

Riviera Beach Community Redevelopment Agency Meeting
Regular Meeting
Via Communication Media Technology

Wednesday, May 13, 2020

8:32 p.m. to 11:47 p.m.

IN ATTENDANCE:

Chair Julia Botel

Vice Chair Douglas Lawson

Commissioner Shirley D. Lanier

Commissioner Tradrick McCoy

Commissioner KaShamba Miller-Anderson

Mayor Ronnie L. Felder

Annetta Jenkins, Director of Neighborhood Services

Attorney Michael Haygood

Senior Project Assistant/CRA Clerk Tamara Seguin

1 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: Can somebody
2 cut their video off or something, because there's
3 something going on, and that's really disturbing.
4 It's --

5 CHAIR BOTEL: I apologize. I did not have my
6 annotated agenda, so I'm going to have to use my City
7 Council one to read the statement. Could we have a --
8 we did the roll call. Could we please have a moment of
9 silence, followed by the Pledge of Allegiance, led by
10 Commissioner Lawson.

11 (Moment of silence observed. Pledge of
12 Allegiance recited.)

13 CHAIR BOTEL: Thank you. I'll read the
14 public comment remarks.

15 Any member of the public wishing to comment
16 publicly on any matter, including items on the agenda,
17 shall submit their --

18 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: Madam Chair.

19 CHAIR BOTEL: Yes.

20 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: She didn't
21 finish roll call.

22 CHAIR BOTEL: I'm sorry, she didn't?

23 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: No, because
24 she didn't call my name. Me.

25 CHAIR BOTEL: Sherley Desir, did you call

1 everybody's name? I'm sorry.

2 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: It was Tamara.

3 THE CLERK: Okay. Commissioner
4 Miller-Anderson. I had it all messed up. I'm sorry.

5 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: Here.

6 THE CLERK: Okay, also present, Annetta
7 Jenkins, Michael Haygood and Tamara Seguin.

8 CHAIR BOTEL: Thank you, KaShamba. I'm
9 sorry. I thought she was done.

10 Okay, any member of the public wishing to
11 comment publicly on any matter, including items on the
12 agenda, shall submit their comments by e-mail to
13 City -- could you, Tamara, could you read the public
14 comment? I don't have the proper document here. Could
15 you read the item on public comments?

16 THE CLERK: Sure.

17 COMMISSIONER LANIER: And Madam Chair, if I
18 might interrupt, could they -- people who are on this
19 call I don't know. I see names. I have no idea who
20 they are. Could they introduce themselves so we'll
21 know who is on the call with us?

22 CHAIR BOTEL: Let's have her -- let's have
23 Tamara do that so she can call their names in order
24 after she reads the piece on public comment. I'm
25 sorry, I don't have my proper agenda.

1 Go ahead, Tamara.

2 THE CLERK: Public comments: Any member of
3 the public wishing to comment publicly on any matter,
4 including items on the agenda, shall submit their
5 comments by e-mail to RBCRA Clerk Tamara Seguin at
6 publiccomments, p-u-b-l-i-c c-o-m-m-e-n-t-s @rbcra.com.
7 The e-mail shall contain the applicable agenda items,
8 along with the precise wording to be read into the
9 record. Explicit language will not be read. E-mails
10 without applicable agenda item numbers will be read
11 under the general public comment section. Be advised
12 the public comments will be accepted for each
13 applicable item in the general public comment section
14 until closure is announced by the Chairperson or RBCRA
15 Clerk.

16 All e-mail addresses and submitted comments
17 are and will be public record. The RBCRA Clerk or
18 designee will read public comments into the record at
19 the appropriate time for no more than three minutes.
20 If you have any questions, please contact the RBCRA
21 Office at 561-844-3408 or e-mail t-s-e-g-u-i-n
22 @rbcra.com.

23 CHAIR BOTEL: Thank you. I'm going to
24 reprint my agenda. Too much paperwork here.

25 Okay, do we have any additions, deletions,

1 substitutions from any of the Council? Yes, KaShamba
2 Miller-Anderson, please.

3 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: Can we have a
4 conversation about maybe not -- possibly taking some of
5 this stuff off that we don't have to do, considering
6 it's 8:40?

7 CHAIR BOTEL: We certainly can.

8 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: So, yes,
9 that's what I would like to --

10 COMMISSIONER LANIER: Madam Chair. Madam
11 Chair, I'd like to -- I'm sorry.

12 CHAIR BOTEL: Go ahead. Let's let
13 Ms. Miller-Anderson finish and then --

14 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: And you all
15 can let me know. I was thinking maybe four could come
16 off, unless that's -- Ms. Jenkins, are you the one
17 that's running the meeting?

18 And I just wanted to make a comment. I mean
19 Mr. Evans was sick. He should have reached out to
20 everybody, all of the Council to let us know. I'm just
21 thinking that we should have known that he wasn't going
22 to be to the meeting. So I mean that was my first --

23 CHAIR BOTEL: Yes, I'm sorry, I should have
24 announced. I mentioned it at our last meeting. But
25 for those of you who are just tuning in to this one, I

1 apologize. He did let me know. He thought he would be
2 here, and he felt increasingly worse this afternoon.
3 His stomach is in really bad shape, and so I
4 apologize --

5 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: Right, I --

6 COMMISSIONER LANIER: I hope he's okay.

7 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: I do too. But
8 I did hear you announce that earlier, but he needed to
9 have sent an e-mail or something to all of us so that
10 we knew and not come to the meeting and not know that
11 he wouldn't be here.

12 So I'm thinking number four, unless that's
13 something that's pressing, which is about the
14 commercial grant. And I'm just putting this out here.
15 You all can tell me whether or not you want to, but
16 these are the ones that I'm thinking may not need to
17 happen tonight, and we can maybe meet on the 27th, our
18 regular day.

19 The operating parameters for the Event
20 Center, unless that's something that we need to talk
21 about.

22 COMMISSIONER LANIER: What number is that,
23 Council?

24 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: Number four.
25 I'm sorry, five. And number seven I'm not --

1 COMMISSIONER LANIER: Number five?

2 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: Yes. I'm not
3 really sure what seven is about. I didn't quite see
4 anything to help me figure that one out. And then
5 number ten, the back yard garden project, I mean you
6 all can let me know. There may be more information I'm
7 not privy to.

8 COMMISSIONER LANIER: Madam Chair, I wanted
9 to pull number seven and number eight anyway. Number
10 seven was the CRA structure that I was going to send to
11 Mr. Evans, both Mr. Evanses. I didn't send everything
12 that I wanted to send to them so that it wasn't a part
13 of the backup. And there's no way that I want to go
14 forward with that item and not have everybody to have
15 that information before we discuss it.

16 CHAIR BOTEL: Okay, we'll pull that.

17 COMMISSIONER LANIER: And number eight is
18 basically part of that, so I wanted to pull seven and
19 number eight anyway.

20 CHAIR BOTEL: Okay.

21 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: But that's --
22 but for number eight.

23 CHAIR BOTEL: Number eight is quite
24 substantive, and I think that other Council people may
25 object to having it be pulled. I can listen to what

1 other people want to say about that. Well, first
2 Mr. McCoy, I think, had his hand up, and then we'll go
3 back to Ms. Miller-Anderson.

4 Mr. McCoy.

5 COMMISSIONER McCOY: So yes, I too was
6 expecting Mr. Evans here, and I'm sad that he got ill.
7 I did see him in traffic today, so I was really shocked
8 to hear you say that. So, yes, you say it was stomach
9 related. Whatever it is, it must be pretty severe,
10 because I know I seen him in traffic earlier this
11 after -- well, this afternoon, I should say.

12 CHAIR BOTEL: He did feel better earlier in
13 the day, but then it got worse as the evening
14 progressed, so --

15 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Okay.

16 CHAIR BOTEL: Did you have something you
17 wanted to pull?

18 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Well, you know, I
19 wanted, I think as you mentioned, specifically called a
20 special meeting for the process, the selection process
21 for the CRA Executive Director, and I definitely want
22 to have that discussion.

23 CHAIR BOTEL: Okay.

24 COMMISSIONER McCOY: I think the item related
25 to the Event Center, I'm okay with that.

1 COMMISSIONER LANIER: What number is that,
2 Mr. McCoy?

3 CHAIR BOTEL: Yes, let's use the numbers. So
4 I'm hearing you say that --

5 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Number five.

6 CHAIR BOTEL: Okay.

7 COMMISSIONER McCOY: That can be put off,
8 because the Center is technically not open, so I don't
9 know that there's any urgency on that.

10 MS. JENKINS: If I may, Chair, number five
11 was an item that has carried over for a few meetings
12 and we were just trying to conclude it. But it is
13 something that can wait. And number four was a
14 directive asking us to come back from bringing some
15 updated procedures, and we can come back with that.
16 There's no urgency there.

17 CHAIR BOTEL: Thank you. So are we saying
18 that we'll leave number six, which is approving the
19 authorization of the existing architectural? We
20 probably need to move on that. I don't think that will
21 take too long. We'll leave number six. We'll take out
22 seven. We'll leave number eight. Is number nine
23 something that's critical?

24 MS. JENKINS: We can --

25 COMMISSIONER LANIER: If you're going to

1 leave number eight, then I need to be able to have a
2 conversation about the CRA structures as well, because
3 it kind of goes hand in hand. If we're going to talk
4 about the process selection for a CRA Executive
5 Director, then the CRA structure itself --

6 CHAIR BOTEL: Okay.

7 COMMISSIONER LANIER: -- should also be
8 discussed. So, but I didn't want to discuss number
9 seven, because I had not given all you guys the
10 information, and that's the reason why I wanted to pull
11 it. But if you're going to have a conversation about
12 number eight, then I can just throw my two cents in.

13 CHAIR BOTEL: Okay. So we'll have seven and
14 we'll have eight. What about nine, Ms. Jenkins?

15 MS. JENKINS: That is something that we can
16 move. We just promised you that we would come back
17 with an update when we had something to show --

18 CHAIR BOTEL: Okay.

19 MS. JENKINS: -- on progress, but we can --
20 the information is in your packet.

21 CHAIR BOTEL: And number 11.

22 COMMISSIONER LANIER: Madam Chair, not number
23 seven, because I said that I will talk about number
24 eight because I want -- I don't even want to talk about
25 number seven without everybody having the information.

1 CHAIR BOTEL: I'm sorry. I thought you were
2 saying that you had to have number seven because number
3 eight hinged on number seven.

4 COMMISSIONER LANIER: It does, but I can
5 still talk about number seven without, you know, having
6 a whole full discussion about it. I just wanted to be
7 able to --

8 CHAIR BOTEL: So we're leaving it on the
9 agenda so that we can have a discussion about it,
10 right?

11 COMMISSIONER LANIER: You can leave number
12 eight on, but number seven, because you guys did not
13 have the information, I did not want to have a
14 conversation about it.

15 CHAIR BOTEL: All right, so you want us to
16 take off number seven.

17 COMMISSIONER LANIER: I did want you to take
18 off number seven and number eight, but that's just my
19 druthers.

20 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: Well, she said
21 she was going to leave on seven, so you can say what
22 you need to say.

23 COMMISSIONER LANIER: Yes. But I don't have
24 the means to give you this information that I have in
25 my possession.

1 CHAIR BOTEL: Well, we can listen; we can
2 listen. We're okay with that, I think, right?

3 COMMISSIONER LANIER: Okay. All right, cool.

4 CHAIR BOTEL: Yes, we'll leave it on; seven
5 and eight are on.

6 COMMISSIONER LANIER: I do not want to have a
7 conversation now, and you guys --

8 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: There will be
9 a conversation.

10 COMMISSIONER LANIER: -- don't have the
11 information in front of you.

12 CHAIR BOTEL: We'll just --

13 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: We'll have a
14 conversation.

15 CHAIR BOTEL: Okay, so number 11,
16 Ms. Jenkins, can number 11 wait? Presentation, Avenue
17 E?

18 MS. JENKINS: That is an update. I think it
19 will be --

20 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: Madam Chair, I
21 would like to hear that.

22 MS. JENKINS: -- some directive.

23 CHAIR BOTEL: You want to hear it, all right.
24 All right, we'll leave number 11. And number 12 we
25 probably should leave. And number 13 we probably

1 should leave because it sounds like those are things
2 that the CRA needs to have us weigh in on, so --

3 MS. JENKINS: Yes, number 13.

4 CHAIR BOTEL: So let us review what we've got
5 now so that the Clerk, so that whoever is doing this,
6 Sherley or whoever. So we're taking off four and five.
7 We're leaving on six, seven, for just us, our own
8 edification, eight. We're taking off nine and ten.
9 We're leaving on 11, 12 and 13. Do we agree?

10 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: Number nine,
11 is that like a little quick little update for the
12 townhouse?

13 MS. JENKINS: It's a quick update. I can
14 make it very quick.

15 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: And not a
16 presentation.

17 MS. JENKINS: Well, it's a presentation, but
18 you actually have the presentation in your packets.

19 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: Right, we have
20 it.

21 MS. JENKINS: And I can follow up with you if
22 you have questions.

23 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: Just for the
24 public, because I know Ms. Lanier has talked about the
25 townhouses and all of that, can you just say a couple

1 sentences about it, and if we need to bring it to the
2 next meeting, we can?

3 CHAIR BOTEL: All right, so we'll leave nine
4 on, but for a brief, okay. So are we clear what we
5 have, what we're talking about?

6 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Madam Chair.

7 CHAIR BOTEL: Yes, go ahead.

8 COMMISSIONER McCOY: I don't particularly
9 have a problem with six, seven, eight, 11, 12 and 13.
10 But I guess at our last CRA meeting when I asked
11 specifically for the item related to relieving the
12 Executive Director of that position and reverting back
13 to the Planning Director, was I expected to make a
14 formal request or a specific motion that that is
15 included back on this agenda, because it's clearly not
16 there, and that's, I guess --

17 CHAIR BOTEL: Would that fall under the
18 rubric of CRA structures? Could you add your comments
19 on that matter under number seven?

20 COMMISSIONER McCOY: No, I don't have
21 comments related to it. I wanted deliberative action,
22 because we withdrew in light of your concern that it
23 wasn't published --

24 CHAIR BOTEL: Okay, so --

25 COMMISSIONER McCOY: -- even though the

1 requirement that it had to be published. Do you
2 recall?

3 CHAIR BOTEL: So your concern is that it's
4 something that you wanted to have on this agenda is not
5 on the agenda. Is that your concern?

6 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Yes, ma'am.

7 COMMISSIONER LANIER: Okay, (inaudible) sent
8 something to your personal e-mail address --

9 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: Ms. Lanier.

10 CHAIR BOTEL: Shirley, your mic; turn your
11 mic off.

12 COMMISSIONER LANIER: Number seven.

13 CHAIR BOTEL: Commissioner Lanier.

14 VICE CHAIR LAWSON: No, let's listen in, no.

15 CHAIR BOTEL: Stop. So bad.

16 Tradrick, Commissioner McCoy, do you want us
17 to add an item to the agenda?

18 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Yes, yes.

19 CHAIR BOTEL: Okay. So would you articulate
20 it so that Tamara or whoever is recording can get it
21 right, and then we'll add it.

22 COMMISSIONER McCOY: I wanted to discuss and
23 deliberate on relieving the current Executive Director
24 from the position of Executive Director, to revert back
25 to the Director of Planning.

1 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: Madam Chair.

2 CHAIR BOTEL: Yes.

3 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: He's wanting
4 to add that onto the agenda? Is that what we're doing?

5 CHAIR BOTEL: He wants to add that on the
6 agenda.

7 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: Okay, and then
8 we would have the conversation about it when --

9 CHAIR BOTEL: Yes.

10 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: -- because I,
11 yes, I do have a question.

12 COMMISSIONER LANIER: Madam Chair, I thought
13 that that was number eight. That's not number eight?

14 CHAIR BOTEL: No. Mr. McCoy would like it to
15 be articulated separately. So we're going to add it as
16 number 7-A. Is that -- Mr. McCoy, will that fit
17 properly with your concept of what this discussion will
18 be, to make it number 7-A, or do you prefer to make it
19 8-A?

20 COMMISSIONER McCOY: You can make it
21 number -- it doesn't matter what the number is.

22 VICE CHAIR LAWSON: Can we have that
23 discussion? Can we make that 8-A, Madam Chair?

24 CHAIR BOTEL: We can make it 8-A.

25 COMMISSIONER McCOY: It has nothing to do

1 with the selection process, so we're clear.

2 CHAIR BOTEL: Okay.

3 VICE CHAIR LAWSON: Correct.

4 CHAIR BOTEL: I know. So I just wanted to
5 know where you wanted it placed on the agenda.

6 COMMISSIONER McCOY: It doesn't matter.

7 CHAIR BOTEL: Then in that case, we'll accept
8 Mr. Lawson's recommendation that it be 8-A. So to
9 whoever is in charge of the agenda -- Tamara, is that
10 you? I'm sorry. Yes, you've got that clear on the
11 order now, now that we've spent ten minutes just
12 figuring out what we're talking about?

13 THE CLERK: We're going to remove four, five
14 and ten?

15 CHAIR BOTEL: We are removing four, five and
16 ten, with the caution that nine be quick.

17 VICE CHAIR LAWSON: And then, Madam Chair --

18 CHAIR BOTEL: And we're adding 8-A.

19 VICE CHAIR LAWSON: Madam Chair, just to make
20 sure there's no confusion, 8-A or 8.5 or whatever we
21 want to call, it so that they're not in conjunction, so
22 that it's just in between eight and nine.

23 CHAIR BOTEL: It's -- right, it's a
24 separate --

25 COMMISSIONER LANIER: It's between eight and

1 nine, okay.

2 CHAIR BOTTEL: Eight and a half.

3 VICE CHAIR LAWSON: Between eight and nine.
4 Eight and a half, 8.5.

5 CHAIR BOTTEL: Was there a movie with that
6 name? I don't know. Fellini, that was a Fellini
7 movie. Okay, we're good.

8 COMMISSIONER LANIER: It was nine and a half.

9 COMMISSIONER McCOY: One last concern.

10 CHAIR BOTTEL: Mr. McCoy.

11 COMMISSIONER McCOY: I would respectfully ask
12 if we could take number 13 ahead of everything else on
13 the agenda after consent, simply because I don't know
14 what's going to happen or how long this meeting is
15 going to last. But this specifically is a concern of
16 mine that I wanted to discuss, being that everything is
17 shut down and we do have municipal tenants -- I'm
18 sorry -- CRA tenants, and I don't want that to be left
19 off. So I at least want that to be heard in the event
20 that we become exhausted and decide to close the
21 meeting. So it seems pretty routine, and I would like
22 to see if the Board will indulge just taking that
23 first.

24 CHAIR BOTTEL: Does anyone have a strong
25 objection to that? I don't. Seems like no one does.

1 So we will take that request for the approval of
2 COVID-19 small business plan for Marina Village
3 tenants, now listed as 13, and we'll make it number --
4 for purposes of not having to reorder the whole agenda,
5 we'll make it number 3-A, but it's on regular business.
6 Is that -- have you got that, Tamara?

7 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: The number
8 doesn't have to change. You can just --

9 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Yes, the number doesn't
10 have to change. You're just taking it out of order.

11 CHAIR BOTEL: Oh, okay, okay. So it's 13,
12 but we're taking it out of order. Great, thank you.

13 Okay, where are we? So we're at the
14 adoption. So we did -- did we do disclosures? No, we
15 have to do disclosures. Anybody have disclosures?

16 MR. HAYGOOD: Madam Chair, you probably need
17 to approve the agenda as amended.

18 COMMISSIONER McCOY: So moved.

19 CHAIR BOTEL: I don't think I've gotten there
20 yet, because we usually do disclosures first.

21 MR. HAYGOOD: Okay.

22 CHAIR BOTEL: And then we approve the agenda.
23 So do we have any disclosures by Commission
24 and staff?

25 COMMISSIONER McCOY: But I'm moving that we

1 accept the additions and the deletions.

2 CHAIR BOTEL: Well, we'll do that when we
3 adopt -- oh, I'm sorry, we can do that now. We can --
4 Mr. McCoy is moving that we accept the additions and
5 deletions. Do we have a second?

6 VICE CHAIR LAWSON: Second.

7 CHAIR BOTEL: Madam Clerk.

8 THE CLERK: Commissioner McCoy.

9 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Yes.

10 THE CLERK: Commissioner Lanier.

11 COMMISSIONER LANIER: Yes.

12 THE CLERK: Commissioner Miller-Anderson.

13 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: Yes.

14 THE CLERK: Vice Chair Lawson.

15 VICE CHAIR LAWSON: Yes.

16 THE CLERK: Chair Botel.

17 CHAIR BOTEL: Yes.

18 Now, do we have any disclosures by Commission
19 and staff? No disclosures. Now we can adopt the
20 agenda.

21 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: Can people
22 mute their mics if they're not talking, please.
23 Everybody needs to mute their mics, please, if you are
24 not talking.

25 COMMISSIONER LANIER: I seen something that

1 says -- wait a second, let me get this --

2 CHAIR BOTEL: Shirley Lanier, Commissioner
3 Lanier, would you mute your mic, please. Thank you.

4 Now we're ready to adopt the agenda. Madam
5 Clerk.

6 THE CLERK: We need a motion and second.

7 COMMISSIONER McCOY: So moved.

8 CHAIR BOTEL: Yes, we do.

9 VICE CHAIR LAWSON: Second.

10 CHAIR BOTEL: You got it.

11 THE CLERK: Okay, so I got Commissioner
12 McCoy, motion. Who was the second?

13 CHAIR BOTEL: Lawson.

14 THE CLERK: Lawson, okay.
15 Commissioner McCoy.

16 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Yes.

17 THE CLERK: Commissioner Lanier.

18 COMMISSIONER LANIER: Yes.

19 THE CLERK: Commissioner Miller-Anderson.

20 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: Yes.

21 THE CLERK: Vice Chair Lawson.

22 VICE CHAIR LAWSON: Yes.

23 THE CLERK: Chair Botel.

24 CHAIR BOTEL: Yes.

25 THE CLERK: Motion carries.

1 CHAIR BOTTEL: Consent agenda. All matters
2 listed under this item are considered to be routine and
3 action will be taken by one motion. There will be no
4 separate discussion of these items unless a
5 Councilperson so requests, in which event, the item
6 will be removed from the general order of business and
7 considered in its normal sequence on the agenda.

8 Do we have any public comments on consent
9 agenda?

10 MS. DESIR: No, we do not have any public
11 comments.

12 CHAIR BOTTEL: Okay.

13 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Move consent, Madam
14 Chair.

15 CHAIR BOTTEL: Thank you. A second? Can
16 someone second?

17 VICE CHAIR LAWSON: Second.

18 CHAIR BOTTEL: Thank you. Madam Clerk.

19 THE CLERK: Commissioner Lanier.

20 COMMISSIONER LANIER: I'm having some
21 technical difficulties. Yes.

22 THE CLERK: Commissioner McCoy.

23 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Yes.

24 THE CLERK: Commissioner Miller-Anderson.

25 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: Yes.

1 THE CLERK: Vice Chair Lawson.

2 VICE CHAIR LAWSON: Yes.

3 THE CLERK: Chair Botel.

4 CHAIR BOTEL: Yes.

5 THE CLERK: Motion carries.

6 CHAIR BOTEL: Thank you. And now we will
7 take a look at what was item number -- still item
8 number -- request for the approval of COVID-19 small
9 business plan, et cetera. Madam Clerk, read the --

10 THE CLERK: Request for the approval of
11 COVID-19 small business plan for Marina Village
12 tenants.

13 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Madam Chair, I offer a
14 motion, an amended motion relative to this item.
15 Instead of the item encompassing the months of April
16 through June, I would like to see if we can go March
17 through June to take that total amount from 28,000 to
18 38,463.44, with discussion.

19 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: I have a
20 question, Madam Chair.

21 CHAIR BOTEL: Yes, go ahead.

22 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: Where are the
23 funds coming from for this?

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And they've been
25 killing it.

1 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: Hello?

2 MR. HAYGOOD: And Madam Chair, you need a
3 second.

4 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: We need to
5 mute our mics, people.

6 CHAIR BOTEL: Did we have a second? I'm
7 sorry, why is my thing off?

8 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: I thought
9 McCoy and Lawson did it.

10 CHAIR BOTEL: I think we did have a second,
11 Mr. Haygood.

12 COMMISSIONER McCOY: No, I just offered the
13 amendment. I didn't hear anything.

14 CHAIR BOTEL: Oh, I'm sorry.

15 THE CLERK: I didn't hear a second.

16 CHAIR BOTEL: Can we have a second, one
17 second?

18 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: I'll second
19 it, but I want my question answered. That's
20 probably --

21 COMMISSIONER McCOY: You don't have to
22 support it, but, you know, I just wanted to start a
23 discussion.

24 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: I just said I
25 offered a second, but I want my question answered.

1 CHAIR BOTEL: I want to make sure I'm not
2 missing anybody. So sorry. No one seconded that,
3 so --

4 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: I just said I
5 second it.

6 CHAIR BOTEL: All right. I didn't hear you.

7 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: I want to have
8 that question answered though.

9 CHAIR BOTEL: Thank you.

10 COMMISSIONER LANIER: Second for discussion.

11 CHAIR BOTEL: What was your question,
12 Ms. Miller-Anderson?

13 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: Where are the
14 funds coming from for this particular item? Did I
15 overlook that?

16 MS. JENKINS: Commissioner Miller-Anderson,
17 we don't have the source of funding. We will be
18 foregoing rent that would be paid into the Marina Event
19 Center coffers, and I'll have to get that information
20 to you. I don't know which line item. Conrad is on
21 the line.

22 And Conrad, if you're able to opine as to
23 which line item we'll be taking the money from, if you
24 would help out.

25 COMMISSIONER LANIER: Point of information,

1 Madam Chair. I'm sorry, Miss; I'm sorry, Miss. I need
2 to figure out who is on this. I don't know these
3 people I see.

4 CHAIR BOTEL: I apologize. We did ask that
5 people introduce themselves. Can we ask Tamara to call
6 people by name and ask people to say who they are and
7 what their function is, Tamara, so we don't have
8 everybody responding at once?

9 THE CLERK: Okay. So I see Jeff.

10 MS. JENKINS: I believe that's the consultant
11 with KCI.

12 THE CLERK: Heidi Siegel.

13 MS. JENKINS: With KCI.

14 THE CLERK: And everybody else is all the
15 rest of us.

16 MS. JENKINS: We have CRA staff on the line.
17 We have Conrad Koller, who's a financial specialist;
18 Sherley Desir, the office manager; Andre Lewis is on
19 the line, and he's our Senior Project Manager.

20 And to clarify a point, if I may,
21 Commissioner McCoy, you were asking to amend or make a
22 motion that the period of rent coverage include March.
23 We don't have pass-through rent for March.

24 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Right.

25 MS. JENKINS: And in actuality, several of

1 the businesses have paid for at the beginning of May,
2 and if so, we're proposing to give three months of rent
3 relief. It may be May, June and July, but the vast
4 majority of them would be for the three months that you
5 see illustrated there, April, May and June.

6 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Correct. And that's why
7 I wanted to have the discussion. Thank you,
8 Ms. Jenkins.

9 So Madam Chair, if I may?

10 CHAIR BOTEL: Yes, go ahead.

11 COMMISSIONER McCOY: So I was looking at
12 this, comparing it to the stay-at-home orders by the
13 Governor and when the actual, I guess, shutdown
14 occurred of businesses. And that stay-at-home order,
15 at least on the City side, I'm looking at our state of
16 emergency was declared on March, was it 18th?

17 And I did want to be considerate of that
18 these are our personal CRA -- not personal, but these
19 are the CRA tenants, and this recovery process is very
20 low. And I know, I just seen that they're currently
21 trying to do, I guess, a modified version of opening,
22 doing takeout services, at least for the two
23 restaurants.

24 But certainly I think that is very minor, in
25 grand schemes, to do another \$9,600 to cover the month

1 of March, which I understand those rents have been
2 already possibly paid, but in the event, just as a
3 recovery initiative by the City's CRA Board to offer
4 that to the members.

5 And you know, you don't have to accept it,
6 but I certainly commend staff for bringing this
7 forward, because my first question was going to be
8 what's happening with those individuals that's leasing
9 space and how is that affecting us. And I know I've
10 had this conversation with the management company for
11 the Ocean Mall, so I wanted to at least start a
12 discussion and see what the desire of this Board was
13 related to adding an additional month.

14 CHAIR BOTEL: Do we have any comments?
15 Commissioner Miller-Anderson.

16 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: So did
17 Mr. Conrad have the answer to my question yet?

18 MR. KOLLER: Well, the money would really
19 come from a diminished amount of revenue. So we have
20 revenue set aside in our budget for these rents. If we
21 don't collect the revenue, then, you know, we'll have
22 less money to spend. We also have, you know, the
23 increased revenue for the other rents. The Event
24 Center building has been raising more money than
25 budgeted, and some other areas are raising more money

1 too.

2 VICE CHAIR LAWSON: I'm sorry, Madam Chair,
3 does Mr. Conrad have to come on camera to speak?

4 Mr. Haygood, I believe he has to be on
5 camera.

6 MR. KOLLER: No, you should -- did you not
7 hear me?

8 VICE CHAIR LAWSON: No, no, we heard you; we
9 heard you. But I believe you have to be on camera as
10 well.

11 MS. JENKINS: They just wanted to see your
12 face.

13 MR. KOLLER: Okay, not a problem.

14 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: Okay, so what
15 was the answer?

16 MR. KOLLER: So it will just be a diminished
17 amount of revenue that we'll see. Instead I think our
18 budget on the revenue line is a hundred and -- or
19 \$276,000. So we'll see a, you know, that \$40,000 less
20 in our revenue.

21 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: Okay. And
22 Mr. McCoy, you said for what dates, for what months
23 again?

24 COMMISSIONER McCOY: I wanted the month of
25 March, but I wanted to attach it to the back end so it

1 would essentially be the month of July, especially --

2 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: Okay, so --

3 COMMISSIONER McCOY: You know, and if it's
4 not a comfortable position for the members of this
5 Commission, you know, we can bring this back in a
6 couple months. I mean we're in May right --

7 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: I don't think
8 we're at that point. I'm just trying to get clarity on
9 what months specifically you're talking about.

10 CHAIR BOTEL: Mr. McCoy.

11 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Right. But I was
12 looking from the date that we declared a state of
13 emergency and when the Governor actually ordered all
14 these businesses that, which you would call
15 nonessential businesses, such as jet skiing and some of
16 these other people that lease space down at our
17 Marina --

18 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: Right, so, but
19 if your goal is to give them five months, or whatever
20 amount of months you're wanting to give them, I think
21 we should just say that. And especially if she said
22 most of them were already paid for March or April or
23 whatever months they paid for, we want to give them
24 five months, just say we want to give them five months.

25 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Okay. Well, it's

1 actually four months, but I wanted the nexus --

2 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: Okay.

3 COMMISSIONER McCOY: -- to be in sync with
4 when the Governor closed all nonessential businesses.
5 That way, we're not giving anybody anything. I think
6 it's --

7 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: Right.

8 COMMISSIONER McCOY: -- a fair statement that
9 if they're leasing space from us, and you know, three
10 weeks or two weeks into the month they're basically
11 closed down, then, you know, we shouldn't be, you know,
12 standing over them with a three day notice, if you
13 will.

14 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: Okay, so if we
15 go back to the March date, they would be provided
16 credit --

17 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Correct.

18 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: -- basically
19 is what you're saying?

20 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Yes.

21 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: Okay. So I
22 mean I'm fine with that.

23 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Because that's too much
24 of an accounting problem for the finance person.

25 MR. KOLLER: Well, we'll do whatever --

1 MS. JENKINS: Commissioner McCoy --

2 CHAIR BOTEL: Mr. Koller, I think Mr. McCoy
3 has a question. Is that something that's doable?

4 MR. KOLLER: It's not a problem. Yes, we can
5 credit. You know, but everybody's paid for March,
6 April and May; almost everybody's paid for March, April
7 and May.

8 CHAIR BOTEL: Thank you.

9 Ms. Jenkins, did you have a comment?

10 MS. JENKINS: I was just going to say that we
11 would make the adjustments, and we wanted to come back
12 in approximately 90 days to give you an update on the
13 progress. We have been in contact with the tenants,
14 and several of them were proactive and reached out to
15 us seeking relief. And Conrad has been very good about
16 staying in contact with the tenants, and I'm sure
17 they're watching this and will be very happy. And
18 we'll make sure that we bring you an accounting.

19 CHAIR BOTEL: Thank you, Ms. Jenkins.

20 Mr. McCoy, you're recognized.

21 COMMISSIONER McCOY: So Ms. Jenkins and
22 Mr. Koller, can you clarify? You said -- someone said
23 they're current through May. Is that because they've
24 already paid the rent and we're applying this as a
25 credit?

1 MR. KOLLER: That's correct.

2 MS. JENKINS: And there's several
3 businesses -- not all of them have rent that's due on
4 the first of the month, and they may have submitted it
5 already. Although they've asked for some relief,
6 they've sacrificed in other ways to be able to not be
7 late. And we told them that we'd bring the item to
8 Commission and we'd work with them. So we would give
9 them the credit.

10 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Okay, all right. Well,
11 however it works, I just want to make sure that it's
12 clear that you guys offered three months, and I'm
13 suggesting that we should do four months.

14 MS. JENKINS: Yes.

15 COMMISSIONER McCOY: And whether it's
16 additional credit, because I'm literally seeing
17 business owners within the City of Riviera Beach
18 shuttering because there is no relief from a private
19 landlord who has a mortgage obligation, and they just
20 have to move on.

21 So I certainly think, you know, as a
22 governing body, that's something that we can certainly
23 support for the people that, you know, really service
24 our community and lease space in our facility, to try
25 to help them as, you know, separate and completely

1 independent from the recovery efforts that we're going
2 to have a discussion about at a later time. So four
3 months is my recommendation.

4 CHAIR BOTEL: Are you making a motion?

5 VICE CHAIR LAWSON: Madam Chair.

6 CHAIR BOTEL: Yes, Mr. -- I heard Mr. Lawson,
7 yes.

8 VICE CHAIR LAWSON: Yes, Madam Chair. I am
9 in complete support of this, of us taking it from three
10 to four months, being that the businesses there are
11 within our facility and they need the support of the
12 Council; they need the support for their rents. And I
13 agree with Councilman McCoy that if we can do the four
14 months, that would be sufficient to kind of help these
15 businesses to move forward.

16 CHAIR BOTEL: Thank you, Mr. Lawson.

17 Anyone else want to weigh in?

18 Mr. McCoy, do you want to make a motion to
19 that effect?

20 THE CLERK: There's a motion on the table.

21 CHAIR BOTEL: Okay, thank you. And it was
22 seconded?

23 THE CLERK: And it was seconded.

24 CHAIR BOTEL: Thank you.

25 COMMISSIONER McCOY: So I'm clear, Madam

1 Chair, if I can, I just want to make sure that I'm
2 clear to amend it, because I used the month of March,
3 and I want to make sure that it's clear that we're
4 amending staff's recommendation from three months to
5 four months. That's my motion, amended motion.

6 CHAIR BOTEL: Do you want the Clerk to read
7 it back to you, Mr. McCoy?

8 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Not necessary. Amend
9 staff's recommendation from three months to four
10 months.

11 CHAIR BOTEL: Okay. Madam Clerk, you can
12 take a roll.

13 THE CLERK: Commissioner Lanier.

14 COMMISSIONER LANIER: Yes.

15 THE CLERK: Commissioner McCoy.

16 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Yes.

17 THE CLERK: Commissioner Miller-Anderson.

18 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: Yes.

19 THE CLERK: Vice Chair Lawson.

20 VICE CHAIR LAWSON: Yes.

21 THE CLERK: Chair Miller-Anderson -- I mean,
22 I'm sorry, Chair Botel.

23 CHAIR BOTEL: Yes.

24 THE CLERK: That motion carries.

25 CHAIR BOTEL: Okay. And now we're moving to

1 number -- thank you --

2 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Thank you.

3 CHAIR BOTEL: -- to number six.

4 COMMISSIONER LANIER: Did we do the consent
5 agenda?

6 CHAIR BOTEL: Yes, didn't we?

7 THE CLERK: We did.

8 CHAIR BOTEL: We did. It's item six.

9 THE CLERK: A resolution of the Board of
10 Commissioners of the Riviera Beach Community
11 Redevelopment Agency approving and authorizing the
12 execution of an amendment to the existing Architectural
13 Services Agreement with REG Architects, Incorporated to
14 increase the compensation by \$19,700, and modifying the
15 scope of services to provide architectural design and
16 engineering services to develop a parking lot at East
17 28th Street, legal description Lee-Woodpark, lt 3,
18 PCN 56-43-42-28-17-000-0030, for the purposes of
19 supplemental parking for the redevelopment project at
20 2600 Broadway, providing an effective date.

21 MS. JENKINS: Commissioners, this is an item
22 that is --

23 CHAIR BOTEL: We need to have somebody move
24 and second.

25 VICE CHAIR LAWSON: So moved.

1 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Second.

2 CHAIR BOTEL: Thank you. Go ahead,
3 Ms. Jenkins.

4 MS. JENKINS: I'm sorry. Commissioners, this
5 is an item that has been before you with much
6 discussion about the redevelopment of the Broadway and
7 Blue Heron project. And following the directive of the
8 Commissioner, and seeking to acquire an adjacent
9 parcel, there is a need for additional architectural
10 services to design the parking lot. Andre Lewis, our
11 Project Manager, Senior Project Manager, has a brief
12 presentation about the amendment.

13 CHAIR BOTEL: Thank you.

14 MR. LEWIS: Okay, good evening,
15 Commissioners, Mayor. How we doing?

16 Okay, so I'm going to go through the
17 amendment for the REG Architects contract. So a little
18 bit of background on this item. So November 2018 the
19 agency purchased the building located at 2600 Broadway.
20 In April 2019, the Board approved the contract with REG
21 to provide architectural services. The initial site
22 plan meeting was recently held, and it revealed that
23 the site was lacking in sufficient parking.

24 So the current site status, 50 percent of the
25 civil and landscaping construction documents have been

1 completed. We have conducted an initial site plan
2 meeting with our Development Services, or the City's
3 Development Services. The site plan documents have
4 been submitted for cursory review, and we have
5 completed the interior layout of the first and second
6 floor.

7 The agency has also secured two off-site
8 satellite locations to provide supplementary parking.
9 We're continuing to negotiate a shared access agreement
10 with our neighbor to the east, the property owner to
11 the east, and that's ongoing. We've completed a
12 traffic study for the Traffic Performance Standards,
13 and we've completed a site photometrics on the site.
14 The survey of the subject lot, which is on East 28th
15 Street, has been completed. The survey for the
16 cross-access easement has just been recently completed.
17 We received that today.

18 So the budgetary impact for this, REG's
19 current contract is currently 246,250, and the proposed
20 increase to complete the architectural and design
21 services for the 28th Street lot will be 19,700, with a
22 nine percent contingency, which will have a -- the
23 contract will have a grand total of 289,885.50.

24 And I will take any questions at this time.

25 VICE CHAIR LAWSON: Thank you. Madam Chair.

1 CHAIR BOTEL: Yes, you're recognized.

2 VICE CHAIR LAWSON: Thank you, Madam Chair.

3 Mr. Lewis, the parcel that you are looking to
4 add into this proposal, what parking is this going to
5 be for? Is this going to be for staff, is this going
6 to be -- which part of the business is this parking
7 going to be for?

8 MR. LEWIS: It will be for staff and any
9 other tenants that are -- would need long-term,
10 off-site parking.

11 VICE CHAIR LAWSON: Okay. Follow-up, Madam
12 Chair.

13 CHAIR BOTEL: Yes, sir.

14 VICE CHAIR LAWSON: Thank you. The parking
15 lot --

16 CHAIR BOTEL: Mr. Lawson, your mic is off.

17 VICE CHAIR LAWSON: Thank you, Madam Chair.

18 The parking would be for long-term tenants'
19 parking. What type of security are we looking to
20 provide for that parking lot and the adjacent parking
21 lot that we're utilizing, that we're leasing?

22 MR. LEWIS: I don't believe we have a
23 specific security setup at this time. I know we've
24 discussed having our safety perceptions development on
25 the 2600 building, and in addition to that, some

1 cameras, things of that nature. But we don't have a
2 safety plan for the off-site parking as of yet.

3 VICE CHAIR LAWSON: Okay. Thank you, Madam
4 Chair.

5 CHAIR BOTEL: Mr. McCoy.

6 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Thank you, Madam Chair.

7 Mr. Lewis, this property hasn't been conveyed
8 to the CRA yet, correct?

9 MR. LEWIS: Well, we got approval from the
10 Board to complete the purchase. I know that the actual
11 execution of the contract is in the works.

12 COMMISSIONER McCOY: As a City and the City
13 Council members giving a formal resolution authorizing
14 the sale of this purchase -- of this property --

15 MR. LEWIS: To my understanding --

16 COMMISSIONER McCOY: -- I don't believe that
17 has occurred yet.

18 MR. LEWIS: I believe that did occur. Again,
19 I'm not sure.

20 COMMISSIONER McCOY: I thought we voted on it
21 to make an ask for the City. Yes, I think in the
22 mirror we are the City. But, you know, I was concerned
23 because I also heard of other individuals concerned
24 with this parking.

25 And until we get actual site control at the

1 CRA and title, I mean I don't want to really delay this
2 process, but like why are we really talking about
3 amending it, our current contract, to an additional
4 \$19,000 when we haven't even decided on the City side
5 as far as the Manager's plan and the City's plan with
6 this property? Because we did go through a really, I
7 guess, overhaul of the City's policy related to surplus
8 property, so I don't want to start this conversation
9 with, you know, we haven't even connected the dots, you
10 know, from the City side.

11 MS. JENKINS: Mr. McCoy, I believe you're
12 correct, the item has not gone to the City yet and
13 we've been attempting to get it placed on the City's
14 agenda to consider. But --

15 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Follow-up. Has there
16 been a -- you know, and I don't -- I'm not trying to
17 stifle this, but I really am concerned. Has there been
18 a conversation, or at least a discussion with
19 administration from the City that this is a declaration
20 of surplus land that the City's willing to sell?
21 Because I think at this point, to do this would be
22 premature if the City decides something different.
23 And, you know --

24 MR. LEWIS: No, I was saying, yes, there have
25 been discussions with the City Manager and the City

1 Attorney, along with our Interim Director Scott Evans
2 about completing the process. And again, we have
3 also -- we've already gotten Board approval on this
4 side, and there have been preliminary discussions, yes.

5 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Okay. It would be my
6 personal perspective that we should wait until we've
7 connected the dots, unless you can offer, Mr. Lewis and
8 Ms. Jenkins, that this is something that's imperative
9 that's going to hold up something else. But it seems
10 like this is an annexed parking space that's not even
11 contiguous to this property, that I don't see how or
12 why we should begin a contract for someone to start
13 architectural work or engineering work on this property
14 when we don't even have site control.

15 And I know it seems real weird to say that at
16 this point, because we are -- you know, we carry both
17 of those titles. So my understanding is that we should
18 probably wait, unless you guys could offer something
19 different as far as a delay.

20 CHAIR BOTTEL: Ms. Jenkins, is there any need
21 for this to be approved tonight, or could we ensure
22 with our persuasive powers that it be put on our next
23 agenda as City Council people?

24 MS. JENKINS: I believe we could wait the two
25 weeks.

1 And Andre, let me know otherwise.

2 We were attempting to keep the site plan
3 approval process moving and making sure that as the
4 other elements of the design were being developed, that
5 we could do this in conjunction. Just trying to save
6 time and make a smoother development process, but we
7 can wait two weeks.

8 CHAIR BOTEL: Okay. Given that, I think we
9 will take Mr. McCoy's suggestion and ask: Could you,
10 Ms. Jenkins, please reach out to City Manager Evans and
11 make sure that this gets put --

12 MS. JENKINS: Yes.

13 CHAIR BOTEL: -- request of him that this be
14 put on our next agenda, which will be on the 20th? I
15 think everybody would agree that this could be put on
16 the agenda. Any objections to that? Okay, so --

17 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: Madam Chair.

18 CHAIR BOTEL: Yes, go ahead,
19 Ms. Miller-Anderson.

20 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: Now, I'm just
21 a little confused now. I know you said to get --
22 you're asking Ms. Jenkins to get with Jonathan Evans.
23 Is she not reporting back to Mr. Scott Evans or --

24 CHAIR BOTEL: Obviously, she's going to have
25 to go through Scott --

1 MS. JENKINS: Sherley.

2 CHAIR BOTEL: -- whoever is in the --

3 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: Okay, okay.

4 CHAIR BOTEL: Yes, just because she's here.

5 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: All right.

6 CHAIR BOTEL: So Sherley or whoever there at
7 CRA is going to do it. That would be great.

8 MS. JENKINS: We'll make sure that the
9 message is carried forward for sure.

10 CHAIR BOTEL: Thank you. Do we need to ask
11 if the motion be withdrawn then, Mr. McCoy?

12 COMMISSIONER McCOY: So prior to that, I
13 guess in the alternative, I mean even if we were to
14 approve this tonight, Ms. Jenkins and Mr. Lewis, was it
15 the desire of you to have the architect to start on
16 this before we receive site control?

17 MR. LEWIS: Well, they would start the
18 initial layout and the engineering on the site. But
19 it's all -- this is all a part of our site plan
20 approval. This was contingent upon us getting site
21 control of that property. And again, but it can wait
22 two weeks.

23 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Well, I don't know if
24 two weeks is going to be it, because I think the agenda
25 for next week has already been published, if I -- well,

1 actually, it's probably not published, but it was
2 already finalized. So I don't want to say two weeks.
3 Can we just withdraw this item, and you guys, without
4 giving you a definitive two week time day, if it takes
5 four weeks, that's fine.

6 I definitely don't agree that we need to
7 start spending money, and then we haven't had a new
8 update in light of everything that has occurred with
9 COVID-19, that we're now selling this property to the
10 CRA or that this particular parcel is not, you know,
11 the desire of the administration to be repurposed. So
12 I didn't want to use two weeks.

13 MS. JENKINS: We'll bring it back as soon as
14 practical.

15 CHAIR BOTEL: Thank you. Thank you,
16 Ms. Jenkins. Thank you, Mr. McCoy.

17 MR. HAYGOOD: Can we have a motion for the
18 record?

19 CHAIR BOTEL: Would you please withdraw --
20 yes, we need whoever made the motion to withdraw the
21 motion, and the second to withdraw the second.

22 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Madam Chair, I ask that
23 we withdraw.

24 MR. HAYGOOD: (Inaudible.)

25 CHAIR BOTEL: Thank you. Or do you -- would

1 you prefer that we table it? I mean we can do either.

2 It might be simpler --

3 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Well, actually --

4 CHAIR BOTEL: -- just to withdraw it, and
5 then when you all get your -- get it all in place, then
6 we'll put it back on the agenda. Right, Mr. McCoy?

7 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Yes, that's perfect, so
8 it's not hanging on every agenda.

9 CHAIR BOTEL: Yes, so it's not hanging, yes.
10 Okay, so this motion was withdrawn. We're going to put
11 that to bed for a little while. Item number seven.

12 THE CLERK: CRA structures.

13 COMMISSIONER LANIER: Yes, item number seven
14 is something that we talked about at the last CRA
15 meeting, about the possibility, just some discussion
16 about the CRA as a part of the City, which the CRA
17 basically is a part of the City.

18 I wanted to share with you some information
19 about a potential CRA structure, unified City/CRA
20 structure that kind of looks at the City Council as the
21 CRA -- I mean the City Council is the CRA Board. And
22 of course, as I said before, this Council sits as the
23 City Council, we sit as the CRA Board and we also sit
24 as the Utility District Board.

25 So with that being said, this is just a

1 discussion piece to talk about some of the structures
2 of how it could look for our City Council -- slash --
3 CRA Board as the City Manager, the CRA Director as
4 being underneath us, basically finance, public safety,
5 community redevelopment, all of these things are kind
6 of put in together because we are sitting as one Board.

7 Now, I also have another piece that kind of
8 gives an idea of -- let's see if I can pull that one
9 up. I'm not accustomed to this, so give me a little
10 leeway, people.

11 Now, you can look at some of these pros and
12 cons of the -- some of the pros and cons of having it
13 in this structure. There are the pros of leverage a
14 strong, competent, unifying, visionary, credentialed
15 and certified executive leader in combination with the
16 range of professional staff, staffing of depth and
17 breadth for the skill set that is needed.

18 Some of the cons are, you know, no unified,
19 strong leadership to chart a new vision for the
20 Community Redevelopment Agency.

21 Now, as you know, people, we, the City
22 Council members, we all went through this whole
23 strategic planning process at the beginning of our
24 reign. And we had people who were there, and we went
25 through this whole process of putting together what we

1 envision this City to be in, you know, ten years, how
2 we see the City, you know, looking in ten years.

3 So this information that I put together was
4 basically, you know, straight from some of the issues
5 that were brought up during our conversation and
6 discussion about the strategic planning for the City in
7 the next ten years, the management, you know, the
8 unified management, the enhanced coordination, the
9 enhanced operations.

10 You know, some of the cons are the lack of
11 interagency communication, less oversight. And when I
12 say lack of interagency communication, just this night,
13 just tonight Mr. -- Councilman McCoy was talking about
14 the fact that, well, you know, the City has not even
15 heard this information.

16 So, you know, it's this coordination between
17 the City, between the CRA, between the Utility District
18 Board so that we're all of one accord. And even though
19 we sit as different Boards, same people, different
20 Boards for these entities, having all of these
21 structures under, especially this particular structure
22 under the City gives us the opportunity to not have
23 disjointed and uncoordinated planning.

24 Because what we're planning for the City --
25 and we all were there at that meeting where we talked

1 about what we saw and what we'd look at in terms of how
2 the City is going to be in ten years. We all had the
3 same idea; we all had the same vision that we would not
4 have delays in execution of projects, that we would not
5 have duplication of execution of projects and that we
6 would not have a duplication or the hard cost of and
7 expenditures to deliver results, which means that we're
8 doing something in the CRA District that is a part of
9 the City.

10 So this is just, this particular piece, the
11 one that I showed before is just a discussion piece for
12 us to have some kind of back and forth, the same way we
13 did during our strategic planning process, to be able
14 to talk about how this would look for the City and the
15 CRA as a joint venture.

16 CHAIR BOTEL: Mr. McCoy.

17 COMMISSIONER LANIER: I'm trying to get back
18 to --

19 CHAIR BOTEL: Ms. Lanier, can I allow
20 Mr. McCoy to have a question here?

21 COMMISSIONER LANIER: Yes, sure. But I'm
22 trying to get back to at least see him. Okay, there we
23 go.

24 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Okay, so, let me see. I
25 don't have my glasses. Matter of fact, I don't even

1 have glasses. But I can't see any of that that you're
2 reading off of.

3 COMMISSIONER LANIER: Can anybody see it?

4 CHAIR BOTEL: It's very hard.

5 COMMISSIONER McCOY: I can see it, but it's
6 really small.

7 CHAIR BOTEL: Yes.

8 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Is this something that
9 you can share with us, because I --

10 COMMISSIONER LANIER: Yes, yes, yes.

11 COMMISSIONER McCOY: I mean I can --

12 COMMISSIONER LANIER: And that's the
13 reason --

14 COMMISSIONER McCOY: But I can't --

15 COMMISSIONER LANIER: That's the reason I
16 wanted -- that's the reason why I wanted to send this
17 to you guys before I had a conversation about it,
18 because you know I am a very big stickler of having a
19 conversation about anything that you have not seen.
20 But because you left it on the agenda, because I think
21 it's a part of number eight and number 8.5, that I
22 wanted to just kind of put that out there.

23 But we can move on, and I will send this
24 information to you guys, and then we can bring this
25 back to the CRA agenda so that we can have a robust

1 discussion about this.

2 CHAIR BOTEL: Ms. Miller-Anderson, and then
3 Mr. McCoy again. Miller-Anderson.

4 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: Yes, don't
5 send it to us, Ms. Lanier. When it comes back, it
6 needs to just be put with the agenda. So don't send
7 that to us.

8 COMMISSIONER LANIER: Yes, ma'am.

9 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Right, I --

10 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: Okay --

11 CHAIR BOTEL: Ms. Miller-Anderson's not
12 finished, Mr. McCoy. Just wait one second.

13 Ms. Miller-Anderson.

14 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: And she was
15 right, we just left it on there because -- well, she
16 said it went with eight, but I don't think we were
17 planning on having a big discussion. And I didn't have
18 anything to add other than just don't send it, just
19 have it on --

20 CHAIR BOTEL: Mr. McCoy.

21 COMMISSIONER LANIER: Right, I will have it
22 as a part of the next agenda.

23 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Okay.

24 CHAIR BOTEL: Mr. McCoy.

25 COMMISSIONER McCOY: So, you know, you're

1 making these statements about we, and I can tell you
2 something, Ms. Lanier, I disagree. The CRA is not a
3 part of the City because if you're going to use that,
4 you have to define the CRA just what it is statutorily.
5 It's a dependent district of the City of Riviera Beach
6 in the same fashion that the Riviera Beach Housing
7 Authority is a dependent district of the City of
8 Riviera Beach. And I don't necessarily agree that this
9 is what I would like to see of our CRA.

10 So I would reserve, you know, the rest of my
11 particular concerns about this unified structure,
12 because currently right now the City has modified every
13 operational standpoint, from HR to Police, Fire and
14 even Utilities Department. I don't want to bog down
15 the development of the City when we have issues. And I
16 can tell you if you're not convinced, look at COVID-19.
17 If you're not convinced, look at the computer hacking
18 incident. If you're not convinced, look at the state
19 of emergency that we had to declare when we had a
20 hurricane last year. So I don't necessarily agree with
21 your --

22 COMMISSIONER LANIER: I agree, Mr. McCoy.

23 COMMISSIONER McCOY: -- position, but I will
24 say that I think we can definitely have the
25 conversation. But to suggest that we need to do it in

1 some of these pros and cons, I mean if I can add to
2 that list, I can give you a lot more cons as to why I
3 don't think that this is a good idea.

4 COMMISSIONER LANIER: Well, then --

5 COMMISSIONER McCOY: If you want a strong CRA
6 or --

7 COMMISSIONER LANIER: -- the reason why --

8 COMMISSIONER McCOY: -- we need to turn
9 around and try to do that for every other dependent
10 district of the City as opposed to just picking out the
11 CRA, because literally, we have positions that have not
12 even been advertised on the Human Resources side.

13 So I respect you bringing this forward, but
14 there's a lot more conversation that has to occur, and
15 then there's a lot more considerations about the
16 structure and the debt and a number of different
17 operational things that we have to do currently as the
18 CRA that I think would be very much premature to start.

19 And I respect what it is that you're doing,
20 but you can't have the CRA structure conversation
21 without having the CRA and their staff and operational
22 components who run the day-to-day to be able to discuss
23 what it is that they do and why it's important in the
24 current projects. But to suggest that we can just
25 shift it over, that's --

1 COMMISSIONER LANIER: I am not, I am not
2 suggesting that.

3 CHAIR BOTEL: Mr. McCoy and Ms. Lanier, it
4 sounds to me like Ms. Lanier is very willing to have
5 this put on some future agenda.

6 Could somebody turn their mic off?

7 It sounds to me like Ms. Lanier is very
8 willing to have this put on some future agenda so we
9 don't have any more conversation about this, because
10 we'll discuss it when the time is right.

11 Do you agree, Ms. Lanier?

12 COMMISSIONER LANIER: I agree that at our
13 next meeting, that is that's -- if this is -- I can
14 send this information out. Mr. McCoy can bring his
15 cause. I think it saves money for the City.

16 And I think that when you say we, we talked
17 about this in our workshop in terms of, you know,
18 combining some of the entities. And we're not talking
19 about privatization. We're talking about combining us
20 under what we control. So yes, we will bring this back
21 for discussion, and I believe, Mr. McCoy, it deserves a
22 lot more discussion.

23 CHAIR BOTEL: Okay, thank you. So we'll move
24 along now. If there's no other comment about this,
25 we'll move along to item number eight.

1 MR. HAYGOOD: Good evening, Chair and
2 Commissioners.

3 As directed, I provided you with a memorandum
4 addressing the concerns and the directions that you
5 gave us at the last meeting. We have -- you, okay.

6 At your directions, I met with
7 Mrs. Dickerson, the Director of the Human Relations
8 Department, and she provided nine different companies
9 that were, I guess, headhunters or executive search
10 committees. She, through her office, sent out Request
11 for Proposals to each of the nine firms. As we stated,
12 we got three responses, which are attached to the
13 memorandum.

14 I also provided you with some information
15 from the last executive search that we had, that the
16 CRA did, which was done, I guess, I don't know about
17 in-house, but we didn't use a third party search firm.
18 We provided you with, I guess, generally how the search
19 was done. It was advertised in several publications,
20 professional publications relating to planning and
21 redevelopment work, which were listed.

22 Some of the things that we're going to need
23 to -- that you will need to address besides deciding
24 whether you're still going with a third party executive
25 search firm is the approval of the job qualifications

1 for the position. We provided you with the job
2 description, salary range and so forth as an
3 attachment. You're going to need to determine the
4 screening process for the applicants and the salary and
5 benefits for the position.

6 Obviously, some of these things will be
7 dependent upon, from a timing standpoint, on when you
8 decide to go with the, your third -- if you decide to
9 go with a third party search firm. And I guess at that
10 point you could also determine how you're going to do
11 the screening and so forth. This was -- I hope this
12 information is helpful. I don't know how you want to
13 proceed.

14 CHAIR BOTEL: Thank you, Mr. Haygood. I
15 appreciate the fact that you gave us this job
16 description and the advertisement summary that you did
17 the last time.

18 I guess the most important question is now do
19 we agree with this description. Has everybody had a
20 chance to look at the job description? Does anybody
21 want to weigh in on any changes to it, or should
22 somebody make a motion that we go with this job
23 description? Does anybody --

24 COMMISSIONER LANIER: Well, to be honest --

25 CHAIR BOTEL: What Mr. Haygood needs is for

1 us to say yes, this is a good job description, or no,
2 we want to make some changes to it. Am I right,
3 Mr. Haygood?

4 MR. HAYGOOD: Yes. And I didn't know that
5 you wanted to do -- I'm sorry.

6 CHAIR BOTEL: Go ahead.

7 MR. HAYGOOD: I didn't know if you wanted to
8 address it this evening, but at some point you're going
9 to need to address it. And also, I guess the biggest
10 decision would be whether you're going to use a third
11 party search firm or whether you're going to use
12 basically the procedures that we used previously.

13 CHAIR BOTEL: Okay. Well, to summarize, I
14 don't know whether you want to summarize that the three
15 search firms that we were provided information about
16 all had different tactics and different price ranges.
17 One of them actually wanted 25 percent of the annual
18 salary; one of them wanted \$20,000; and one wanted
19 25,000. Am I right, Mr. Haygood?

20 MR. HAYGOOD: That's correct.

21 COMMISSIONER LANIER: Yes, that was --

22 CHAIR BOTEL: Go ahead, Ms. Lanier.

23 COMMISSIONER LANIER: I'm sorry, Madam Chair.
24 I didn't mean to interrupt you.

25 CHAIR BOTEL: Go ahead.

1 COMMISSIONER LANIER: That's what I was
2 saying, that, you know, if we were using the last job
3 description, you know, we talked about this, and I
4 think that the Council even decided that they wanted a
5 search firm. So that's neither here nor there at this
6 point.

7 But I mean if you want to -- I'm asking
8 Mr. Haygood: Did we use this last job description as a
9 basis for this new one?

10 MR. HAYGOOD: I'm sorry, I didn't understand
11 your question.

12 COMMISSIONER LANIER: I'm asking that we have
13 advertised this job before.

14 MR. HAYGOOD: Yes.

15 COMMISSIONER LANIER: And apparently we've
16 advertised this job numerous times. I wanted to know
17 was this job description, this new one that you have,
18 was this based on the old one that we've used?

19 MR. HAYGOOD: It's the exact same one.

20 CHAIR BOTEL: It's the old one.

21 COMMISSIONER LANIER: Okay, okay.

22 MR. HAYGOOD: But, you know, for instance,
23 the salary range, I don't know if you want to use the
24 same salary range. I think the cap on this was
25 125,000, though in fact, I think your last Executive

1 Director exceeded that amount. There are some other
2 issues in the job description that I guess you need to
3 give us some direction on whether it's something that
4 you want, educational background, et cetera.

5 COMMISSIONER LANIER: I think it needs to be
6 said that, you know, if we're talking about -- I'm
7 talking about, you know, CRA structure, that the person
8 has to be, you know, at least aware of different types
9 of structures of CRAs, that the structure that I
10 introduced tonight was something that is around the
11 state that they do. So if a person -- and I don't
12 think that I saw that, that the people who or the
13 person that we're looking for is familiar with those
14 different types of hybrid types of CRAs.

15 CHAIR BOTEL: Mr. McCoy, go ahead.

16 COMMISSIONER McCOY: So if I can, I'm less
17 concerned about their familiarity with the different
18 types of CRAs, because if you look at the statute, I
19 think just the composition of how a CRA Board is
20 created, there's at least three. I know you can have
21 the current form that we're in now, and then you can
22 also have a hybrid form where you have members who are
23 not elected as well as elected members, and then you
24 can have one that is solely appointed members. So I
25 mean there's all kind of different variations of the

1 CRA.

2 Most importantly, we got to understand the
3 functioning, what we expect from a CRA. But I can tell
4 you a few things that jumped out to me automatically,
5 and I appreciate that, Mr. Haygood, was \$125,000. That
6 was a 2009 salary, which I don't even know that we'll
7 be recruiting the right type of individuals.

8 And especially given that there's a residency
9 requirement, which I'm not so sold that we need to
10 remove, because I don't want to have a situation where
11 we have a part-time resident CRA Director where we have
12 to basically pretty much wait on, you know, them to do
13 whatever. But I don't necessarily know that I want to
14 remove that portion.

15 But I definitely wanted to see that we need
16 to have a real conversation, because clearly, we've set
17 the precedent already when we hired both the City
18 Attorney and also our current City Manager as to what
19 the salary ranges is, and clearly, this is probably
20 75,000 at least off from around that range. So that's
21 the first thing.

22 The second thing that I seen was the
23 requirement in the education that's related to
24 municipal community development. While certainly I
25 want them to have experience dealing in government,

1 however, CRAs aren't solely limited to municipalities.
2 So there's CRAs that actually covers areas and
3 districts that go beyond a city's boundary. So I think
4 if you suggest something like that, then we're kind of
5 limiting the pool if we have someone that may have
6 experience from a private sector development. So I
7 definitely don't know if that is something that I would
8 like to see.

9 So, you know, those are the two immediate
10 things that jump out, because I think that would kind
11 of create a smaller pool of individuals if we limit it
12 to municipal community development.

13 CHAIR BOTEL: So Mr. McCoy, you're suggesting
14 we just eliminate the word municipal --

15 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Correct.

16 CHAIR BOTEL: -- and leave in community
17 development, okay.

18 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Right, correct.

19 CHAIR BOTEL: Ms. Miller-Anderson.

20 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: So one thing
21 that kind of sticks out to me is there's no years of
22 experience listed on here, unless I overlooked it. But
23 then it just says about the educational requirements,
24 and that's basically just taking courses. So we're
25 basically saying that they need to have major course

1 work, and obviously a Master's degree, but it doesn't
2 talk about having any experience doing the job.

3 So I think that needs to be updated to point
4 to that, because we don't want to just get -- you know,
5 we'll get all kinds of responses from that. I think we
6 need to kind of narrow it down a little bit, at least
7 require, you know, whether it's five years of, you
8 know, whether it's Assistant City Manager or some sort
9 of managerial role, and having, of course, the
10 experience in dealing with this type of matter. But I
11 can't see having someone that shows up with a degree
12 and never worked in that field.

13 CHAIR BOTEL: I think we would all agree on
14 that. Does anybody disagree with that?

15 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: Mr. McCoy
16 would probably (inaudible) go and get (inaudible) so
17 that he can --

18 COMMISSIONER LANIER: No, I agree.

19 CHAIR BOTEL: Mr. McCoy probably wants the
20 job. No, I think we all agree.

21 COMMISSIONER LANIER: Oh, he wants the job?

22 CHAIR BOTEL: Don't have to take time. Do we
23 all agree --

24 COMMISSIONER LANIER: We can completely go
25 ahead and just go ahead and be done with it then if he

1 wants the job.

2 CHAIR BOTEL: So I think we all agree that we
3 would want somebody with experience. Do we want
4 somebody specifically with CRA experience, or would
5 somebody who has had the goal of municipal leadership
6 be appropriate? Does anybody have a preference? Does
7 anybody have a preference?

8 COMMISSIONER LANIER: Whatever Mr. McCoy
9 says, I agree with Mr. McCoy in terms of having some
10 requirements --

11 COMMISSIONER McCOY: I can't hear you,
12 Ms. Lanier. What was that?

13 CHAIR BOTEL: Stop, stop.

14 COMMISSIONER McCOY: You cut out. Repeat
15 that.

16 CHAIR BOTEL: She agreed with you.

17 COMMISSIONER LANIER: I agree with you. I
18 often agree with you, Mr. McCoy. Don't say that.

19 I agree in terms of making sure, and
20 especially agreeing with Councilwoman KaShamba
21 Miller-Anderson, in fact, we need to be able to have
22 someone with experience, someone who, you know, just
23 doesn't just, you know, come in with a degree, but at
24 least have some experience in doing this kind of work.

25 Were they a CRA Director before? Have they

1 worked for the CRA? It's not just municipalities. But
2 I think that the CRA is a very distinct job. It's a
3 very distinct boundary. So being able to, you know,
4 have those qualifications as a part of it will kind of
5 narrow down who we get in our pool.

6 CHAIR BOTEL: So Mr. Haygood, would you be
7 sure that that is added to the job description, that of
8 having, let's say three years experience, three to five
9 years experience as a CRA Director?

10 Mr. Miller-Anderson and then Mr. McCoy.

11 COMMISSIONER McCOY: I'm saying five.

12 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: Yes, I'm
13 saying five as well, a minimum of five.

14 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Minimum.

15 CHAIR BOTEL: Thank you. Mr. Haygood, and --

16 MR. HAYGOOD: I would also suggest that as
17 far as the salary's concerned, that you may want a
18 salary survey done, I think it's called.

19 CHAIR BOTEL: I was just going to suggest
20 that myself. Yes, could you make sure that we get some
21 information about the salaries of comparable positions
22 in the County, let's say?

23 Mr. McCoy.

24 COMMISSIONER McCOY: But, you know, do we
25 really need a salary survey --

1 CHAIR BOTEL: Yes.

2 COMMISSIONER McCOY: -- because clearly, we
3 look at -- what we do know is this, this was the
4 advertisement --

5 COMMISSIONER LANIER: But Mr. McCoy,
6 Mr. McCoy, they'll figure out, they will figure out --

7 COMMISSIONER McCOY: No, what I'm saying
8 is --

9 COMMISSIONER LANIER: It's 125.

10 COMMISSIONER McCOY: -- I don't know that we
11 should wait to have a salary survey done. I mean but
12 if you just look at one of the proposals that came
13 back, I think I seen it started at 125 -- actually
14 started at 175 up to 200. Now, I'm not saying that
15 that should be the threshold, but at the very minimum,
16 I believe that our current interim is at 150 right now.
17 You know, I would like to --

18 CHAIR BOTEL: (Inaudible.)

19 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Right, I would like
20 to --

21 CHAIR BOTEL: We're going to get (inaudible).
22 Mr. Haygood --

23 COMMISSIONER McCOY: -- (inaudible).

24 CHAIR BOTEL: -- do we know what the current
25 person in that position is making now?

1 COMMISSIONER McCOY: 150.

2 MR. HAYGOOD: I do not.

3 CHAIR BOTEL: So do we want to make that --

4 COMMISSIONER LANIER: He's saying 150, so we
5 at least start, we at least start the basic or the
6 minimum at 150.

7 CHAIR BOTEL: All right, so we'll go 150 to
8 175 or something?

9 Ms. Miller-Anderson.

10 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: I don't think
11 we should just be throwing numbers out. We need to
12 make sure that it's commensurate with their, you know,
13 degree, their experience. And I'd rather have some
14 other references to go by and not determine that
15 tonight, just throwing numbers out without actually,
16 you know, having some facts to back it up.

17 CHAIR BOTEL: I actually would too. I would
18 prefer that we do what Mr. Haygood suggested, and that
19 is some sort of a salary survey so we see what
20 comparable communities are offering. I think that
21 would be very --

22 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: And we're
23 not -- when you say survey, we're not talking about
24 doing a --

25 CHAIR BOTEL: No, somebody gets on the phone

1 and finds out what people are making. You know, not a
2 formal --

3 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: And just check
4 with the FRA.

5 COMMISSIONER LANIER: Yes, it's not a big --

6 CHAIR BOTEL: Yes, it doesn't have to take
7 very long. It doesn't have to --

8 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: Then we can
9 have a further discussion on it next.

10 CHAIR BOTEL: Yes.

11 MR. HAYGOOD: Okay, so what I will do is
12 bring back, try to revise, taking your comments into
13 consideration, try to revise the qualifications, bring
14 it back to you so you can review it and approve it.

15 CHAIR BOTEL: Okay.

16 MR. HAYGOOD: One of the things I think we
17 really need, or you really need to address is first, I
18 guess, the consensus is that you do want to use a
19 professional executive search, and then number two, how
20 are you going to go through the process of selecting
21 the three proposals that you got?

22 COMMISSIONER LANIER: Madam Chair, I think at
23 the last --

24 CHAIR BOTEL: Ms. Lanier.

25 COMMISSIONER LANIER: I think at the last

1 meeting we -- it was -- I mean I didn't, but the Board
2 agreed that they wanted an executive search; that was
3 agreed upon.

4 CHAIR BOTEL: Ms. Miller-Anderson.

5 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: Madam Chair,
6 when we selected prior to Mr. Evans, when we did the
7 national search before, if you get with HR, they can
8 tell you the process that we went through when we did
9 the initial -- somebody, that's somebody else in the
10 background. Somebody needs to mute.

11 CHAIR BOTEL: Lawson, can you mute?

12 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: Get with HR.
13 Lawson, can you mute, or who is that -- who
14 is that?

15 CHAIR BOTEL: Not me.

16 VICE CHAIR LAWSON: I don't have anybody.

17 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: Okay.

18 CHAIR BOTEL: Mr. Lawson.

19 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: If you can get
20 with HR back in 2017 when we did the national -- or
21 actually, '16 we did the search for the City Manager
22 position, they can give you exactly how we went through
23 that whole process. I mean it's clearly defined, so
24 that would be a starting point. And if we want to
25 modify it from there, we can. But if you just get that

1 from them, it can explain to you how that was done.

2 MR. HAYGOOD: Okay, so --

3 CHAIR BOTEL: Mr. Haygood, will you take care
4 of that?

5 MR. HAYGOOD: Yes. How are you going to make
6 the selection on which of the search firms that have
7 responded? How do you want to do that?

8 CHAIR BOTEL: Did we get a recommendation
9 from the City's HR? I know she narrowed it down or
10 she -- these were the three that responded. Did she
11 have a preference for any one of these?

12 MR. HAYGOOD: No, ma'am, we didn't discuss
13 that.

14 CHAIR BOTEL: I mean I would like to know
15 what -- she's a professional. I would like to know her
16 opinion about this at least.

17 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Who's this?

18 CHAIR BOTEL: Mr. McCoy.

19 COMMISSIONER McCOY: I'm sorry, I didn't
20 understand who you were referring to as the
21 professional.

22 CHAIR BOTEL: Our HR Director, Ms. Dickerson.

23 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Okay, okay. I
24 particularly --

25 CHAIR BOTEL: Unless, do you have a strong

1 preference for one of these? They are all -- they all
2 look like reputable firms. They have -- it would be
3 difficult, I think, for us, as non-HR professionals, to
4 make a determination about this, unless you have a
5 strong preference for one of these.

6 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Well, I dislike the one
7 firm that wants the commission. I don't think that
8 that's --

9 CHAIR BOTEL: That 25 percent, I agree. I
10 don't like that either.

11 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Yes, that doesn't --

12 CHAIR BOTEL: I didn't like that either. Do
13 you want to then just ask Ms. Dickerson if she has any
14 recommendations from the one that wanted 25 and the one
15 that wanted 20?

16 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Do I want to? No.

17 CHAIR BOTEL: You want to make a decision;
18 you want to decide?

19 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Yes.

20 CHAIR BOTEL: Okay, which one would you
21 prefer?

22 COMMISSIONER McCOY: The one that wanted the
23 25.

24 CHAIR BOTEL: Okay, let me look at that.
25 That would be --

1 COMMISSIONER McCOY: You know, before we
2 commit to it, Mr. Haygood is the individual that we're
3 designating to see this whole acquisition of the search
4 firm, or is it going to be Ms. Dickerson? Or are we
5 really allowed to ask Ms. Dickerson to do something CRA
6 related? I mean I'm trying to understand it.

7 CHAIR BOTEL: Mr. Haygood.

8 MR. HAYGOOD: Well, quite frankly, she was
9 very helpful. This was a list of the executive search
10 firms that she had dealt with in the past. And she's
11 been very helpful. One of the issues we did have is
12 that her staff, she's really understaffed right now, so
13 that was difficult. But she was very helpful. I can
14 go back to her, ask her for a suggestion, that the
15 Board wants her to recommend one of the firms and bring
16 it back to you. Whatever your preference.

17 COMMISSIONER LANIER: Madam Chair, I mean --

18 CHAIR BOTEL: Ms. Lanier.

19 COMMISSIONER LANIER: -- we have to follow
20 the procurement process. So I think that the
21 procurement process is, you know, whatever top three we
22 choose, then we, you know, get the lowest bidder or the
23 best possible fit for what we're looking for. So I
24 think at the very least, we have to follow the City and
25 the CRA's procurement policy.

1 CHAIR BOTEL: Anyone else? Mr. Lawson,
2 you've been notably quiet.

3 VICE CHAIR LAWSON: I honestly was in
4 agreement that I don't want the commission based
5 agency, but I don't have a preference of the two. I
6 wouldn't mind HR taking a look at either one and giving
7 a recommendation.

8 CHAIR BOTEL: Okay, Ms. Lanier.

9 COMMISSIONER LANIER: I say, Madam Chair, I
10 just say issue an RFQ and short list and then, you
11 know, interview or select.

12 CHAIR BOTEL: No, no, no, no. Right now
13 we're deciding -- you mean issue an RFQ. Right now
14 we're deciding which of these three firms. I think
15 there seems to be consensus that we didn't want the one
16 that wanted 25 percent of the salary --

17 COMMISSIONER LANIER: Right.

18 CHAIR BOTEL: -- so we have two remaining.

19 COMMISSIONER LANIER: Right, so you're
20 saying, right, there was some question about, you know,
21 you didn't want 25, you don't want 20. So the top
22 three that we say we're going to go with, do an RFQ and
23 then just go from there.

24 CHAIR BOTEL: We don't have to do an RFQ. I
25 think we're at the point now where we might consider

1 asking --

2 COMMISSIONER LANIER: Just select one and
3 that's it.

4 CHAIR BOTEL: We will ask for a
5 recommendation from our City HR person, if she's
6 willing to do that, because again, it's not a CRA --

7 COMMISSIONER LANIER: But I don't think that
8 we can just pick one without the procurement process
9 that's in place. We can't just arbitrarily say we want
10 to go with this particular unless we follow the City
11 and the CRA's procurement policy. And if --

12 VICE CHAIR LAWSON: Madam Chair.

13 COMMISSIONER McCOY: (Inaudible.)

14 COMMISSIONER LANIER: -- we can do that, if
15 we could do it like that, then so be it --

16 VICE CHAIR LAWSON: Madam Chair.

17 COMMISSIONER LANIER: -- the procurement
18 policy.

19 CHAIR BOTEL: I think that these were the
20 only firms that responded to her request. Am I right,
21 Mr. Haygood?

22 MR. HAYGOOD: That's correct.

23 CHAIR BOTEL: Yes. So in essence, she did
24 put something out there, and these were the three firms
25 that responded, and now we would be at liberty, I would

1 believe, to make a choice amongst these three.

2 Mr. Lawson.

3 COMMISSIONER LANIER: So if that's a part of
4 the procurement process and if it's legal, then fine.

5 CHAIR BOTEL: Okay. Is it legal,
6 Mr. Haygood?

7 MR. HAYGOOD: Yes, ma'am. You should have
8 the 13 firms that are identified.

9 CHAIR BOTEL: Right, right. So we don't have
10 to do another RFP or anything?

11 MR. HAYGOOD: No.

12 CHAIR BOTEL: We have these three.

13 Mr. Lawson, and then Mr. McCoy.

14 VICE CHAIR LAWSON: Madam Chair, just to kind
15 of backtrack a little bit, before we send it back to
16 HR, we asked for a recommendation from HR from these
17 firms, and then make a decision on our next Council --
18 at our next CRA meeting as to which one based on a
19 recommendation? Is that -- would that be the direction
20 that we would be going in the event that we --

21 CHAIR BOTEL: Does anybody -- does anyone
22 object to taking it -- are you suggesting that we let
23 her go forward, or do you want it to come back to us
24 again for us to say yes, we agree this is the firm? Is
25 that what you're asking?

1 VICE CHAIR LAWSON: That's the point. I
2 don't want it --

3 CHAIR BOTEL: You don't want it to slow down.

4 VICE CHAIR LAWSON: I don't want it to slow
5 down. I wouldn't want to bring it back before us with
6 her recommendation. That would be my point. I
7 wouldn't have to wait to a meeting so that we can start
8 the process.

9 CHAIR BOTEL: You're suggesting that we ask
10 her for her recommendation, and then now say to her you
11 decide and you go with the firm that you have chosen.
12 Is that what you're suggesting?

13 MR. HAYGOOD: Madam Chair, you can't do that.
14 You have to make --

15 CHAIR BOTEL: Mr. Haygood says we have to do
16 that, okay.

17 VICE CHAIR LAWSON: Right.

18 CHAIR BOTEL: Okay, so we do have to slow it
19 down a tad. We have to ask her for her recommendation,
20 and then we have to approve her recommendation. Right,
21 Mr. Haygood?

22 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Well, no. Well, Madam
23 Chair, that --

24 CHAIR BOTEL: That's what Mr. Haygood is
25 saying, Mr. McCoy. Let Mr. Lawson finish, and then

1 I'll go to you, Mr. McCoy.

2 VICE CHAIR LAWSON: Well, then, Madam Chair,
3 if that's the fact of we'd have to slow down the
4 process, then I would change my stance in regards to
5 picking one of the agencies as opposed to sending it
6 back to HR. I would like to actually select one of the
7 agencies to move forward, which would be the lowest
8 responsive. Based upon their scope of work and
9 details, I wouldn't mind going with the \$20,000 agency.

10 CHAIR BOTTEL: Okay.

11 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: Madam Chair.

12 CHAIR BOTTEL: Mr. McCoy and then
13 Ms. Miller-Anderson. McCoy.

14 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Okay, so if I can just
15 provide an additional context to what Commissioner
16 Lawson said, you know, in even looking at this, I don't
17 want to go back. First of all, this is under the
18 threshold to have to do anything competitive. What we
19 did was do a solicitation. So even at \$25,000, that
20 falls under administration's purview, so that's not
21 necessarily a requirement.

22 And the one company who I guess Commissioner
23 Lawson was suggesting would have been GovernmentHR USA.
24 And I particularly -- I mean if you look at the
25 attachments relative to the advertisement and that they

1 actually put out on behalf of the organization, I
2 really like that, and it seemed like it took a lot of
3 commitment.

4 And even further, if you look at the
5 organization's -- what do we call this -- proposal, I
6 think, you know, I think it really lays out every level
7 of, you know, from start to finish, and it even lists
8 the consultant's biography in here. So, and even when
9 you look at the, I think it's the last three or four
10 pages where it talks about their particular
11 professional engagements and their participation and
12 even some of the positions that they fill. However, I
13 didn't see a whole lot about, maybe seven or so
14 relative to the state of Florida.

15 But I think they have a wide variety of
16 executive positions that they recruited from, most of
17 which are county and city management and director
18 positions relative and very closely to what we have
19 here. So, you know, I particularly like this.

20 One additional thing I would add is if we
21 choose to go with whichever one, which personally is my
22 preference to go with Government -- GovHR USA, that we
23 also add in the notation that we seen earlier of the
24 different -- state of Florida difference leagues,
25 Florida League of Cities and those other agencies where

1 it's advertised, and require that, you know, as much as
2 possible, even though I'm not going to favor anybody,
3 but I think it really helps to have someone that's
4 relatively familiar with the development and the
5 current market here in Florida, and more specifically,
6 in south Florida when it comes to development. And
7 that's why I want those advertised. I would like to
8 see that they're also advertising in those, I guess,
9 that same list that's on exhibit -- on the attachment.

10 CHAIR BOTEL: Yes, it's Exhibit --

11 COMMISSIONER McCOY: ED.

12 CHAIR BOTEL: -- C, Exhibit C.

13 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Yes, C.

14 CHAIR BOTEL: Yes. Okay. All right,
15 Ms. Miller-Anderson. Your mic; your mic.

16 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: No, I'll pass
17 for now; I mean I'll pass for now.

18 CHAIR BOTEL: Mr. -- anybody else have a
19 preference? Mr. Lawson.

20 VICE CHAIR LAWSON: Madam Chair, I just want
21 to add to that point. I do agree with those searches.
22 That was one of the things that was attractive for me
23 with the search form with the -- I believe it was
24 Government -- or GGA, with the additional locations
25 that they were advertising in. But if we can get the

1 original firm that's priced a little bit lower to
2 actually add those searches into those other locations,
3 I think that would be our best bet.

4 CHAIR BOTEL: Okay.

5 MR. HAYGOOD: May I ask a question?

6 CHAIR BOTEL: Yes. Go ahead, Mr. Haygood.

7 MR. HAYGOOD: I guess of Mr. McCoy. Yes, it
8 is, if it's under 25,000, your Executive Director has
9 authority to enter into the contract. But, you know,
10 it's still being procured from a competitive
11 standpoint. So I don't know if you -- how you want to
12 do this. We could, if you want to select a firm, we
13 could bring a contract back to you, hopefully at the
14 next meeting, and maybe at that time can address some
15 of the other concerns you have, including a proposed
16 salary range and a proposed scope of services or
17 either.

18 COMMISSIONER McCOY: So what was the purpose
19 of the contract coming back to us if this is within the
20 authority of the Executive Director?

21 MR. HAYGOOD: If that's what you want to do.
22 So you're going to select the firm and then just have
23 him sign the contract?

24 COMMISSIONER McCOY: I mean do you have a
25 reason why that's not a good idea, is what I'm asking.

1 MR. HAYGOOD: No, just trying to get it
2 straight as to what you wanted to follow, what process
3 you want to follow.

4 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Well, you know, I
5 thought specifically that it was good that everybody
6 came in under the \$25,000. So I don't know, unless
7 there's some other member that wants to see anything, I
8 mean clearly, you know, I would just ask that whoever
9 we decide on, that they do a ranking or something of
10 that sort, but we still be provided with the -- you
11 know, like obviously, I don't want them to send us the
12 credentials and the submissions of somebody that
13 clearly don't meet the minimum qualifications, you
14 know.

15 CHAIR BOTTEL: Well, Mr. McCoy, if I can
16 suggest that we -- did we not say previously that we
17 would try to use the same procedure that we used when
18 Ms. Miller-Anderson suggested back in 2016 when we did
19 a search for City Manager, which seems to be -- it
20 seems like it had a good outcome.

21 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Well, you know, I know
22 she's definitely been around, but I don't even know
23 what that was.

24 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: But that's why
25 I asked for Mr. Haygood to get that. And I was hoping

1 that next meeting that could come, or he can send it to
2 us, you know, via e-mail. But I understand we're
3 trying to move a little fast, but I just -- I don't
4 want us to -- I don't think we should just say here,
5 this is what you do.

6 And I don't know about Mr. Evans signing
7 the -- I mean he eventually will, but I think it's for
8 his position that he's currently in. I think it needs
9 to come back to us. That's just my thought on it.

10 But I'm thinking if Mr. Haygood can reach out
11 to them, he can go ahead and get that information and
12 provide it to us, and then we could, you know, have
13 this next meeting. You know, unless there's something
14 I don't know about, I don't, you know -- well, we do
15 have an item, 8-A, that you want to speak on, so maybe
16 that may have something that will push --

17 COMMISSIONER LANIER: Madam Chair, I just
18 also think that we need to bring it back so that we
19 will know what we are agreeing to.

20 CHAIR BOTEL: Right.

21 COMMISSIONER LANIER: And also that, you
22 know, when you rush, you don't want to miss anything.
23 I don't want to rush so much that we miss something.
24 So we need to bring the contract back, we agree to it
25 and we keep it moving.

1 CHAIR BOTEL: Right. I, myself, would
2 like -- I think that this firm -- and Mr. McCoy, if I
3 can ask you, you made a -- you referenced to a
4 different name. I'm looking at CP&S, CPS, if that's
5 the one that was the \$25,000 proposal.

6 COMMISSIONER McCOY: No, no, I went with the
7 20,000, the GovHR USA.

8 CHAIR BOTEL: Oh, okay. Then you were in
9 agreement with Mr. Lawson. I thought you were not in
10 agreement, but it sounded like you were in agreement
11 with him.

12 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Yes.

13 CHAIR BOTEL: Okay. I personally would like
14 to have the recommendation from HR, if she's willing to
15 provide us with a recommendation as to the comparative
16 points between this one, this CPS one and the other
17 one. Can I get your indulgence to allow that to
18 happen? It won't slow it down that much longer.

19 COMMISSIONER McCOY: That's fine, Madam
20 Chair.

21 CHAIR BOTEL: Thank you.

22 Ms. Miller-Anderson.

23 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: Okay, so are
24 we agreeing that we're going to have this on the next
25 agenda, so it can come back and Mr. Haygood can get the

1 information, and then also we'd get the recommendation
2 from Ms. Dickerson --

3 CHAIR BOTEL: Yes.

4 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: -- and then we
5 make the decision on the next meeting, or are we coming
6 for the next meeting and we're just going with the
7 contract?

8 CHAIR BOTEL: Mr. Haygood, what's your
9 recommendation?

10 MR. HAYGOOD: Well, I suppose if you're
11 trying to get a suggestion from her as far as ranking,
12 so I guess --

13 CHAIR BOTEL: No, as -- yes, as far as
14 ranking the agents.

15 MR. HAYGOOD: Yes, ma'am. It'd be analogous
16 to you having a screening committee, like a screening
17 committee of one. She would make a recommendation, and
18 I assume that since you want to go with that person, we
19 could probably try to bring a contract back at that
20 time also.

21 CHAIR BOTEL: Okay, is that agreeable to
22 everybody? Sounds like --

23 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: You're going
24 to do it all in the same meeting?

25 MR. HAYGOOD: I'm --

1 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: How are you
2 going to do that?

3 MR. HAYGOOD: I'm sorry?

4 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: I don't
5 understand. So we're going to get the information
6 before the meeting so when we come to the meeting we
7 have that information, or you're going to give it to us
8 then for recommendation?

9 MR. HAYGOOD: The contract?

10 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: You're going
11 to bring the contract on the same night that you're
12 going to provide the information on the recommendation?

13 MR. HAYGOOD: Yes.

14 CHAIR BOTEL: But you'll provide it to us in
15 advance? It will be backup --

16 MR. HAYGOOD: The backup, yes, yes, for the
17 meeting.

18 CHAIR BOTEL: It will be backup; it will be
19 backup for the meeting. On the meeting agenda, it will
20 be backup.

21 MR. HAYGOOD: Right. It will be a contract
22 attached.

23 CHAIR BOTEL: Yes.

24 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: What about the
25 recommendation?

1 CHAIR BOTEL: Well, the contract would be for
2 the one that she recommends.

3 MR. HAYGOOD: Correct.

4 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: Yes, but what
5 if it's the other one? I mean we're saying GovHR right
6 now, but if she says the other one, I mean are we going
7 to make a change that night, or I don't know --

8 MR. HAYGOOD: Well, I guess you need to
9 decide how you want to move forward. If you want a
10 recommendation from her and then you still make a
11 decision, that's one thing. If you are saying you're
12 going to go with whatever her recommendation is, then
13 we could do it with one contract, whatever, trying to
14 address the timing and all. But it's really up to you,
15 whatever you want to do.

16 CHAIR BOTEL: Well, the contract, can the
17 contract not be boilerplate to the extent that you
18 bring us back, you say Ms. Dickerson says -- there's
19 only X or Y, okay? Ms. Dickerson says X. I have
20 prepared a contract that you fill in the blank with X.
21 Oh, you don't like X, then fill in the blank with Y.

22 MR. HAYGOOD: I don't know if that will work.

23 CHAIR BOTEL: Okay. Trying to be -- trying
24 to move things along. Why wouldn't it work?

25 MR. HAYGOOD: Well, I mean, you know, it's

1 people have different interests in the contract. You
2 know, one firm may not want a provision that we would
3 negotiate. It's kind of hard to do a complete
4 boilerplate. I mean a lot of the stuff, obviously,
5 will be boilerplate.

6 CHAIR BOTEL: Okay. So Ms. Miller-Anderson,
7 would you prefer then to have this in two steps? Step
8 one, Mr. Haygood comes back to us with the
9 recommendation that Ms. Dickerson has made with regard
10 to these two entities and then follows on at a future
11 meeting with the contract?

12 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: Yes, and even
13 remember, we have -- when are we scheduled to have a
14 special meeting? What is that, this Friday?

15 CHAIR BOTEL: Yes.

16 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: I was going to
17 say you wanted to have two special meetings, but get
18 the recommendation. But I'm just thinking if we could
19 have another meeting at some point just to get the
20 recommendation and decide what we want to do maybe, and
21 then on that actual meeting?

22 CHAIR BOTEL: If she could do it by Friday,
23 you know, it puts her under a little bit of pressure.
24 Today is Wednesday; I mean she'd only have two days, a
25 day and a half. If she could give us her

1 recommendation as to which of these firms she would
2 prefer we use by Friday, it would certainly expedite
3 the process. And since we have a meeting set anyway,
4 we could add that -- oh, wait. Now --

5 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: It's not on
6 that --

7 CHAIR BOTEL: -- the meeting where we
8 can't -- we'd have to have two separate meetings, a CRA
9 meeting and a City, and a Council meeting.

10 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: And I wasn't
11 saying it has to be this Friday. We could do a special
12 meeting before the City meeting, or you know, around
13 that time just to get that answer if we're saying we
14 need to have the information. I just -- I'm not in
15 favor of just doing it, getting it and then agreeing
16 that night.

17 CHAIR BOTEL: Okay.

18 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: And how are we
19 going to have the contract for it the same night? I
20 understand we're trying to move fast, but I think we're
21 moving a little too fast, unless somebody can explain
22 to me how we're going to do it.

23 CHAIR BOTEL: So Mr. Haygood, let's plan on
24 having a special CRA meeting on the same night --
25 that's the 20th, right? Am I right about that date?

1 Yes. Let's plan on having a special CRA meeting with
2 this one item on the 20th, either before or after the
3 Council meeting.

4 MR. HAYGOOD: Okay. I --

5 CHAIR BOTEL: And we're only -- we're looking
6 for Ms. Dickerson to weigh in on these two entities,
7 which one does she recommend we use, and then we will
8 say yea or nay on the 20th very quickly, yes or no, we
9 accept her recommendation. And then you can move
10 forward with developing a contract for that entity.

11 Mr. McCoy has a comment. I can see it on his
12 face.

13 COMMISSIONER McCOY: No, I don't have
14 anything.

15 CHAIR BOTEL: Oh, all right.

16 COMMISSIONER McCOY: I'm just like, okay.

17 CHAIR BOTEL: He's getting tired.

18 COMMISSIONER McCOY: You know, let me ask you
19 this. And I hate to kind of belabor this, but what if
20 she comes back with something that's not agreeable
21 then?

22 CHAIR BOTEL: Well, it's only two. Not
23 agreeable, then you can say no, I don't like that.

24 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Well, let's flip a coin
25 right now if that's the case, I mean --

1 CHAIR BOTEL: No --

2 COMMISSIONER LANIER: That's the purpose of
3 having two meetings though.

4 COMMISSIONER McCOY: But that's what I'm
5 saying.

6 CHAIR BOTEL: The purpose of having two
7 meetings is that -- well, that is the purpose of having
8 two meetings. We need to have two meetings because
9 Mr. Haygood is saying that he can't do a boilerplate
10 contract. We would have to approve X or Y, then at a
11 subsequent meeting he will come back to us and give us
12 a contract for the one that we approved based on
13 Ms. Dickerson's recommendation.

14 MR. HAYGOOD: And which are the two firms
15 you've narrowed it down to?

16 CHAIR BOTEL: The one that was 25 is CPS HR
17 Consulting. The one we threw out is GGA, Gans, Gans &
18 Associates. Which is the other one, Mr. McCoy? I
19 can't seem to find it in my --

20 COMMISSIONER McCOY: GovHR USA.

21 CHAIR BOTEL: Thank you. GovHR USA.

22 COMMISSIONER McCOY: I mean it says it in
23 their name. I mean --

24 CHAIR BOTEL: I'm looking for it.

25 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Hey, I like their name.

1 CHAIR BOTEL: I have too many papers.

2 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Can I make that my
3 selection?

4 CHAIR BOTEL: Too many papers.

5 Okay, did you get that, Mr. Haygood?

6 MR. HAYGOOD: Yes, ma'am.

7 CHAIR BOTEL: Okay. Have we beaten this
8 horse to death enough? Okay, can we move along to the
9 next item?

10 Mr. Haygood, are you satisfied with all of
11 the things we've done so far? You're all right now?

12 MR. HAYGOOD: Yes, ma'am. I just hope I can
13 get it all back to you by your next meeting.

14 CHAIR BOTEL: Okay, good. Item -- we don't
15 have to make any votes on this, right? We're all good.

16 Are there any public -- were there any public
17 comments? Where's Tamara? We should probably stop at
18 some point. It's 10:09. We should at least take

19 public comments before it gets too late. Tamara or --

20 MS. DESIR: There were no public comments for
21 the item.

22 CHAIR BOTEL: Okay. Any public comments for
23 the meeting?

24 MS. DESIR: There is one general public
25 comment.

1 CHAIR BOTEL: Why don't we get that out of
2 the way so we can move on?

3 MS. DESIR: Okay. This public comment is
4 from Fane Lozman:

5 My comments are addressed specifically to
6 Councilperson Lanier, Lawson, McCoy and
7 Miller-Anderson. The four of you have the
8 responsibility to replace the current Chairperson
9 immediately. Ms. Botel, after she was elected to
10 office, stated that the Council was -- quote -- dumber
11 than a box of rocks -- unquote. Ms. Botel also stated
12 that Lynne Hubbard was -- quote -- mentally retarded --
13 unquote -- and never should have been elected to
14 office. Botel's despicable comments preclude her not
15 only from acting as the Chairperson of the CRA, but
16 reflect poorly on the Singer Island residents that
17 voted her into office.

18 CHAIR BOTEL: Is that the extent of his --
19 thank you so much. Let me clarify that I never said
20 either of those things, and I think my colleagues on
21 Council know better and know who to believe.

22 So moving right along to item number, let's
23 see, 11? Let me see, which ones did we get rid of?

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Box of rocks, huh?

25 CHAIR BOTEL: Box of rocks. Hey, dumber

1 than -- we're on number --

2 THE CLERK: Nine.

3 CHAIR BOTEL: Thank you, nine. And this is
4 going to be a quick update.

5 THE CLERK: Townhouse project update.

6 CHAIR BOTEL: Yes. Ms. Jenkins.

7 MS. JENKINS: This will just be very quick if
8 I can --

9 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Did we -- I'm sorry,
10 Madam Chair. Did we forget 8-A?

11 CHAIR BOTEL: Oh, I'm sorry, we did. I'm so
12 sorry, yes. Thank you for reminding me. 8-A, could
13 you read the -- could you read it? Mr. McCoy, I think
14 it was your motion, it was your item.

15 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Okay. So I wanted to
16 have a discussion on relieving the current Interim
17 Executive Director of that position and the Interim
18 Executive Director reverting back to the Director of
19 Planning in the CRA.

20 And you know, my reasoning is mostly I really
21 believe that we can go in a different direction as far
22 as the leadership, and I've kind of lost confidence in
23 our current Executive Director. And I wanted to bring
24 this to the Board at the last meeting, and you know,
25 there were some concerns about it not being posted on

1 the agenda. So I thought it was an automatic function
2 that it would be there, but apparently not. So I
3 wanted to have that discussion.

4 CHAIR BOTEL: Thank you, Mr. --

5 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: Can Tamara --
6 can Tamara mute her mic, because it will -- shuffle all
7 the paper --

8 CHAIR BOTEL: Thank you.

9 Go ahead, Mr. McCoy.

10 COMMISSIONER McCOY: So, you know, it's
11 not -- I guess my concern is if we take action on
12 removing the Interim Executive Director, it means
13 absolutely nothing until we decide on who the designee
14 or who the person or the individual that we decide
15 should take this interim appointment until we fill the
16 permanent Executive Director position. So I wanted to
17 have that conversation begin with the members of the
18 Board.

19 CHAIR BOTEL: Anyone want to comment?

20 Ms. Miller-Anderson.

21 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: So my
22 question, I know you just kind of touched on it, what
23 would you propose or who would you propose be the
24 person to step in until we fill the position? Who
25 would take on that responsibility?

1 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Well, the Mayor looks
2 really good in that suit right now.

3 No. However, I did want to have that
4 discussion with the Board. Literally, you know, I
5 don't want to go into speaking of, you know, things
6 that occurred in the past, but I think certainly we
7 should have the discussion. And my idea was to select
8 someone currently within the department so there
9 wouldn't be a huge transition or learning curve for
10 someone.

11 And more particularly, obviously, I don't see
12 Ms. Jenkins on here. Is she still on? Well, her
13 camera is probably off. But considering either someone
14 that's currently within the CRA, either the Project
15 Manager or Ms. Jenkins. So I don't know what their
16 current roles is, but yes, those were at least what I
17 wanted to begin the conversation with.

18 CHAIR BOTEL: Ms. Miller-Anderson.

19 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: So for me, I'm
20 not comfortable with that. I do know that we are
21 trying to fill the position, and I'm sure Mr. Evans
22 probably, you know, I'm sure he was probably sick
23 tonight, but I'm sure there was, you know, some
24 thoughts about the situation from the last meeting.
25 And that's fine. But he's been in that role for quite

1 a while now. I think to continue him in that role for
2 the next few weeks or a month, you know, for the short
3 period of time that we would have to get someone in
4 permanently I think would be appropriate.

5 However, if he's, you know, if he doesn't
6 want to remain in that position, that's a whole other
7 conversation. But if he's willing to stay in that
8 position until we fill it permanently, then I would be
9 inclined to go with that.

10 CHAIR BOTTEL: Thank you, Ms. Miller-Anderson.

11 Mr. Lawson, do you have a comment? Turn your
12 mic on, please. Thank you.

13 VICE CHAIR LAWSON: Yes, Madam Chair. I
14 would not feel comfortable moving forward with removing
15 Mr. Evans at this point, being that we've started the
16 process or initiated the process for a new Executive
17 Director, being that we don't have anyone to fill the
18 position.

19 I think Ms. Annetta Jenkins is capable and
20 our Project Manager, but she's also over and running
21 our CDC, so I wouldn't want Ms. Jenkins taken away from
22 that progress and those steps to step in as Executive
23 Director currently. And just because I don't know the
24 structure of the makeup of the CRA that would have
25 somebody capable of being Executive for the next one to

1 two or three months that it takes us to find an
2 Executive Director, I'd prefer to ask Mr. Evans to
3 remain in that one.

4 CHAIR BOTEL: Thank you, Mr. Lawson.
5 Ms. Lanier.

6 COMMISSIONER LANIER: I'm waiting for a
7 motion.

8 CHAIR BOTEL: Okay. Mr. McCoy, do you want
9 to make a motion?

10 COMMISSIONER McCOY: So are we -- is that the
11 extent of the conversation?

12 CHAIR BOTEL: Well, I am in agreement with
13 Ms. Miller-Anderson and Mr. Lawson. Ms. Lanier hasn't
14 weighed in yet. But I don't see any reason to remove
15 Mr. Evans from his position. I feel likewise that
16 although I'm completely -- I have complete confidence
17 in Ms. Annetta Jenkins to run anything that she'd put
18 her mind to, I think that she's quite busy running the
19 function that she has right now.

20 And Mr. Scott Evans has years of experience
21 in this position, and I would prefer to leave him in
22 that position, unless he chooses on move on, leave him
23 in that position until we find a permanent replacement.
24 But if you would like to make a motion, we can
25 entertain it.

1 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Okay. Well, I move that
2 we put Ms. Annetta Jenkins in the Interim Executive
3 Director position until permanently filled.

4 CHAIR BOTEL: Does anyone second that motion?
5 It dies for a lack of a second.

6 Okay, thank you, Mr. McCoy.

7 Moving right along now to item number --
8 where am I? Now we're at item number 11.

9 THE CLERK: Nine.

10 CHAIR BOTEL: No, no, nine, I'm sorry. Nine,
11 townhouse project update, townhouse project.

12 MS. JENKINS: Commissioners, I have a very
13 brief update, and I hope you can see my screen now for
14 our townhouse project.

15 CHAIR BOTEL: Not yet. But we have it in our
16 backup.

17 MS. JENKINS: Hold on a minute.

18 CHAIR BOTEL: I see it.

19 MS. JENKINS: Okay. Is that better?

20 CHAIR BOTEL: Yes, thank you.

21 MS. JENKINS: Okay. The townhouse project is
22 something that we've been working on for a few months,
23 and I think you all were very excited about the idea of
24 bringing home ownership to 11th Street between Wright
25 Street and Avenue E.

1 There you see the proposed site, which goes
2 west to east on 11th Street, and it fronts residential
3 structures across the street. Architects have been
4 engaged, and you see the proposed site located there
5 with the proposed site plan, one of the proposed site
6 plans, and we wanted to share that with you. In the
7 packet that you have, there are two illustrations, and
8 we're working on several others to fine tune what you
9 see there, which would have from 12 to 16 units in two
10 buildings.

11 We're on track in terms of the timeline. And
12 the proposed units would range from about 1,500 to
13 1,800 square feet. You see there the three-story
14 illustration, which is three bedrooms, two and a half
15 baths and a garage. And the interesting thing is that
16 the architects were able to design the site so that the
17 units could front load from the back so you would not
18 have cars on the street. The streets would be
19 walkable, and a garage there for cars to enter from the
20 back. There's a little courtyard. There are balconies
21 and a small patio on the back.

22 This illustration is a two-story structure,
23 which would give us fewer units because they're wider
24 units and slightly smaller, but it's still a very
25 beautiful project incorporating the old Florida

1 architecture.

2 And I just wanted to bring this to you to get
3 some feedback, see what you thought, if you like the
4 direction that we're going in so we can continue to
5 move forward. On our timeline we finished our initial
6 tasks, and we're at the point where we would begin to
7 share the concepts with the community, as we promised
8 them we'd bring them ideas before we move forward any
9 further. We've also engaged partners to begin the
10 environmental review process.

11 So I'll just stop there and see if there are
12 any comments.

13 CHAIR BOTTEL: Any comments? Mr. McCoy.

14 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Ms. Jenkins, your last
15 slide, the second from the last one that had the
16 timeline, I was trying to take a glimpse of it. But
17 while that's coming up, I do have one -- actually. A
18 few questions. So what kind of construction are we
19 talking about, because I was trying to make a -- I was
20 trying to determine what kind of siding that was on
21 that building and I couldn't figure it out. Is that
22 prefabricated --

23 MS. JENKINS: No.

24 COMMISSIONER McCOY: -- or prebuilt or
25 something like that?

1 MS. JENKINS: These would be CBS
2 construction. And the illustration probably shows some
3 hardy siding. We have not gotten to that point, to
4 decide on materials. But the overall structure would
5 be CBS construction.

6 COMMISSIONER McCOY: I'm sorry, can you
7 define what that is?

8 MS. JENKINS: Concrete block structure.

9 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Oh, okay. Well, so the
10 three story versus the two story, what's the difference
11 in the price?

12 MS. JENKINS: We either --

13 COMMISSIONER McCOY: You don't know the exact
14 amount, but if you -- just a range.

15 MS. JENKINS: Well, the average price would
16 be about 250,000 to construct. And depending upon the
17 sizes, probably ranging from about 245 to 275,
18 depending on where the unit is and the overall
19 buildings, et cetera, but with an average price of
20 250,000. With subsidy, we're hoping to bring them to
21 market for buyers at a little bit less than 200,000 so
22 we could market them more to a low-mod buyer in the
23 area. They would be Workforce units.

24 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Okay. And the April
25 through May says predevelopment financing and

1 underwriting. Is that for the actual purchaser, the
2 buyer? I'm not sure I understand what that means.

3 MS. JENKINS: That would be for the project
4 itself. COVID has slowed us down a little bit in terms
5 of moving forward, but we're hoping that we can catch
6 up or make up some of the time and stay on target. But
7 that is for the construction. Know we do have the
8 Riviera Beach Home Buyers Club, and in the club we have
9 buyers who are working towards pre-qualifying to be
10 able, hopefully, to buy some of these units. So that's
11 a separate but parallel process.

12 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Does this require any
13 zoning changes?

14 MS. JENKINS: I don't believe that it does.
15 We're not at that point yet. But it fits with -- well,
16 it does fit within the existing zoning. I don't think
17 we'll have any. We might have to come back for some
18 leeway from the City depending upon where the easements
19 are in that area.

20 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Okay. And one last
21 question. Phase one underway, can you explain what
22 that is?

23 MS. JENKINS: Phase one is the townhouse
24 project itself. Ideally, we'd like to develop other
25 portions of that block. You're going to hear, and

1 after I finish, the Avenue E update. And we want this
2 project to fit into the overall concept and the
3 direction for the Avenue E corridor study that you all
4 are looking at. And this project would just be phase
5 one. There'd be a phase two that might include some
6 smaller Workforce apartments or condos and neighborhood
7 retail on the bottom floor.

8 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Okay, that's all I have,
9 Madam Chair.

10 CHAIR BOTEL: Thank you.

11 VICE CHAIR LAWSON: Madam Chair.

12 COMMISSIONER LANIER: Madam Chair.

13 CHAIR BOTEL: Mr. Lawson.

14 VICE CHAIR LAWSON: Thank you, Madam Chair.

15 Ms. Jenkins, the selection process of your
16 contractors, are you guys, are you going to be using
17 local participation?

18 MS. JENKINS: Most definitely. We've made
19 every effort to have this project accessible and to
20 have participation with local contractors. We always
21 do that.

22 VICE CHAIR LAWSON: Okay. Do you have a
23 requirement in place of what percentage is going to be
24 local?

25 MS. JENKINS: We are not at the point. We'll

1 bring that back and have some input from you. But as
2 much as we can incorporate. And I don't have an answer
3 for you tonight, but it will be strongly local, local
4 subs, local labor, and we'd be marketing to local
5 residents.

6 VICE CHAIR LAWSON: So I guess, for
7 Mr. Haygood, the legality of us having a higher
8 percentage of local participation than what's in our
9 code, which requires a 15 percent local participation,
10 are we able to do that with the CDC?

11 MR. HAYGOOD: Yes. I mean it's -- well, I
12 don't know that you can, but the CDC Board can. Can --
13 I'm sorry. Yes, sorry. Yes, the CDC Board can require
14 more than the limit that's in the legislation now. In
15 fact, I don't know if Annetta plans on using, was it
16 Urban -- what's the group?

17 MS. JENKINS: You're talking about Urban
18 Farmers, the reentry program, that labor hopefully will
19 be a part of this project, but we've not structured or
20 discussed the RFP process for proposals, and it would
21 depend upon some of the financing.

22 For instance, if we were to receive Federal
23 funding for the number of units, we'd have to follow
24 section three guidelines. For the number of units
25 we're proposing, we'd have to follow Davis-Bacon, and

1 all of those point towards local participation, local
2 hires, et cetera.

3 VICE CHAIR LAWSON: Okay. So as a follow-up,
4 Madam Chair.

5 Ms. Jenkins, based upon that economic
6 recovery plan and what I want to see from the City, CRA
7 and the CDC is I would like to push the agenda, push
8 the tape as far as possible.

9 Colleagues, what I mean by local, of course,
10 is starting within the City of Riviera Beach, but then
11 going into Palm Beach County, which is considered an
12 outlying detail that's local. I would want Ms. Jenkins
13 to see if we could do 100 percent local, if we can
14 legally and possibly move forward with that, because if
15 we're going to really provide economic recovery for our
16 residents, we have to provide opportunities, jobs and
17 the ability to be gainfully employed.

18 So if we can actually not only build these
19 townhouses locally, but also have them sold to our
20 workforce here in our city and our community, I think
21 that's truly kind of empowering the community, the
22 residents, and giving the opportunity for them to be
23 gainfully employed and to live, work and play here in
24 the city. So if we can truly push for 100 percent
25 local participation, Ms. Jenkins, that's where I would

1 want to see us move forward.

2 MS. JENKINS: I think the CDC Board would be
3 very supportive of doing whatever we can legally do on
4 moving forward with that. So we'll make every effort.
5 And we've already been talking with the surrounding
6 neighbors, and they're curious about what's coming.
7 And we told them that we will include them in the
8 process in terms of having input, and we've said so as
9 well to some local contractors and subs. So we most
10 definitely can do that.

11 VICE CHAIR LAWSON: Okay, thank you,
12 Ms. Jenkins.

13 CHAIR BOTEL: I think Ms. Lanier first, and
14 then Ms. Miller-Anderson. Ms. Lanier.

15 COMMISSIONER LANIER: Yes. I just wanted to
16 tell Ms. Jenkins that this is the type of projects that
17 I really, really, really like. But I also want to
18 piggyback off of Councilman Lawson's sentiments and the
19 fact, you know, when we -- we just had this
20 conversation last week with the Housing Authority, and
21 you know, nobody can really promise us that we're going
22 to have local participation, I can't really guarantee
23 that.

24 But I mean this is our city. This is what we
25 are here to do. We're here to make sure that the

1 people in this city are able to participate in any
2 business that the City does and also to benefit from
3 what the City does.

4 So I totally agree with you, Ms. Jenkins, in
5 the fact that take this information back to the CDC
6 Board. We like the concept, we like the fact that
7 these are things that are considered to be Workforce
8 housing.

9 But I also want to reiterate the fact that,
10 you know, thinking about in terms of local
11 participation, thinking about crimes, we're thinking
12 about everybody who lives in this city who is local
13 participation are -- is involved with this project.

14 And I really like that project that --
15 reentry project where you used the gentlemen who are
16 returning citizens and are, you know, they are
17 participating in the development of the city. And who
18 better to be able to give an opportunity to than to
19 local people who are returning citizens to be able to
20 build this city up? So I agree with what you're doing.
21 I just hope that we can do everything that we can to
22 ensure that there is local participation.

23 MS. JENKINS: And we'll report back to you on
24 a regular basis and let you know how we're doing. So
25 we appreciate the comments.

1 CHAIR BOTEL: Thank you. Is there anybody
2 else waiting in the wings here? Okay. Mr. Lawson.

3 VICE CHAIR LAWSON: Yes, after
4 Ms. Miller-Anderson. She had a comment. I just had a
5 quick question.

6 CHAIR BOTEL: Go ahead, Ms. Miller-Anderson.

7 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: I just wanted
8 to say I appreciate this project coming along,
9 particularly in that area, because we do need some
10 movement going on over there. You know, it's been
11 vacant for a while, and a lot of times you have a lot
12 of people just, you know, throwing trash and just doing
13 a number of things in the area. So I appreciate that,
14 and I do totally support being able to have as many
15 local participation businesses on this project as
16 possible.

17 Again, I've mentioned this before.
18 Mr. Haygood can certainly attest to the fact that I've
19 been trying to give us something on the CRA side. And
20 we haven't done a disparity study, but there is
21 something that we're able to put into place.

22 Is there something we can do for this
23 project, Mr. Haygood, what we talked about, or what you
24 and Mr. Evans have been working on for about almost two
25 years now?

1 MR. HAYGOOD: Yes, ma'am. In fact, we had a
2 contract, I think, with someone to provide a sheltered
3 market program, which I think we believe we can
4 institute legally quicker than having to get a
5 disparity study done. And we had intended it
6 through -- I think the intent is to use it on the 2600
7 project, and once it's in place, we could also use it
8 for this project. I think Scott was in the process of
9 actually negotiating the amount of the contract, and we
10 had a little problem with that. So that should be
11 coming back to you shortly.

12 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: Okay, so for
13 the next meeting, our actual meeting on the 27th, yes,
14 the 27th, can you have it on the agenda to bring
15 something back so that even the new people on the
16 Council or the Commission will know what you're talking
17 about, because we haven't officially brought that
18 information to the Board to explain what they're
19 talking about.

20 MR. HAYGOOD: Well, I was not negotiating the
21 contract, but I will carry the message to Scott and see
22 that we can get it back to you --

23 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: I mean even if
24 you don't --

25 MR. HAYGOOD: Sorry.

1 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: Even if you
2 don't have the contract, just the concept of what
3 you're talking about --

4 MR. HAYGOOD: Yes.

5 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: -- doing, it
6 hasn't been explained at all to the Commission.

7 MR. HAYGOOD: Okay.

8 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: So if we get
9 even -- if it's just like an update talking about
10 exactly what the process was and what you all are
11 thinking of doing, because that has never come to us.

12 MR. HAYGOOD: Okay, and hopefully we'll have
13 the contract itself.

14 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: Okay, so at
15 the next meeting?

16 MR. HAYGOOD: Yes, ma'am.

17 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: The official
18 meeting, the 27th. All right. Thank you.

19 CHAIR BOTEL: Thank you.

20 I have one last comment myself, Annetta. I
21 think it's a wonderful project. It looks beautiful.
22 I'm just wondering if there's any kind of
23 pre-apprentice program, or rather apprentice program
24 that we could incorporate.

25 It's one thing to say yes, we want local

1 participation, but I would like to see us, as much as
2 possible, do some kind of a training component so
3 people who are interested in getting into the
4 construction trades have a place where they can
5 practice, not that we would want them to be doing
6 anything, you know, without supervision, but I think
7 this would be a great opportunity to do an
8 apprenticeship program. So can we talk about that at
9 some point in the future as well?

10 MS. JENKINS: Most definitely. And that's
11 close to what the reentry program is doing. So we'd
12 love to talk with you about that.

13 CHAIR BOTEL: Okay, if there's nothing else,
14 we'll move along to item number -- now I think we're at
15 11. Am I right? Keep me honest.

16 I would ask: Are there any public comments
17 for any of the other items on this agenda?

18 MS. DESIR: No, Chair, there are no public
19 comments.

20 CHAIR BOTEL: Okay, good, so we don't have to
21 ask every time. So we are on --

22 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: Madam Chair.

23 CHAIR BOTEL: Yes.

24 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: Well, you do,
25 because technically, she's not going to close until she

1 reads the item.

2 CHAIR BOTEL: Okay, you're right. Somebody
3 might --

4 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: And it's
5 important that she says that, because someone may send
6 something in.

7 CHAIR BOTEL: You're right. All right. I'm
8 trying to be quick here.

9 Avenue E, number 11. Madam Clerk.

10 THE CLERK: Avenue E corridor study
11 presentation. The acceptance of public comments is now
12 closed.

13 CHAIR BOTEL: Thank you. Heidi? Annetta,
14 who's making this presentation?

15 MS. JENKINS: We have the KCI team here to
16 give us an update on the Avenue E corridor, and they do
17 have a presentation. So I'll turn it over to Heidi.

18 CHAIR BOTEL: Thank you.

19 MS. SIEGEL: Good evening. Thank you for
20 allowing us to present this project. We're really
21 proud of our work. I know it's a little late in the
22 evening. If you'll bear with us, we have some pretty
23 exciting things to show you. I'm bringing up my screen
24 right now to share with you.

25 So we have been working on this project for a

1 number of months now. And I'm trying to get my slides
2 to advance. Here we go.

3 And it's a multidisciplinary approach to the
4 project. We've spent a lot of time on Avenue E. Three
5 specific teams that we have working together that all
6 come out of our office include our planners, who also
7 look at economic development, our landscape architects,
8 who look at the streetscape, as well as our engineers,
9 who look at everything from storm water drainage as
10 well as traffic conditions.

11 What I'm about to tell you is no surprise to
12 you. Of course, the current built environment is not
13 ideal for redevelopment right now. There's six main
14 points that we identified, and that's the number of
15 vacant lots, the backout parking right onto Avenue E,
16 the lack of a sidewalk network, the lack of the
17 buffering of the outdoor storage areas, nonconforming
18 uses, such as auto repair -- nonconforming means it's
19 no longer allowed by the code -- and inconsistent
20 signage up and down the corridor.

21 Our scope also had us look at the zoning code
22 to see where we could suggest improvements for
23 specifically Avenue E, as it does have its own zoning
24 designation, which is downtown general. One of the
25 things we found is that it refers to retail is allowed

1 along Avenue E, which is fine, and retail has a broad
2 definition in the definition section of the code.

3 But we'd like something we saw somewhere else
4 in the code, which your commercial neighborhood
5 district, which is somewhere away from Avenue E, they
6 actually spell out very specific -- and you can see it
7 on the right side of the slide -- uses that they want
8 to see in the commercial neighborhood district. So
9 when we met with the community, there was a very
10 distinct and specific vision for Avenue E. So that's
11 an opportunity to spell out the uses in the downtown
12 general.

13 Also to address residential uses, single
14 family homes are allowed because it broadly, in the
15 zoning code, allows for residential uses. If we want
16 to make this an urban, walkable environment that has
17 both living and working opportunities along it, we
18 might want to not allow new residential uses, but make
19 sure what we do is compatible with the single family
20 homes, not allow new single family homes, but make sure
21 what we do is compatible with the single family homes
22 that are there.

23 And something else we found is that there's
24 no majority property owner up and down Avenue E. And
25 sometimes that can lead to the conditions that you have

1 here if you don't have one large investment. And we'll
2 talk about that as we go through.

3 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: Madam Chair,
4 can we make sure we have three Commissioners on,
5 please. Thank you. I can't hear you. You're on mute.
6 Thank you.

7 CHAIR BOTTEL: Thank you, Mr. Lawson.
8 Go ahead. I'm sorry.

9 MS. SIEGEL: Absolutely, absolutely.

10 So we looked at what is available to start
11 spurring redevelopment along Avenue E. One of the
12 things we recommend, which is, of course, the meat of
13 this project, is to implement and construct the
14 streetscape using public funds or grant money. We feel
15 that the commitment from the City would incentivize
16 developers to come in, and your return on investment
17 will be huge as developers increase the tax value of
18 those properties.

19 So the nice thing is I'm not necessarily
20 recommending that you make a very hard decision,
21 because the City code already allows the City Council
22 to enact an assessment along any street for the
23 construction of sidewalk. So a big part of the project
24 that we're recommending is actually sidewalks. So we
25 think that you should take advantage of this section of

1 the code, which is 29-92, and perhaps consider some
2 kind of assessment either on the front end or the back
3 end of projects in order to help fund the project.

4 We think it's important to invest in
5 identification or street signage, and I'll show you
6 opportunities for that as we go through our drawings.

7 We think the CRA should incentivize the
8 combining of parcels and developing on larger parcels.
9 So if a developer wants to come in and buy up a whole
10 block, there might be incentives.

11 When we talk about incentives, we don't
12 always talk about money incentives. And I know in CRAs
13 that's the first thing we think about, but there's
14 other ways to incentivize developers. Time is money
15 for them, so streamlining the process or allowing
16 relief from setback requirements or other development
17 regulations might be an incentive that a developer is
18 looking for, and not just money towards their project.

19 And also we recommend identifying parcels
20 which we -- I'll show you a couple of them that the CRA
21 should consider for purchase and to enter into
22 public-private partnerships.

23 These are actually two areas where we've
24 identified opportunities for public-private
25 partnerships. The left side of your screen, you see

1 between 19th and 17th the City already owns that large
2 vacant parcel, as well as -- so, and then to the east
3 of that is the Miami Subs, to give you reference. The
4 parcel directly south of that is owned by one property
5 owner, from Broadway all the way to Avenue E, and the
6 Property Appraiser has that valued about 1.3 million
7 right now.

8 We think there's an opportunity by combining
9 these lots and entering into some kind of agreement
10 with a developer. That is a nice chunk of land. Even
11 Miami Subs could stay there. But there's opportunity
12 for redevelopment. I'm going to play a video for you
13 shortly of our design, and I'll show you some really
14 neat opportunities that could happen there.

15 The other opportunity for public-private
16 partnership might be right there at Blue Heron and
17 Avenue E. Our design considers that a gateway and an
18 entrance into Avenue E, and by really controlling what
19 happens at this entrance through a public-private
20 partnership, you're also going to set the tone for the
21 rest of the block.

22 We have some recommendations for changes to
23 the way it is regulated through either the zoning code
24 or policy. Backout parking should be no longer allowed
25 to exist. The existence of backout parking should not

1 delay the streetscape project from construction
2 eventually.

3 We recommend that the City and the CRA allow
4 existing businesses to use the proposed on-street
5 parking that I'm going to show you, and just let
6 businesses start using that on-street parking for now.
7 I'm thinking of the auto parts stores and the smaller
8 businesses that are there.

9 We think that it should be a requirement to
10 buffer outdoor storage areas and also to sunset,
11 meaning to set a time when they are no longer allowed
12 to exist. We talked with staff in looking at being
13 aggressive, about three to five years and these need to
14 go away. The same thing with auto repair businesses.
15 There's other opportunities in the city for those
16 businesses to exist, and with the proposed streetscape,
17 Avenue E is no longer the place for them.

18 Sunset inconsistent signage. These type of
19 programs already exist along the Northlake Boulevard
20 overlay district, which is U.S. 1 through North Palm
21 Beach, and the other smaller cities around there, that
22 they all have a sunset of inconsistent signage.

23 As I mentioned before, limiting single family
24 homes and the intensification of single family homes,
25 and what we think should happen is that all new

1 development should be four units or more so you'll have
2 a bigger bang for your buck with investment.

3 I mentioned the permitted uses before. We
4 think you should expand those permitted uses. There's
5 an opportunity already in the code that as the City
6 Council, you can have waivers, and not variances, which
7 also streamlines the process for the developers.

8 And this is sometimes a hard pill to swallow.
9 I myself, I'm a former City Manager and a former
10 Planning Director, so I know how scary this could be,
11 but sometimes it's time for Code Enforcement and the
12 Building Official to get a little more involved and to
13 look at unsafe structures and start to remove
14 structures that don't contribute to Avenue E, and
15 through the existing laws on the books.

16 So we also looked for opportunities for
17 connectivity along -- from Avenue E to make it more of
18 that urban hub, to play off of the existing residential
19 neighborhood. We identified employment areas and
20 recreation areas as well as transportation.

21 One of the biggest stumbling blocks for this
22 connectivity -- again, this is not a surprise to you --
23 is the lack of continuous sidewalks along Avenue E.
24 This picture isn't staged. It's not something that we
25 went looking for. Just one day of field work, I was

1 out there for about an hour, and I came across three
2 wheelchair users in the street, as well as pedestrians,
3 a young lady in a Publix uniform walking to work in the
4 street because there was no sidewalk for her to use.

5 Also, the opportunity for enhanced pedestrian
6 crosswalks exists, and that's in our design. Our
7 proposed design has a very strong emphasis on the
8 pedestrian and bicycle user, because we believe that is
9 reflective of the existing community and we want to
10 enhance that existing need.

11 Long term, as the streetscape comes together,
12 we would like to recommend that the CRA, the City reach
13 out to Palm Tran about bringing the route onto Avenue
14 E. There's an opportunity with route 30, as well as
15 route 21, and we talked to staff about this as well.
16 Introducing transit along Avenue E, once it's more
17 built out, will also lend to its success.

18 And of course, there's the opportunity for
19 connection to the Boys and Girls Club, the parks that
20 exist and also the Marina Center.

21 So this is the pretty stuff and how does it
22 happen. So we put together this map that starts here
23 at the west end of -- I mean the north end of Avenue E
24 at Blue Heron and goes all the way down to 10th Street,
25 which is our boundary. It's a little less than a mile.

1 What you see on your screen is not
2 necessarily a zoning map or a future land use map, but
3 instead, a use map. And the idea is it's going to CRA
4 staff, or you as the Board meet with potential
5 investors and developers, and we recommend that you
6 follow kind of this pattern of the type of uses that
7 should go along Avenue E. And our streetscape is
8 designed to reflect this, with on-street parking,
9 roundabouts, bulb-outs and those type of things. So
10 I'm going to walk you through our streetscape. We have
11 four subareas. Just dividing makes it easier for us to
12 do the study.

13 Starting at Blue Heron and going to 22nd,
14 starting right there at Blue Heron, we think there's an
15 opportunity for a townhouse development and mixed use
16 type property. This is also where we think there's an
17 opportunity for a public-private partnership along
18 here. So when you go to our streetscape, what happens
19 here at Blue Heron is we're proposing that you do a
20 median here using the existing right-of-way. The
21 right-of-way along this area is 60 feet, and we're
22 proposing about a ten foot median. And what that does
23 is it creates an entrance feature. It says there's
24 something special in this neighborhood, as well as it
25 helps slow traffic as it comes, as traffic comes around

1 the corner.

2 As I go through the design, you'll see that
3 on most intersections we have paper crosswalks, and
4 I'll show you also how that can be implemented as we go
5 through this design.

6 The full right-of-way of 68 feet, which is
7 your widest right-of-way, takes place between 25th and
8 24th. And we believe that there's an opportunity here
9 for some street trees to be introduced, sidewalks, as
10 well as on-street parking. The same design continues
11 all the way down the street. Whenever there's an
12 opportunity to do on-street parking, we recommend it.

13 I want to point out that all of our designs
14 respect the existing single family homes along the
15 street and do not encroach onto their properties, to
16 the best of our ability, and we don't put on-street
17 parking in front of the existing single family homes.

18 So the next subarea would be between 22nd and
19 17th. You have the large house of worship that
20 currently exists over there, but we believe this is an
21 opportunity for your major commercial hub.

22 Some of the other opportunities that exist
23 here, here at 19th where you see this long green strip
24 is where the convenience store is. When we met with
25 the public, there was a lot of talk about the need for

1 a park, and we identified this as possibly an
2 opportunity for a park as opposed to introducing a
3 commercial use and backing up to the existing single
4 family homes, making this into some kind of park.

5 Over here between 19th and 17th are those
6 lots that I pointed out to you where the City owns this
7 lot, and these lots are owned by the same owner. We're
8 recommending, and you'll see it in our design, a path
9 go from Broadway to Avenue E that would then connect
10 through a bike path to the park over here so that there
11 was connectivity back to Broadway and a multiuse path.

12 So this is the streetscape of that area
13 beginning down on 22nd. Coming down the street, we
14 have the landscaping, the pavers. We also have
15 bulb-outs here which will slow down traffic. And we
16 found an opportunity -- this also came from the
17 community meeting -- to introduce a traffic circle
18 along Avenue E. Then when you come down here, this
19 property here is where we're proposing the park, so we
20 have a large bulb-out out here, and this is where we're
21 proposing the multiuse path. With the joint ownership
22 between the City and the CRA bringing a developer in,
23 it would be easier to get some kind of amenity like
24 this path done.

25 Moving on to the next block, we're

1 recommending commercial as well as opportunities for
2 mixed use or townhomes. The streetscape remains very
3 similar to what I've shown you so far, also respecting
4 those single family homes that exist, while introducing
5 the street trees and the bulb-outs and landscaping.

6 And then finally, the southern area of Avenue
7 E. As Ms. Jenkins just presented to you, over here
8 there's an opportunity, be it for commercial mixed use
9 or townhomes, as well as opportunities for commercial.
10 The only zoning change that would be required by our
11 recommendations would be between 11th and 10th. And I
12 know that the CRA staff is also studying this area. It
13 is currently zoned industrial. We don't think that is
14 the best use for there, and we are actually
15 recommending townhomes go down here as well.

16 The streetscape here has an opportunity for
17 on-street parking so that it's consistent with the
18 townhomes that you just saw that would have rear loaded
19 driveways so there would be no need for driveway cuts
20 right along this street here. We found an opportunity
21 to put in another roundabout. And the bike lanes that
22 go along Avenue E would come down 11th Street, because
23 that's where the downtown bike path ends.

24 So to go back to what the intersections might
25 look like, we talked to staff about doing pavers or

1 decorative painting in the intersections. My
2 recommendation is always to go with pavers over
3 painting -- the painting doesn't seem to last as
4 long -- and also to find opportunities for public art
5 all along Avenue E.

6 Part of our scope of work also included
7 architectural standards so that there would be a
8 consistency of architecture and the uses and it would
9 be compatible with the streetscape. All of these also
10 came out of our public outreach.

11 So the first style that we're recommending is
12 that Florida coastal style, Key West style. What you
13 have here are rear loaded townhomes. All of them are
14 designed to meet the code requirements, as well as our
15 streetscape. And then here we have a different
16 townhome product, which is actually three stories, with
17 the driveways in the front.

18 Moving on, we recommend a Mediterranean
19 revival type style for the one story commercial. Of
20 course, it can be further ornamented with awnings and
21 overhangs, but we wanted to show the architecture of
22 the building. And then finally, something like this
23 for your mixed use, where you would have residential on
24 top of commercial, or you might have offices on top of
25 commercial.

1 So to put it together, we have a video that
2 I'd like to show you. The video starts over here by
3 25th and 24th, just to give you some context. As the
4 video starts, we're looking at this intersection.

5 (Video presented.)

6 So this shows you having the wider sidewalks
7 as well as the trees, and then the pavers at the
8 crosswalks, using the existing right-of-way as well as
9 bollards that would keep people safe and the
10 introduction of bike lanes.

11 This is your more intense commercial area,
12 while respecting the existing houses of worship. All
13 along Avenue E you have houses of worship, and none of
14 them are recommended for changes, but instead we did
15 the streetscape around them.

16 We have in this area is what we call
17 bulb-outs over here, which are where the planters are
18 and the curbing goes a little more into the street.
19 It's a way to slow traffic as well as introduce more
20 green space.

21 Here's the roundabout.

22 And if you recall, I mentioned the
23 opportunity for the multiuse path. It would be coming
24 up here and connect back into Avenue E. The
25 architecture we propose, as you can see, is a lower

1 scale to respect the residential neighborhood to the
2 west. So here's where the multiuse path is that would
3 connect into the future park opportunity.

4 (End of video.)

5 So just a couple more slides. Our next steps
6 are to get feedback from City staff to finalize our
7 draft report and then also conclude with our public
8 engagement. As you can well imagine, and as you are
9 dealing with yourselves, because of the recent events,
10 public engagement has gotten a little more tricky, so
11 we're currently talking over some ideas with City staff
12 on how to proceed.

13 Our three recommendations are to delay until
14 in-person gatherings are allowed. Option two is to
15 create a project online platform and just receive
16 projects. And then -- receive comments, I'm sorry.
17 And then option three would be a little more
18 interactive, create an online interactive forum where
19 we can have a big Zoom meeting. Our company has that
20 capability. And also posting content online where we
21 would get feedback.

22 Also, we're recommending, if we went with
23 option three, to designate an outdoor venue for live
24 streaming of that Zoom event with social distancing,
25 kind of like a movie night in the park where people can

1 see the Zoom on a big screen as well as submit comments
2 and participate.

3 So that's where we are with the project. I
4 am going to exit out of screen sharing if I can. I
5 have too many screens open from this office.

6 COMMISSIONER LANIER: Madam Chair.

7 CHAIR BOTEL: You're recognized.

8 COMMISSIONER LANIER: I just wanted to ask
9 one question, Madam Chair.

10 CHAIR BOTEL: KaShamba had her hand first,
11 please. Ms. Miller-Anderson.

12 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: Well, I
13 certainly love the project, the way that it could
14 potentially look, particularly the way in which it
15 currently looks. I know for a number of years we
16 talked about trying to do the roads, and we haven't
17 really gotten very far with any of the progress that,
18 you know, many of the Council over the years have
19 wanted to see happen.

20 So I'm just excited to see this, and I would
21 like to try to do whatever we can to make sure that
22 this comes to fruition, and I look forward to the next
23 phase of it.

24 I know when we had the community meeting, a
25 lot of people attended and they really took their time

1 and put forth an effort in giving their suggestions on
2 what they wanted to see. And so I hope that we're able
3 to capture all of the great ideas that they had and be
4 able to make this happen, because, you know, we have a
5 lot of, not just on Avenue E, I mean within the area,
6 which is where I live, it's just a lot of vacant
7 property, vacant land. We just really need something
8 to spur that area and get it going, and I think this
9 would be the great focal point to make that happen. So
10 I'm very happy to see the project and would like to
11 make sure that we can do whatever we can to move it
12 along. Thank you.

13 CHAIR BOTTEL: Thank you.

14 Ms. Lanier.

15 COMMISSIONER LANIER: No, I just wanted to
16 have one question, and maybe Mrs. Siegel and I can talk
17 off-line. But I'm very interested in your public
18 engagement process. And I know that it's going to be
19 very difficult, even in the next six months, about how
20 are you going to engage people, especially when you're
21 trying to engage people, you know, that may not have
22 access to internet or may not be able to meet in
23 person.

24 So I really would like to talk to you
25 off-line about how you guys envision that, in terms of

1 I saw your different options, but to really try and get
2 to the nitty-gritty of getting people in that
3 neighborhood engaged, and I would really like to hear
4 some of your thoughts on that. Now, we could take that
5 off-line though.

6 MS. SIEGEL: Yes, ma'am.

7 CHAIR BOTTEL: Anyone else? Mr. Lawson.

8 VICE CHAIR LAWSON: Thank you, Madam Chair.

9 Miss Heidi, thank you so much. I saw a lot
10 of the feedback from the community charrette that was
11 hosted and your actual presentation. So it was
12 amazing.

13 I have a question in reference to the
14 densities on Avenue E. I saw that a lot of the stories
15 that we were looking at was three to four with heights.
16 Would we be interested in going any higher on Avenue E
17 since that's something that we've talked about with
18 increasing heights on Broadway?

19 And that was a question more so for my
20 colleagues versus Miss Heidi.

21 CHAIR BOTTEL: Oh, I'm sorry, I thought it was
22 for --

23 VICE CHAIR LAWSON: That was for the Board,
24 because Heidi's just probably going to go with our
25 recommendation. So I'm sorry, Ms. Siegel. So she'll

1 probably just go with our recommendation versus --
2 whatever we tell her to go.

3 So my question is for the Board. Being that
4 we've talked about densities, attracting more business
5 and bringing some -- a different look to that Broadway,
6 that Avenue E corridor, what would our thoughts be on
7 increasing those densities down there?

8 CHAIR BOTEL: Anyone? Ms. Miller-Anderson.

9 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: I don't --

10 VICE CHAIR LAWSON: I know it's at 11:00,
11 so --

12 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: Yes, the
13 juices are not flowing. That is certainly something I
14 can put in my head and think about, but right now, you
15 know, I want to -- it's more than zero right now. So
16 any addition is good. In terms of how many we'd want
17 to go, I can't put a number on it right now.

18 VICE CHAIR LAWSON: What is the height? And
19 Ms. Siegel, what is the height restriction right now,
20 or Ms. Miller-Anderson?

21 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: I believe it's
22 five.

23 MS. SIEGEL: I think five happens with some
24 extra bonus type activity, but it's generally three and
25 four along the corridor.

1 CHAIR BOTEL: Well, it's something we can
2 take a look at, and maybe some other night we can look
3 at it.

4 But I think you've done an excellent job,
5 Ms. Siegel. I was also at the community meetings, and
6 you incorporated much of what the community discussed
7 on the evenings that you had them.

8 So if there are no other comments, we'll
9 move -- thank you for your time this evening. I know
10 it's late, and we appreciate your hanging in there with
11 us.

12 COMMISSIONER LANIER: Yes, a very good
13 presentation.

14 CHAIR BOTEL: We only have one more item. So
15 thank you so much. We appreciate it.

16 Moving along to the last item, Madam Clerk.

17 THE CLERK: A resolution of the Board of
18 Commissioners of the Riviera Beach Community
19 Redevelopment Agency approving and authorizing the
20 transfer of funds in the amount of \$125,000 from
21 property acquisition to the 2020 CRA economic
22 development initiatives for participation in the City
23 of Riviera Beach economic recovery plan, providing an
24 effective date.

25 The acceptance of public comment cards is now

1 closed.

2 COMMISSIONER LANIER: So moved.

3 CHAIR BOTEL: Is there a second?

4 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: Second.

5 CHAIR BOTEL: Thank you.

6 Ms. Jenkins.

7 MS. JENKINS: Yes, very briefly, we're asking
8 for support for an allocation of \$125,000, to be
9 matched with 50,000 from the City for the economic
10 recovery initiative. I believe you all heard a
11 presentation from the City Manager on that last week.
12 And this would allow us to assist from 30 to 35 small
13 businesses immediately for up to \$5,000 during the
14 COVID emergency. We would be utilizing a streamlined
15 process.

16 And thank you, Commission Lanier, for
17 providing information and direction for a similar
18 program that's getting attention around the state from
19 the City of Boynton, where they were able to approve a
20 program and to turn it around within days and had
21 checks in the hands of the small businesses. So I'll
22 stop there and see if there are any questions.

23 Oh, and just one more thing. The dollars
24 would come from our property acquisition line item
25 where we currently have \$300,000, and it would leave a

1 balance of \$175,000. So we do have money to allocate
2 for this new initiative.

3 CHAIR BOTEL: Ms. Jenkins, I have a question.
4 You're asking for a \$50,000 contribution from the City
5 over and above what the City has already allocated
6 for --

7 MS. JENKINS: No, no, no. I believe this is
8 the amount that the City had proposed. I know that
9 Mr. Evans was in conversation and discussions, and this
10 is a coordinated program with the one that you've heard
11 from the City side.

12 CHAIR BOTEL: Okay, thank you.
13 Any questions from my colleagues?
14 Ms. Lanier.

15 COMMISSIONER LANIER: No, I just wanted to
16 say this was a, as Ms. Jenkins said, this was a program
17 that was put together by the City of Boynton and the
18 City of Boynton CRA. And they were looking at the fact
19 that there are a lot of the businesses in our city that
20 are really, really hurting. And as you know, the
21 federal government statistics, 80, 90 percent of the
22 funding did not come to small businesses, it came to
23 corporations.

24 So we were looking at some type of, you know,
25 we can't do a whole lot, but some type of small relief

1 for our businesses in the city, for them to be able
2 to -- you know, I think the three major categories are
3 payroll, utilities and -- I forgot the other one.

4 MS. JENKINS: Inventory.

5 COMMISSIONER LANIER: Inventory. So we want
6 to be able to do our part. You know, we have these
7 seminars and webinars on the Paycheck Protection
8 Program, on COVID-19, the Care Act Recovery Program,
9 but none of that money is coming to our businesses here
10 at the city of Riviera Beach, and we want to be able to
11 do something on our part to be able to at least provide
12 them with some assistance. But the program that the
13 Boynton Beach CRA and Commission did is something that
14 has been replicated across the state.

15 CHAIR BOTEL: I'm so glad you provided that
16 as an example. I think it's an excellent example, and
17 I, for one, would support this.

18 I'd like to ask Mr. McCoy's opinion, because
19 he's the purveyor of all things small business with
20 regard to our assignments for economic recovery. So
21 Mr. McCoy.

22 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Thank you, Madam Chair.

23 So I'm a little bit confused, because I see
24 conflicting information in the resolution and also in
25 the memo from Mr. Evans. And let me preface that by

1 saying Mr. Scott Evans.

2 So Ms. Jenkins, it is 125 instead of 100,
3 because I see 100.

4 MS. JENKINS: I confirmed it. It's 125,000.
5 The 100,000 is a typo. That was the initial amount
6 that they started with, but it's 125.

7 COMMISSIONER McCOY: And I don't think we've
8 had this discussion about the City putting \$50,000 into
9 this program. Is this something that occurred
10 administratively? Like how does this happen, because I
11 thought we did 125 for the entire economic recovery
12 initiative and allocated 25 over each department. So
13 is this something different?

14 MS. JENKINS: I don't want to misspeak,
15 Commissioner.

16 COMMISSIONER LANIER: No, no, if I may say;
17 yes, if I may say, Mr. McCoy, these are two different
18 initiatives. Now, the initiative that we had
19 originally with our recovery plan, that had five, or I
20 think it was about five different types of categories,
21 health and human services, small business, public --
22 all of that.

23 This is something totally different from this
24 particular project, because this project is gunning
25 towards small businesses in the city, to give them a

1 direct benefit to be able to keep them going and to be
2 able to keep them, you know, at least here in the city
3 of Riviera Beach and not have to close.

4 Now, we cannot -- the City of Boynton
5 actually supplied their small businesses with, you
6 know, 10,000 apiece. And they said that within the
7 first 24 hours they had, you know, 100 applications.
8 They put in \$500,000 for this particular program.

9 But we know that we already had this other
10 recovery piece that's already happening, so we didn't
11 want to be a -- we didn't want to go in and say we can
12 put in 500,000 because we just can't afford that. But
13 we did want to do something and piggyback off of a lot
14 of the other municipalities and making sure that the
15 businesses in the city are recognized and also are
16 given some type of incentive to stay open.

17 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Okay, so let me follow
18 up to ask, and I don't know who is this question for,
19 but let me restate. Where does the \$50,000 come from,
20 because this is not something that we've discussed as a
21 City Council. So unless you're privy to something that
22 we aren't aware of, you keep referring to we, and I'm
23 trying to understand what that means. So like can you
24 tell me what that means?

25 COMMISSIONER LANIER: It's that this

1 particular \$50,000 would be coming to our Council
2 meeting on Wednesday.

3 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Okay, so --

4 COMMISSIONER LANIER: This was something
5 that --

6 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Okay, that's all I
7 wanted to find out, because here's why. So I want to
8 go back to Ms. Jenkins. So we are being asked to vote
9 on a \$125,000 contribution to the City's fund, or is
10 this something that's going to be administered by the
11 CRA, because when looking at the memo, there's not much
12 clarity. And it refers to Boynton Beach CRA is doing
13 this program. So is it Rivera Beach CRA doing the
14 program or the City of Riviera Beach going to be
15 administering it?

16 MS. JENKINS: From what I understand,
17 Commissioner McCoy, it would be the City's program, and
18 this is a contribution from the CRA. And because the
19 City and the CRA are participating, it will be a
20 program that's available citywide.

21 MR. HAYGOOD: We can't do that, no.

22 COMMISSIONER McCOY: That's exactly why I was
23 asking that question.

24 MR. HAYGOOD: Yes.

25 COMMISSIONER McCOY: So if this is

1 sponsorship, that's one thing. If it's a donation,
2 that's one thing. Because if we donated, Mr. Haygood,
3 then once we transferred the money, we don't have any
4 control or have any stipulation as to how it has to be
5 spent. So I want to make sure it's clear, because
6 there's a lot of conflicting information in here. And
7 not that I want to stop this, but --

8 MR. HAYGOOD: As I understood it, the CRA
9 moneys would be restricted to businesses within the
10 CRA. And I guess the other moneys that the City would
11 administer would be citywide.

12 MS. JENKINS: But it would be --

13 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: Madam Chair.

14 CHAIR BOTEL: Ms. Miller-Anderson.

15 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: Jenkins can
16 finish what she was saying.

17 CHAIR BOTEL: Go ahead.

18 MS. JENKINS: I understood that we were
19 supporting the City program. How it's structured, I
20 wasn't part of the discussions. But it wouldn't be two
21 separate programs that we would be running; it would be
22 one initiative.

23 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: So Madam
24 Chair.

25 COMMISSIONER LANIER: And we know that we

1 cannot use CRA money to be able to do anything with the
2 City. The purpose of it was the fact that because we
3 were asking the CRA, we did not want to limit it just
4 to the businesses in the CRA. We wanted to go
5 citywide. So that's the reason why there was
6 conversation between the CRA and the City about their
7 part in it, because we did not want to just limit it to
8 businesses in the CRA.

9 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: Madam Chair.

10 MS. JENKINS: Exactly.

11 CHAIR BOTEL: Ms. Miller-Anderson, and then I
12 have a question for Mr. Haygood. Go ahead.

13 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: So for this
14 particular -- I understood it to be the 125 is what we
15 were being asked for, and that was to be just for the
16 CRA businesses. I don't know anything about the
17 50,000.

18 Now, I do know on the City side we talked
19 about the recovery, this recovery plan with those
20 categories, and each one of them have 25,000 per
21 category. But I never understood it to join together
22 with the CRA. And like Mr. McCoy said, we have not
23 discussed this 50,000 situation. I'm not comfortable
24 with combining them. And the other thing is have the
25 two attorneys on City and CRA side discussed this or

1 aware of it, because Mr. Haygood sounds like he just
2 heard about it just now.

3 MR. HAYGOOD: Well, I knew that there was a
4 suggestion that we, that the CRA at least would
5 institute something similar to the Boynton Beach
6 program. And I understood that the City was going to
7 use some funds for businesses outside of the CRA on a
8 similar basis. I have not discussed it with the City
9 Attorney, though I have discussed it with Boynton Beach
10 CRA Attorney.

11 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: So my next
12 question is too when these items, like on the City
13 side, you know, through Novus they have to -- finance
14 has to sign off on it, an attorney has to sign off on
15 it. Do you not have to sign off on these things before
16 they're posted to the agenda, Mr. Haygood?

17 MR. HAYGOOD: I think this was done rather
18 recently. I think it was done like either on Monday or
19 Tuesday. So other than the fact that it was --

20 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Was it today?

21 MR. HAYGOOD: I'm sorry?

22 COMMISSIONER McCOY: It was done today?

23 MR. HAYGOOD: Yes. Other than conceptually,
24 conceptually that you're going to use CRA funds to
25 attempt to help businesses that were having trouble

1 because of the pandemic. That was really the issue
2 that I had.

3 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: So I mean this
4 is not an issue that we could fix tonight, but I'm
5 thinking going forward you need to sign off on what
6 this item is all about before it comes to the agenda,
7 just so we're clear and not hearing -- figuring out
8 that this is kind of a conflict.

9 And then I mean I'm not comfortable with
10 doing anything tied up with the City tonight if we
11 haven't discussed it already. As I understood it, the
12 125 may be to be for this is in CRA, but that's it. So
13 that's where I am.

14 COMMISSIONER LANIER: I think, Madam Chair, I
15 wanted to be clear that it was not about the City
16 tonight. The City just -- we talked to the City, we
17 meaning the CRA talked with the City about this
18 endeavor, and the City said it sounds like a good idea.
19 The CRA said, listen, we can only fund what's in our
20 CRA District. We can't do anything outside of that
21 district. The City said that's a very good idea, we
22 can do something to at least assist with businesses who
23 are not in the CRA District. It was just a good faith
24 effort from the City to say we support this.

25 CHAIR BOTTEL: Okay, it seems to me that if we

1 struck the last part of this resolution and let it only
2 read that we would -- willing to transfer the funds of
3 125,000 from property acquisition to the 2020 CRA
4 economic development initiatives, and strike for
5 participation in the City of Riviera Beach economic
6 recovery plan, that we could go ahead and ensure that
7 all of the funding would be spent on CRA businesses.

8 Ms. Miller-Anderson, and then --

9 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: So, I mean
10 unless I'm missing, what are the 2020 CRA economic
11 development initiatives? Have I missed that? What is
12 that?

13 CHAIR BOTEL: It sounds like --

14 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: What are they?

15 CHAIR BOTEL: -- that would be the Boynton
16 Beach model. Am I right, Ms. --

17 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: Yes, but
18 that's what I'm saying. It should be clear what we're
19 talking about, not guessing. I mean I know that the
20 City has an initiative going on, but do we -- have we
21 identified what that economic development initiative is
22 on the CRA side?

23 MS. JENKINS: For COVID, nothing that
24 pertains to grants or donations, you just approve some
25 relief to the businesses at the Marina. That will come

1 under that umbrella. And we wanted to take in some
2 training sessions to help with recovery. But there are
3 no financial programs beyond that.

4 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: Because of
5 the -- I mean the memo says one thing, and then we have
6 the resolution saying another. I remember a few weeks
7 back on the City Council update meeting, not a meeting,
8 but an update that we had one night is when this was
9 brought up, that we wanted to use the 125 to match what
10 the City was doing in terms of the recovery plan. And
11 I remember that coming up. But we never had much more
12 of a discussion about what that would look like on the
13 CRA side.

14 So I thought with this memo here, it's sort
15 of kind of explaining what we were going to do, but I
16 thought it was -- it seems like it turned into
17 something else. So I'm just a little -- I mean I would
18 love to provide that, but I just think right now it's
19 just a whole lot of confusion, for me anyway. Maybe
20 I'm misunderstanding.

21 CHAIR BOTEL: Mr. McCoy.

22 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Well, you know, I'm
23 confused too. And by no means am I suggesting that we
24 shouldn't do it. But I'm okay with the CRA doing their
25 own thing, and if the City decides to do something in

1 that realm, then the City can, you know, we can work to
2 find the funding for it.

3 But, you know, one of the things that I see
4 in the memo that I really would like both to adopt
5 regardless of how we go, there was a vision that spoke
6 of, obviously, payroll, utilities and inventory.

7 I would want payroll and utilities to be a
8 requirement, because, you know, what's so crazy about
9 this, I thought I was really behind because somebody
10 asked me, a resident from the community asked me today
11 about the grants and the loans. And I'm saying to
12 myself, how could you possibly tell me about something
13 that I haven't even heard about? And when I looked at
14 the agenda today, clearly, we saw it on the agenda. So
15 this has been the desire of somebody or some
16 individuals to do this.

17 However, here's my concern. There's not
18 going to be any fly-by-nights pulling up in the city of
19 Riviera Beach who don't have a utility bill. First of
20 all, you need to have an actual, physical location in
21 the city, regardless of whether the CRA is
22 administering it or the City's administering it.

23 I just don't want a popup shop or somebody
24 that leases space that doesn't have the responsibility
25 of somebody that has a vested tax bill every year, that

1 has a monthly recurring water bill to be able to take
2 City money, because literally, it won't be hard to make
3 a case to try to come back and say the \$5,000 should be
4 forgiven.

5 And I really want to give it to people that
6 have a regular, recurring business tax receipt and a
7 utility bill, because I can see that this is going to
8 be a program, and unless it's properly managed, then
9 somebody's going to use it as some leverage to take
10 advantage of the whole process.

11 And really, truly I think what we did to help
12 those businesses down at the Marina Event Center is
13 what we really need to support and not just trying to
14 give somebody a few extra bucks in their pocket just
15 because the program exists.

16 And you know, whatever we decide, I'm
17 supporting it, but I think that there needs to be some
18 clarity as to who's administering it, what is the
19 parameters and the eligibility and that sort of thing.
20 But certainly I'm going to support it regardless. I
21 just want to make sure that we're clear on who receives
22 this money or who's eligible to apply.

23 CHAIR BOTEL: No Shape Shacks.

24 COMMISSIONER LANIER: No, I totally agree
25 with that. I totally agree with the fact that one of

1 the conversations that was had with the Boynton Beach
2 CRA was the fact that they were very, very careful in
3 their eligibility requirements. They wanted to make
4 sure that those people who were getting the funding
5 were not just somebody who set up a business six months
6 ago, they were people who had a vested interest in the
7 city. So I definitely understand that, and if that's
8 what we need to do, then that's what we need to do.

9 CHAIR BOTEL: Ms. Miller-Anderson.

10 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: Can we get --
11 do we have one of these with our name on it? Why isn't
12 it done where we have our own wording for forgivable
13 loan instead of having the one from Boynton here?

14 CHAIR BOTEL: I would like to see somebody
15 put together a real Riviera Beach CRA version of the
16 Boynton --

17 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: Yes.

18 CHAIR BOTEL: -- so that we know exactly what
19 it -- I mean I think we're all in agreement that we
20 want this --

21 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: Right.

22 CHAIR BOTEL: -- money earmarked to help
23 businesses.

24 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: Yes.

25 CHAIR BOTEL: That's a given.

1 MS. JENKINS: It would definitely be branded
2 as Riviera Beach CRA District businesses. So we'd make
3 sure that the application and whatever marketing we use
4 to get the word out would definitely say all of that.
5 We just wanted to give you an example of a best
6 practice.

7 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: But for me,
8 I'm not comfortable with voting on this tonight without
9 having all of this stuff lining up. I mean I felt like
10 all that should be together; everything should have
11 been in line if you're asking us to do this tonight. I
12 mean I want to do it, but --

13 MS. JENKINS: We can bring it back; we can
14 bring it back with --

15 COMMISSIONER LANIER: I totally agree.

16 CHAIR BOTEL: I think we all want to, but we
17 want some clarity about what the "it" is so that we
18 know exactly what we're putting \$125,000 behind. So if
19 you can come back to us as soon as possible --

20 MS. JENKINS: Yes, we can.

21 CHAIR BOTEL: -- with a fleshed out thing.
22 And then we would also have time -- this is a surprise.
23 The 50,000 is a total surprise to us, you know, in
24 terms of the City's contribution, not that we are
25 opposed, but we haven't had a chance to digest this

1 yet. And we need to be able to, you know, take a good,
2 big bite out of this idea, and you know, run it around
3 in our heads for a few minutes before we make a vote on
4 it. So let's --

5 COMMISSIONER LANIER: So can I make a motion
6 to bring this back at our next --

7 CHAIR BOTEL: Yes.

8 COMMISSIONER McCOY: I wanted to add
9 something before we make a motion.

10 CHAIR BOTEL: You're recognized.

11 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Well, here's the
12 problem. I mean we got to remember why we're doing it.
13 And I certainly, you know, I couldn't agree more with
14 Commissioner Miller-Anderson. But paragraph three
15 says: The program provides immediate loans to small
16 businesses.

17 I don't want this to get tied up in the
18 bureaucracy of waiting another two weeks, because
19 literally, I'll tell you what I've seen already, that
20 folks have had to shutter their doors because they
21 don't have a foreseeable future on when they're going
22 to open back up. For instance, barber shops, massage
23 parlors, nail salons literally have to now, just this
24 Monday, work under some conditions that we haven't even
25 accounted for as a community, which completely impacts

1 us.

2 I don't want -- I mean if we're going to call
3 a special meeting, and I don't know if we've already
4 decided on that, this is something I believe is very
5 technical that can be corrected in no time, that we do
6 correct it. But I don't want them to wait for two
7 weeks, because I mean really, do we know where we're
8 going in two weeks or what the current situation will
9 be? So I just want to keep that on the members' mind
10 when we have this discussion and make a vote.

11 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: Madam Chair.

12 CHAIR BOTEL: Miller-Anderson.

13 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: I mean I think
14 we kind of agree to bring that CRA executive one back
15 for next week, I believe, if I'm not mistaken. So we
16 can very well put it on there. But I am -- I want to
17 support, but this stuff, for me, needs to be together.
18 I'm not comfortable with just voting on it based on
19 what it says another city is doing. I want to see
20 exactly what it says for me. That's just me. And I
21 mean we can vote, but I'm telling you where I am with
22 it.

23 COMMISSIONER McCOY: But can I ask this
24 question? So who from the CRA side has had
25 conversation with the City side? Because one of the

1 important questions that we have to ask is who's
2 administering this from the City.

3 CHAIR BOTEL: We know --

4 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Who would be the person
5 or department that's going to be administering this
6 program from the City? Is anyone, Mr. Haygood?

7 COMMISSIONER LANIER: I don't -- the thing
8 about it is that our conversation is not about what the
9 City is going to do. Our conversation tonight is about
10 that's why we wanted to strike out that part that
11 talked about the City. We're not -- I don't want to
12 get into what the City is going to do. I just wanted
13 to have a --

14 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Absolutely.

15 COMMISSIONER LANIER: -- conversation.

16 COMMISSIONER McCOY: What, us give money
17 blindly without knowing who's going to administer it?

18 COMMISSIONER LANIER: No, we're having a
19 conversation about the CRA money tonight.

20 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Right, but --

21 COMMISSIONER LANIER: At our CRA meeting.

22 COMMISSIONER McCOY: But if I'm not mistaken,
23 isn't the auspices of this resolution is for us to give
24 money to a City fund, to be administered --

25 COMMISSIONER LANIER: No.

1 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Yes.

2 CHAIR BOTEL: No, I think --

3 COMMISSIONER LANIER: No.

4 CHAIR BOTEL: I think we've clarified,
5 Mr. McCoy, that the CRA cannot give money to the City.
6 The CRA --

7 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Even if it's CRA
8 businesses. So are we saying the CRA is going to
9 administer this?

10 COMMISSIONER LANIER: Yes.

11 CHAIR BOTEL: I think the CRA has to
12 administer it.

13 Mr. Haygood, if you would weigh in on that.
14 I think Mr. Haygood was mentioning that the CRA can't
15 give money to anything that the City would do because
16 there might be other city businesses involved. This
17 would only be CRA businesses. Am I right, Mr. Haygood?

18 MR. HAYGOOD: Well, that's not quite true.
19 We could always do it in local, and the City could be
20 restricted to just using the money --

21 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Right.

22 MR. HAYGOOD: -- the CRA money that's in the
23 CRA area. So that's not the point. But I think the
24 point is we need to bring something back to you showing
25 you that this is a CRA program and how it's going to be

1 administered. So that's what we'll do, we'll bring it
2 back at your special meeting.

3 CHAIR BOTEL: By Wednesday. It's not that
4 much longer.

5 Mr. McCoy.

6 COMMISSIONER McCOY: But --

7 COMMISSIONER LANIER: And plus, we don't want
8 the businesses to suffer.

9 COMMISSIONER McCOY: But if that's true,
10 Mr. Haygood and members of the CRA Commission, then do
11 we really need to send this money to the City? If
12 there's going to be a restriction like that, then why
13 don't we allow the CRA to administer this so that we
14 don't get caught up in the bureaucracy?

15 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: I thought the
16 CRA was doing it. I wasn't aware that the --

17 COMMISSIONER LANIER: The CRA is doing it.

18 COMMISSIONER McCOY: But that -- no, not if
19 you look at the memo --

20 MR. HAYGOOD: Commissioner McCoy --

21 COMMISSIONER McCOY: -- because it clearly
22 says --

23 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: That's exactly
24 why it needs to come back.

25 MR. HAYGOOD: It was structured where it is

1 just a CRA program for the CRA funds within the CRA
2 area.

3 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Okay, but who's going to
4 administer it is still the question that remains. Is
5 it going to be administered by the CRA, or is it going
6 to be administered by the City? And we need
7 (inaudible) because there's clearly a conflict.

8 MR. HAYGOOD: Yes, sir. I don't know about
9 the administration, but it appears to me that the Board
10 is saying they want the CRA to administer money within
11 the CRA area. That's what will be done.

12 CHAIR BOTTEL: Okay.

13 COMMISSIONER McCOY: I'm okay with that.

14 VICE CHAIR LAWSON: Madam Chair.

15 CHAIR BOTTEL: Mr. Lawson.

16 VICE CHAIR LAWSON: Madam Chair, thank you.

17 And I think the confusion, because I was
18 confused as well, says in the resolution that it was
19 participate in the City of Riviera Beach economic
20 recovery plan. And from my understanding, that
21 couldn't work.

22 I think, as Ms. Miller-Anderson stated, that
23 if this can come back next week, Wednesday, prior to
24 the meeting, and we give some feedback to Mr. Haygood,
25 we make sure it's structured properly, that we can have

1 this on the agenda for next week. We could vote it and
2 get applications out to the businesses by Thursday,
3 because we really have to get moving on this because
4 these businesses are in desperate need of this money.

5 A lot of the businesses are not receiving the
6 PPP loans and the funding that's coming down from the
7 Federal government, so we want to get this going
8 immediately. So I think next week if we can have it
9 administered as a CRA item, exclusively run and managed
10 by the CRA so that we get applications to the
11 businesses next week, I think that's the best bet.

12 CHAIR BOTEL: Thank you. I think I'm hearing
13 consensus to that. So Mr. Haygood, if you would --

14 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Not necessarily, Madam
15 Chair. The question is if we don't have to deal with
16 the City, we can appropriate this. Instead of putting
17 it in the City's COVID economic recovery, we could put
18 it in the CRA recovery and have staff to send back a
19 memo outlining what that looks like in the
20 administration of this program along with the
21 application so it doesn't have to come back to us.

22 Because really, I'm trying to shorten the
23 time that we have to take. For us to see another item
24 again, we've already established that this is something
25 that the CRA has to do within their district. Let's

1 not, you know, make it more arduous on
2 administration --

3 COMMISSIONER LANIER: Madam Chair.

4 COMMISSIONER McCOY: -- as well as those
5 that's going to apply, because I tell you, it's going
6 to start as soon as we hang up this meeting, folks are
7 going to be interested in applying.

8 CHAIR BOTEL: Ms. Lanier --

9 COMMISSIONER LANIER: Madam Chair.

10 CHAIR BOTEL: Ms. Lanier and then
11 Ms. Miller-Anderson.

12 COMMISSIONER LANIER: I'd like to make a
13 motion that we move forward with this item, that it is
14 in the sole purview of the CRA to administer these
15 funds. They will bring it back to us before this hits
16 the streets, so to speak, that it is a CRA administered
17 program and that they have eligibility criteria and
18 that it is something that is in the house of the CRA.

19 CHAIR BOTEL: Okay. So basically, it's the
20 agenda item as written, with the change that the end of
21 it would say: Transfer of funds in the amount of
22 \$125,000 from property acquisition to the -- to a CRA
23 project to be outlined by the time we meet next, right?
24 And we're leaving it in the hands of the CRA
25 administration to come back to us with the appropriate

1 language and so on. But for tonight's purposes, we're
2 just approving the transfer of the 125, the allocation.
3 Okay, do we have a second?

4 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Second.

5 CHAIR BOTEL: Madam Clerk.

6 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: Madam Chair.

7 CHAIR BOTEL: Yes, Miller-Anderson.

8 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: Before we go
9 into that, I want to be very clear. I support doing
10 this, but I do not feel comfortable with the fact that
11 we have information that we were given and it does not
12 match up with what we are talking about. Nobody even
13 understood what we were doing a few minutes ago.

14 And I'm not trying to withhold anything from
15 any small businesses, but we need to get our act
16 together if we need to be able to make some decisions.
17 We can't come here with confusing documentation. And
18 we just had this conversation a couple weeks back at a
19 few meetings. So I mean this is basically what we're
20 doing now is having conflicting information. I'm not
21 trying to slow the process, but I just can't support
22 doing something blindly.

23 COMMISSIONER LANIER: I agree; I agree,
24 KaShamba. I mean I agree with the fact that this is
25 the issue that we've had time and time and time again.

1 There are things that come to the CRA that are
2 confusing, that there is no backup. I totally get it,
3 I really do. But I just don't want to slow down --

4 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: I just wanted
5 to put that on the record.

6 COMMISSIONER LANIER: -- the businesses
7 getting the funding.

8 CHAIR BOTEL: Understood; understood. So can
9 we have a roll call?

10 THE CLERK: Commissioner McCoy.

11 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Yes.

12 THE CLERK: Commissioner Lanier.

13 COMMISSIONER LANIER: Yes.

14 THE CLERK: Commissioner Miller-Anderson.

15 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: No.

16 THE CLERK: Vice Chair Lawson.

17 VICE CHAIR LAWSON: No.

18 THE CLERK: Chair Botel.

19 CHAIR BOTEL: Yes.

20 THE CLERK: That motion carries, with
21 Commissioner Miller-Anderson and Vice Chair Lawson
22 dissenting.

23 CHAIR BOTEL: So to be clear, we're going to
24 get something very definitive about what the CRA is
25 going to do at our next meeting, but we at least have

1 taken the first step in allocating the funding and
2 moving it from one account to another.

3 MS. JENKINS: Yes, we'll bring a complete
4 packet back to you next Wednesday.

5 CHAIR BOTEL: Okay, thank you. Okay.

6 COMMISSIONER McCOY: So we're clear, has the
7 meeting been set for next Wednesday, and do we need to
8 modify the special meeting now that this item has been
9 approved?

10 CHAIR BOTEL: Mr. Haygood needs to take care
11 of adding this.

12 Somebody's sound is still on. It's annoying.
13 Mr. Haygood is going to take care of --

14 COMMISSIONER LANIER: That's Mr. Lawson.

15 COMMISSIONER McCOY: Yes, Mr. Lawson, the
16 gentleman from the fifth district.

17 CHAIR BOTEL: Yes. Mr. Haygood is going to
18 take care of everything (inaudible) that Mr. Haygood,
19 yes? You'll take care of it?

20 MR. HAYGOOD: Yes, ma'am.

21 CHAIR BOTEL: Thank you very much.

22 MR. HAYGOOD: So --

23 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: Madam Chair.

24 CHAIR BOTEL: Yes.

25 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: Madam Chair.

1 So can somebody just explain to me what we just did?
2 We just voted on it, but we're still bringing it to the
3 meeting next week? Well, why did we vote tonight.

4 MR. HAYGOOD: I thought it was just the
5 allocation.

6 CHAIR BOTEL: Just to put the allocation --

7 MR. HAYGOOD: I thought you were just
8 allocating the monies --

9 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: But are we
10 going to disburse it? Are we dispensing the money?

11 MR. HAYGOOD: No. No, ma'am, not until you
12 get the --

13 CHAIR BOTEL: Not until he brings us --

14 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: Well, why
15 couldn't we do that next week? Just help me
16 understanding it. Okay, thank you.

17 CHAIR BOTEL: Point taken. Let's see, we
18 are --

19 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: We are at
20 11:35.

21 CHAIR BOTEL: I know. We're going to do --
22 we're going to be very quick with this. A report of
23 the Executive Director. I'm sure Ms. Jenkins will say
24 she passes.

25 MS. JENKINS: I pass. And I just would

1 encourage everyone to attend our webinar on Monday, the
2 public.

3 CHAIR BOTEL: Thank you. A report from
4 general counsel, Mr. -- where'd he go? Report from
5 counsel.

6 MR. HAYGOOD: I would like to get some
7 clarification exactly, much like Commissioner McCoy.
8 So I thought there was going to -- this is going to be
9 for your next Wednesday before your City Council
10 meeting you're going to address these two items --

11 CHAIR BOTEL: Yes.

12 MR. HAYGOOD: -- one being the executive
13 director search, the information you asked me to bring
14 back.

15 CHAIR BOTEL: Yes.

16 MR. HAYGOOD: And number two is going to be
17 the pandemic relief fund?

18 CHAIR BOTEL: Yes. Yes, those two items.

19 MR. HAYGOOD: So typically you would get
20 this, we would try to get it to you like today, but
21 that's not going to happen. So we'll try to get it out
22 to you by Friday.

23 CHAIR BOTEL: Okay. Thank you. Appreciate
24 it.

25 Report -- let's see, discussions by the

1 Board. We'll start with Mr. McCoy. Nothing. Thank
2 you.

3 Ms. Lanier.

4 COMMISSIONER LANIER: I have nothing.

5 CHAIR BOTEL: Thank you.

6 Ms. Miller-Anderson.

7 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: I only wanted
8 to say I know I keep harping about the three people
9 being visible. I totally understand the need to leave,
10 but I just want to help us remember if we were in the
11 chambers, we would not all leave the dais without
12 having three people. I'm not saying we can't go,
13 because you know I'm the first one to get up and go.

14 All I'm asking is that we make sure we look
15 to see that there are three people left if you're going
16 to leave off. I understand that Walter has it set up
17 that there's only active cameras being shown, but I
18 just don't want us to be in a position. And the
19 Governor's order did not waive the fact that you have
20 to have a quorum. You've still got to have a quorum.

21 COMMISSIONER McCOY: He did. He did, in
22 fact.

23 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: You've got to
24 have a quorum. It says present; it says present. And
25 I have it up here. It said it waived it for you to

1 have a quorum in a -- to be physically present,
2 basically, is what he's saying. You've still got to
3 have a quorum.

4 COMMISSIONER McCOY: But I'm here. My
5 camera's just not on.

6 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: So how do we
7 know you're there? You might just be signed in and not
8 there. That's what I'm saying; that's all I'm saying.
9 And it's for everybody's protection. I may be being
10 anal about this situation, but I just don't -- it's
11 unchartered territory, and I just don't want to be, I
12 just don't want to be --

13 COMMISSIONER McCOY: I'm not (inaudible) all
14 night. This has already (inaudible).

15 COMMISSIONER LANIER: There's a chat on the
16 side over here that if we want to say that we're going
17 to step away for ten minutes, you can just put it in
18 the chat box and everybody knows.

19 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: No. No, we
20 don't need to do that. We just look and see have we
21 got three people there, then feel free to leave. But
22 if you've got to go, just look and see if you've got
23 three. That's all I'm saying.

24 CHAIR BOTEL: Thank you.

25 COMMISSIONER MILLER-ANDERSON: I mean that's

1 all I'm saying. Just I don't want to be the example,
2 that's all.

3 CHAIR BOTTEL: Thank you.

4 Mr. Lawson, anything for the good of the
5 order?

6 COMMISSIONER McCOY: He doesn't have
7 anything.

8 VICE CHAIR LAWSON: Thank you.

9 COMMISSIONER McCOY: I'm sure he doesn't have
10 nothing to say.

11 VICE CHAIR LAWSON: Thank you, Madam Chair, I
12 appreciate it. I was going to ask that all my
13 colleagues, tomorrow we're going to be hosting a
14 community conversation called The Bridge. It's going
15 to be immediately after the City call that we do every
16 Thursday. It's called The Bridge. It's going to be
17 for concerned residents that have been expressing their
18 issues and concerns with the crime that's in our
19 community, with the divide in our community, with the
20 lack of support between residents and leadership and
21 police force.

22 So I reached out to all -- I'm reaching out
23 to my colleagues now to see if they have anyone in
24 their district interested in sitting on the task force
25 that's going to be community led and community driven.

1 Mr. Dave Barry and Burgess is going to be on the call.
2 Senator Bobby Powell and Chief Osgood and Mr. Jonathan
3 Evans will be on the call tomorrow. So it's going to
4 be a task force of about 12 to 15 residents. So I
5 would love for my colleagues to submit a name to
6 Mr. Jonathan Evans tomorrow by 12 so we can reach out
7 to them and see if they'd like to participate in the
8 task force.

9 CHAIR BOTEL: Thank you.

10 VICE CHAIR LAWSON: Thank you.

11 CHAIR BOTEL: I only have -- thank you so
12 much.

13 I only have one comment, and that is I
14 respect you all so much. I think you know that. I
15 think that anybody who would even try to put words in
16 my mouth to the contrary is just himself dumb as a bag
17 of rocks. I didn't say that. No, seriously, you know,
18 you know my sentiments about you, and I think that goes
19 without saying.

20 So we will see each other again on Friday.
21 No. Let's see, when's our next meeting? I've gotten
22 so confused now. It's too late. Friday, okay. Thank
23 you very much, Friday. Thank you, this meeting is
24 adjourned.

25 (Whereupon, at 11:47 p.m., the proceedings

1 were concluded.)

2

3

4

C E R T I F I C A T E

5

6

7 THE STATE OF FLORIDA)

)

8 COUNTY OF PALM BEACH)

9

10

11 I, Susan S. Kruger, do hereby certify that
12 I was authorized to and did report the foregoing
13 proceedings at the time herein stated, and that the
14 foregoing pages comprise a true and correct
15 transcription of my stenotype notes taken during the
16 proceedings.

17 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my
18 hand this 18th day of May, 2020.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25


Susan S. Kruger



ADJOURNMENT

The CRA Board Meeting was adjourned at 11:47 P.M. The minutes were approved by the Board of Commissioners on _____.

Julia Botel, Chairperson

Interim Executive Director Scott Evans

/cw
Florida Court Reporting