdale contractors to work on approved projects. If a HCD/CRA approved contractor is awarded work, it will be for the portion of the project that is funded through the CRA.

PROPERTY TAX REIMBURSEMENT (PTR)

Goals/Objectives: Eliminate slum and blight, remove deterioration, update existing buildings, and encourage new investment/development with an emphasis on enhancing the overall CRA, improving the quality of existing buildings within the CRA, and attracting new construction to the CRA.

Eligible Area: All properties within the CRA that are owned by an organization that fully contributes to the tax increment income.

Eligible Properties: All commercial, multifamily, or mixed-use (residential/commercial) buildings in the CRA with uses permitted by applicable land use codes or approved conditional uses that have had substantial capital improvements or new construction.

Substantial capital improvements means the cost of rehabilitation/renovation exceeds 50% of the current property value, as indicated by Broward County Property Appraiser or private appraisal.

Eligible Project Costs: The benefits of this Program are not directly based on Project costs. Rather, the benefits of this Program are based on capital improvements on existing properties or the development cost of new buildings that result in a substantial increase of Ad Valorem Tax (Property Tax). The property owner will only be entitled to the incremental tax increase generated by project that would be returned to the CRA as tax increment revenue. The proposed Project must comply with the Plan, CRA urban design guidelines, and applicable land use regulations, subject to review/approval by the City of Fort Lauderdale Planning Division and CRA staff. All construction work must be performed by licensed contractors with required building permits and progress inspections.

Basis/Limits of Benefits: PTR is a reimbursement and payment disbursed upon verification that property taxes for the year has been paid. A PTR award will run for a maximum of five (5) years and the limits are as follows:

- Year 1 – 95% of real property Ad Valorem taxes returned to the CRA as tax increment revenue
- Year 2 – 90% of real property Ad Valorem taxes returned to the CRA as tax increment revenue
- Year 3 – 85% of real property Ad Valorem taxes returned to the CRA as tax increment revenue

- Year 4 – 80% of real property Ad Valorem taxes returned to the CRA as tax increment revenue
- Year 5 – 75% of real property Ad Valorem taxes returned to the CRA as tax increment revenue

Applicant: The property owner /developer (Owner) must be the applicant. A RFIG award will have ongoing obligations/covenants, which will be protected by a lien on the applicant's property.

Special Conditions: Where possible, the developer will use best efforts to hire Fort Lauderdale contractors to work on approved projects. If a HCD/CRA approved contractor is awarded work, it will be for the portion of the project that is funded through the CRA.

RESIDENTIAL PROGRAMS

RESIDENTIAL REHABILITATION FORGIVABLE LOAN (RRG)

Goals/Objectives: Eliminate slum and blight, remove deterioration, and update the exteriors of existing residential buildings, with an emphasis on generally enhancing the residential neighborhoods in the CRA and to correct code violations, health and safety issues including but not limited to electrical, plumbing, roofing, windows, ac/heating and structural items including emergency repair.

Eligible Area: All properties within the CRA. There is a designated Focus Area defined as Sistrunk Boulevard between NW 24 Avenue and the FEC Railway, including one block north and south of Sistrunk Boulevard; as well as, 9th Avenue (*between Sunrise Boulevard and Broward Boulevard*), and 7th Avenue (*between Sunrise Boulevard and Broward Boulevard*).

Target Client: Individuals and/or families that occupy their homesteaded property. The annual household income cannot exceed 160% of the Area Median Income (AMI).

Eligible Properties: Existing single family residential, whose appraised value does not exceed \$300,000.

Eligible Project Costs: Generally, all costs associated with interior and exterior improvements, restoration, and/or rehabilitation are eligible for consideration (Project). The proposed Project must comply with the Plan, CRA urban design guidelines, and applicable land use regulations, subject to review/approval by the City of Fort Lauderdale Planning Division and CRA staff.

Basis/Limits of Benefits: The maximum award for the RRG is \$75,000. Throughout the CRA and Focus Area, a RRG award will provide assistance to owner occupied single family homes. Owners will not require a contribution if the rehabilitation costs do not exceed a CRA award amount of \$55,000. An owner cash contribution of 10% is required if the costs of the repair exceeds the available CRA funds. The owners' cash contribution will be based on the costs that exceed \$55,000.

The CRA Board (and/or designee), at its sole discretion, may consider increasing the funding limits on a case-by-case basis.

Terms and Obligations: The program award will require an application and review process. The RRG will have ongoing obligations/covenants, which includes, but is not limited to a lien on the applicant's property. The maximum household income of the families assisted in this program cannot exceed 160% of the Area Median Income (AMI). The City/CRA will develop the scope of work for each project.

General Contractor: There must be a documented selection process for the General Contractor used for the project. Owner-occupied single family rehabilitation must use an approved General Contractor from the City's approved contractor list.

PURCHASE ASSISTANCE PROGRAM (PAP)

Goals/Objectives: To provide assistance to for profit and not for profit organizations to construct single family homes on CRA and/or City owned infill housing lots, for the benefit of eligible families to purchase. The assistance provided to the organization must be passed through to the eligible family to purchase the property.

Eligible homebuyers must be identified by the organization and submitted to the CRA for eligibility review and approval.

Eligible Area: NWPF CRA

Target Client: Eligible individuals and/or families that are purchasing a property they will occupy as their primary and homesteaded residence.

Eligible Properties: Existing residential CRA and City-owned residential lots within the NWPF CRA boundary.

Basis/Limits of Benefits: Throughout the CRA a PAP award will provide down payment and closing cost assistance to the eligible homebuyer. Assistance to the homebuyer from the CRA cannot exceed \$45,000 and is based on affordability needs.

Terms and Obligations: The program award will require an application and review process. The PAP award will have ongoing obligations/covenants, which includes, but is not limited to a lien on the applicant's property. All properties will require owner occupancy and the maximum household income of the individuals or families assisted in this program cannot exceed 160% of the Area Median Income (AMI).

General Contractor: The General Contractor selected must come from the City's/CRA's approved contractor list.