



**APPROVED**  
**BEACH REDEVELOPMENT BOARD (BRB)**  
**AND**  
**PARKS, RECREATION AND BEACHES BOARD (PRBAB)**  
**100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE**  
**8th FLOOR CITY COMMISSION CONFERENCE ROOM**  
**FORT LAUDERDALE, FL 33301**  
**Monday, November 7, 2018, 2:00 P.M.**

<b>BRB MEMBERS</b>	<b>FEB 2018/JAN 2019</b>				
	<b>REGULAR MTGS</b>		<b>SPECIAL MTGS</b>		
	<b>Present</b>	<b>Absent</b>	<b>Present</b>	<b>Absent</b>	
Ina Lee, Chair	P	6	0	4	0
Thomas B. McManus, VC	A	3	3	3	1
Art Bengochea	P	3	0	2	0
Jason Hughes	P	4	2	3	1
Monty Lalwani	P	1	0	2	0
Christian Luz	A	4	2	2	2
Kristen Maus	P	3	0	2	0
Tim Schiavone	P	5	1	4	0
Shirley Smith	P	6	0	4	0
Aiton Yaari	P	3	3	3	1

**PRBAB MEMBERS PRESENT**

Debby Eisinger, Chair  
 Karen Polivka, Vice Chair  
 Michael Flowers  
 James Jordan (arr. 2:16 p.m.)  
 Charlie Leikauf  
 Marianna Seiler  
 Jo Ann Smith (arr. 3:20 p.m.)  
 Martha Gutierrez Steinkamp  
 Amber Van Buren

**BRB STAFF**

Don Morris, Beach CRA Manager  
 Lizeth DeTorres, Administrative Aide  
 Tom Green, Project Manager

**PARKS STAFF**

Leona Osamor, Parks and Recreation Administrative Assistant I

**GUESTS**

**I. Call to Order and Roll Call Quorum**

Ina Lee, BRB Chair, and Debby Eisinger, PRBAB Chair, called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. A quorum of the BRB was present, but the PRBAB did not have a quorum.

## **II. DC Alexander Park Renovation Concepts - Paul Weinberg PLA, ASLA Planning and Landscape Architecture**

Mr. Morris said that Keith & Associates have prepared preliminary concepts for the playground, which Mr. Weinberg will be presenting. With the input obtained at this meeting, there will be meeting with community groups at a public open house on November 14, 2018, and a meeting with the Central Beach Alliance (CBA) on November 15, 2018. The plan is to move forward with the project sometime early in 2019.

Mr. Weinberg gave a PowerPoint presentation on the proposed playground.

[James Jordan arrived at 2:16 p.m.]

Chair Eisinger (PRBAB) stated that the PRBAB now has a quorum.

Ms. Smith thought the plan was “overkill” and said they need room for parking. She said there should be sand for children to play in.

Mr. Morris reviewed the previous meetings about the plan.

Mr. Luz asked if SE 5 Street could be closed off for events/festivals, and Mr. Weinberg answered affirmatively, adding it will be two-way. He said they purposely did not make it paved because of the design planned for Las Olas Boulevard. Mr. Morris explained that from a budget standpoint, the paving being done in other parts of the CRA is expensive, and paving SE 5 Street would detract from what could be done in the park. Mr. Green noted that FDOT has a project for changing out the signals and the mast arms at the intersection to create a permanent two-way condition.

Mr. Leikauf praised the concept, but expressed concern about night-time security, Spring Breakers, and children getting lost. It was noted the site will be locked at night and, like other beach projects, will have a robust security system.

Mr. Yaari was very pleased with the design for both locals and tourists. He recommended more than a peek-a-boo view from SR A1A so that people could see it and have time to turn into the site.

Mr. Morris said they are working with a budget of about \$5 million and Mr. Weinberg stated they are close to budget. Mr. Yaari suggested naming rights for the park. Mr.

Morris commented he did not know if there might be restrictions on the name since the land was donated.

Ms. Steinkamp advised that the original Fort Lauderdale was not a military fort, but a trading post. She believed that the history of the post should be part of the project. She was concerned about ADA compliance in the tower, and Mr. Weinberg said there will be ramps and it will be accessible.

In response to a question by Ms. Steinkamp, Mr. Weinberg explained that not all the trees are real, because they are limited as to what they can plant. The artificial trees can be interactive and part of the playground equipment. Ms. Steinkamp said she did not like fake trees and suggested finding a way of creating shade that did not involve them.

Ms. Steinkamp also suggested incorporating history of the New River Settlement into the site, since the fort itself only existed for four years. She said that would also provide more opportunities for engagement for those who are not interested in forts.

Ms. Steinkamp commented that if they have naming rights by a cruise line, they could get a negative reaction if something bad happens on the cruise line.

Mr. Hughes liked the concept and was pleased there was no parking since that would make more room for the park itself. He suggested having a fitness element, and Mr. Weinberg explained it there are several fitness stations outside of the front gates. The reasoning is that those people may not have children, and it would prevent having a "random mix" of people in the playground.

Regarding parking, Mr. Weinberg mentioned there is parking at Southside Beach, the Aquatics Center, and the future garage.

Mr. Bengochea was also impressed with the design but wanted to see a long-term maintenance concept. Mr. Weinberg said that is part of their scope.

Other comments included appreciation for the incorporation of history and connectivity, and maximizing of space.

There was another concern expressed that the project could not be done for \$5 million, and a question if there would be private rentals to offset the cost. Mr. Morris did not know if that would be allowed and would defer that question to the Parks and Recreation Department. He did say that the covenant requires that the land be used as a park.

Mr. Jordan concurred with Ms. Smith, that the concept is “over the top” and wondered if families would even go there. Mr. Weinberg said families already come to that part of the beach. Mr. Jordan preferred a passive park.

Ms. Polivka mentioned there needs to be a safe drop-off place so people do not have to park far away and carry all their equipment (chairs, etc.) to the park.

In response to a question by Ms. Maus, Mr. Weinberg said that the catwalks and walls will serve as fences for security. Those structures will be durable and also create secondary barriers for mini eco-systems. At the place where the water feature will be, the fence will be transparent, adhering to ADA regulations.

Ms. Maus pointed out there is already a fitness element half a block away, and believed another one might be duplication. Mr. Weinberg mentioned there will be several elements, but not a complete area.

Ms. Maus also expressed the need for parking and a drop-off area. She said the hotel parking was too expensive. She called to mind the results of the parking study that said there was an unmet demand of 928 parking spaces, and said they need to seriously consider adding some parking.

Ms. Maus stated that they need to be cautious about the history that is shared, perhaps working with a consultant. Mr. Morris said they will consult the Historical Society and bring back their input.

A question was raised about the attitude of the property owner to the north, and Mr. Yaari believed they were amenable to the concept.

Regarding the financing, Mr. Morris explained the CRA (\$4.5 million) and General Fund (\$500,000) will be paying for the project; it is in the CRA budget and fits into the Redevelopment Plan. He reviewed the progress on the Aquatics Center and other projects.

Mr. Schiavone said parking and a drop-off function are important, and thought it might be too complicated to incorporate the historical aspect into the park. He was happy with any theme.

Mr. Lalwani said he loved the concept, but also wanted a drop-off area.

While also agreeing with the concept, Mr. Flowers wished to see some passive areas in the shade and a drop-off area. He expressed some concern about the effect of the structures on the adjacent properties (shading, etc.).

Mr. McManus echoed the previous positive comments. His main concerns were maintenance (salt concern) and a drop-off area.

Chair Eisinger (PRBAB) thought the loading area was very important. However, she did not think parking was important so that people would be encouraged to walk. If the historical aspect is pursued, she thought it may be more work than it would be worth to get it correct. She liked the ramps, and the height of the structures for viewing. She suggested naming rights for the lookout tower (perhaps for a limited number of years), not the entire park. Chair Eisinger assured the boards that the Aquatics Center would be a world-renowned facility.

Chair Lee (BRB) recalled that their consensus at the last meeting was to make sure the park was not passive. She said there need to be benches or places for grandparents to sit when they take their grandchildren to the park. She also suggested designing the park so that the different age groups will be safe, perhaps segregating play areas. In addition, she wanted to see protection from children falling off the structures. Chair Lee spoke about the importance of play being experiential.

In response to a comment by Chair Lee (BRB), Mr. Weinberg mentioned there is a swale along SR A1A for storm water runoff.

Finally, Chair Lee did not like the image of people with rifles and said they need to be sensitive not to encourage that kind of visual.

Mr. Morris reviewed the project process going forward.

At this time, there was a second opportunity for the members to comment on the project. Chair Lee (BRB) asked everyone to keep comments short, and comments were as follows:

- Need adults present when dropping off children
- Get nearby developments to help
- Keep up with the maintenance and do it at night
- Emphasize safety and security at the drop-off area
- Maybe get additional money to enhance the project
- Send a message to the City Commission that the boards “love the direction” of the project
- If it is historical, it needs to be correct
- Guns “have to go,” as well as anything that evokes that kind of thinking (such as a fort)
- The activities on the fake trees could be done on something other than a fake tree that would still provide shade
- Pursue naming rights for maintenance in perpetuity

[Ms. Smith arrived at 3:20 p.m.]

- Do not need another drop-off:
  - There is already a Swimming Hall of Fame drop-off on the west side with a signal
  - There is a drop-off zone at the Oceanside Plaza/Park, one block away
  - Beach Boy Plaza will have “major” parking
  - Show the other approved parking areas in future presentations and the trams from the parking garage to the drop-off at Oceanside Lot – perhaps the trams could be extended to D.C. Alexander Park
- Eliminate the idea of the park having a historical context since there is confusion about where the forts were located
- A fort is okay as a theme, but not associated with historical artifacts
- Could be a shipwreck theme

There was majority consensus by show of hands not to embrace the historical concept.

Comments continued as follows:

- It could be a “fort” but not an historical fort
  - If it was called “Fort Lauderdale,” that would reinforce its ties to the City
- Eliminate references to guns
- Need to keep a fort in the park
- Should not have to cross the street to have a safe drop-off
- Maintenance should be in the plan
  - CRA cannot pay for maintenance
  - Can the Parks bond money be used for maintenance?
  - Ask the City Commission if money that the City contributes to the CRA be put aside for beach maintenance exclusively after the CRA sunsets
- Not following the historical or educational aspect would be a missed opportunity
- Having a fort and calling it “Fort Lauderdale” implies it is part of the history
- Money spent on fitness and playground areas should be used instead on restrooms and drop-off area – maybe have parking
  - The existing playground on the beach cannot be repaired because of the Coastal Construction Zone restrictions
- Have educational areas on one-third or two-thirds of the property
- Did not like locking up a park at night – if scaled it back, maybe it would not need to be locked up
  - Parks are closed at night (sunset to sunrise)
- Wanted to see the property restrictions
- Having the historical component would slow the process down
- Instead of a fort, there could be a tree house or sand castle
- Most important, will the park be sustainable and maintainable
  - Do not want to see funds cut back for maintenance

- The drop-off zone should not require crossing a street or walking from other drop-offs
  - Hard for disabled and elderly
- If the maintenance declines, the homeless population will inhabit the park
- Not against the water feature, but do not want to see it turn into a water park
- Children will love the fort – just keep it “non-historical”

Chair Eisinger (PRBAB) reviewed that the boards are agreed to move forward, letting go of the historical aspect. She added they have to embrace walkability and public transportation, but still need a safe loading/unloading zone.

Chair Lee (BRB) observed that DC Alexander Park is tied into the Aquatics Center, which is about families and children. She liked the activities provided for children as an alternative to the beach. She reemphasized that Oceanside Plaza is designed for seating areas, art festivals, music, etc. Chair Lee acknowledged City Manager Feldman for bringing this project forward.

Chair Lee (BRB) stated that as the CRA sunsets and they request an extension from the County, that the money the City is putting into the CRA go to maintenance of the projects going forward.

Mr. Weinberg stated that the website, DCAlexander.com, will have more regular updates with information from the presentations.

Chair Lee (BRB) wanted to find out if naming rights were allowable under the restrictions of DC Alexander park. If so, the boards should encourage the City to begin negotiations now.

### **III. Communication to City Commission – None**

Hearing no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:38 p.m.

#### Attachments:

PowerPoint on DC Alexander Park Renovation Design – Paul Weinberg

[Minutes transcribed by J. Rubin, Prototype, Inc.]