



City of Pompano Beach

100 W. Atlantic Blvd.
Pompano Beach, Florida
33060

Detailed Minutes - Final

Community Redevelopment Agency

Rex Hardin, Chairperson
Alison Fournier, Vice Chairperson
Audrey Fesik, Commissioner
Beverly Perkins, Commissioner
Rhonda Sigerson-Eaton, Commissioner
Darlene Smith, Commissioner

Gregory P. Harrison, Executive Director
Claudia McKenna, CRA Attorney
Kervin Alfred, CRA Secretary

Thursday, September 18, 2025

8:30 AM

Commission Chamber

Continuation from September 16, 2025 CRA Board Meeting

RESUME MEETING FROM SEPTEMBER 16, 2025

Present Commissioner Audrey Fesik, Commissioner Beverly Perkins, Commissioner Rhonda Sigerson-Eaton, Commissioner Darlene Smith, Vice Chair Alison Fournier, and Chairperson Rex Hardin

Chair Hardin reconvened the Pompano Beach CRA meeting at 8:30 AM, noting it was a continuation of the budget discussion from the previous meeting.

Claudia McKenna, CRA Attorney, stated she wanted to clarify the law for the record, emphasizing that the CRA, as a dependent special district, was legally obligated to adopt a budget each fiscal year under state statutes. She warned that voting against the budget would mean violating the law and outlined the legal requirement to appropriate funds for projects already approved in the CRA plan.

Comr. Fesik inquired about a previous conversation regarding motions and clarified that she had spoken with Ms. McKenna and Mr. Alfred about scheduling concerns and the inability to attend CRA meetings remotely. She explained that she had incurred personal costs to attend in person and wanted to ensure future flexibility for remote participation, emphasizing the importance of avoiding similar conflicts for other members.

Kimberly Vasquez, CRA Project Manager, reviewed a memo outlining the severe financial impacts if the CRA budget were to fail to pass. She detailed that the CRA held outstanding bonds, and failure to adopt the budget could result in default, damaged credit ratings, unpaid city reimbursements, breached contracts with developers, unpaid insurance, and termination of essential city services. She also warned it could trigger a financial emergency, exposing both the City and CRA to legal action and negatively affecting future bond issuances.

Joshua Watters, the City's Budget Director, explained the interconnected nature of the CRA and City budgets.

He said several city positions were partially funded by CRA reimbursements, totaling \$1.6 million. If the CRA budget failed, that revenue would disappear, leaving the city budget unbalanced and forcing service reductions. He added that after the City recently lowered its millage rate, there were no options to raise it again without costly and time-prohibitive re-advertising.

Vice Chair Fournier questioned conflicting language between Mr. Watters' memo and Ms. McKenna's statements regarding the McNab project. Ms. McKenna clarified that while funds must remain appropriated for approved projects, the Board could "fence" funds-keeping them in the budget but withholding spending authorization until further action by the Board. Mr. Watters confirmed that such fencing would restrict expenditures without violating the statute.

Vice Chair Fournier maintained confusion over how the funds could be both restricted and spendable. Ms. McKenna reiterated that spending could be deferred but not removed from the budget.

Chair Hardin urged the commission to adopt the budget as is, explaining that control over major projects like McNab and Downtown remained with the Board because bond issuance required four votes. He stated that refusing to pass the budget would violate state law, emphasizing the urgency to act and avoid financial catastrophe.

Vice Chair Fournier acknowledged the high stakes but expressed frustration with the ongoing lack of compromise and trust, stating that the commission only discussed collaboration during crises. She noted that every time the Board faced funding votes, they were presented with warnings of dire financial consequences, which prevented meaningful discussion earlier in the process.

Chair Hardin responded that this was not a typical crisis but a legal obligation. He argued that failing to pass the budget would amount to a governmental shutdown, describing it as "Armageddon" for the City.

Vice Chair Fournier countered that city leadership had long held taxpayers hostage. Chair Hardin disagreed.

Comr. Fesik agreed with the Vice Mayor's concerns and frustration with the lack of collaboration. She stated that residents had elected new leadership to be heard, but the 3-3 split created tension. She criticized the pattern of late communications and called for compromise, asserting that "failure to plan on your part does not constitute an emergency on mine." She also recalled having requested discussions about the McNab House project months earlier, but said her attempts were ignored or delayed by staff. She then made a motion to allow remote participation in future meetings to avoid similar personal and logistical conflicts.

Chair Hardin ruled Comr. Fesik out of order, stating that her motion was not related to the budget.

Comr. Fesik expressed offense, accusing others of showing no willingness to cooperate and of using legal language to pressure instead of collaborating.

Comr. Sigerson-Eaton addressed Comr. Fesik, explaining that passing the CRA budget was a legal necessity. She stated that failure to do so would shut down city operations, adding that the law required continuation of existing projects, including those predating Comr. Fesik's election. She stated she supported the budget,

believing that staff and legal counsel had clearly outlined the consequences. She criticized the ongoing distrust and argued that opposing commissioners had offered no alternative solutions despite months of budget meetings. She concluded that the City must move forward and follow the law to avoid a shutdown, urging the commission to adopt the budget.

Comr. Fesik stated that no one should presume to know or announce what she was thinking or feeling, as others did not know her personally or understand her thoughts.

Chair Hardin intervened, asking everyone to avoid personal remarks, and moved the discussion.

Vice Chair Fournier explained that she had long expressed her concerns and opposition to parts of the budget and had consistently voted against it for the same reasons. She criticized how the memo describing the consequences of not passing the budget used stronger language for Northwest projects than for those in the East, arguing this reflected bias within city leadership. She accused the City of operating with favoritism and a lack of transparency, referring to it as an “insider, shadow government.” She stated she could not continue working with the current city leadership, citing misleading statements and broken trust. She said she did not oppose budgets generally but opposed being forced to approve plans that ignored community input. She urged the commission’s majority-whom she called “the gang of yeses”-to stop approving everything without compromise and to listen to newer commissioners who were elected because residents wanted change and accountability.

Comr. Smith clarified that taxpayers did not directly fund the CRA, but that the CRA’s projects benefitted taxpayers through property improvements, affordable housing, and infrastructure. She said that while the McNab Botanical Gardens and Downtown projects were ongoing, new Northwest projects like the 6th Avenue improvements and BSO substation would not proceed without an approved budget. She noted that by law, the CRA had to present and pass a lawful budget based on previously approved projects. She reminded the Board that there was a workshop planned for Downtown and that the community had already provided input on McNab over many years.

Chair Hardin emphasized that the CRA and City budgets were financial documents, not reflections of staff or leadership performance. He asked Vice Chair Fournier whether her opposition stemmed from her lack of confidence in City Manager Greg Harrison.

Vice Chair Fournier denied holding the budget “hostage” but said the City’s leadership had long held the Commission hostage by refusing to compromise or listen. She reiterated her lack of confidence in the city manager and CRA executive director, saying she could not approve a budget that gave them more authority to act without accountability. She suggested it might be time for a leadership transition and challenged Chair Hardin to consider beginning that process.

Comr. Fesik thanked Comr. Smith for acknowledging that CRA spending ultimately came from taxpayers. She criticized city communication and leadership for not facilitating compromise or presenting solutions, arguing that staff should have sought ways to collaborate after earlier contentious meetings. She described the City’s operations as an “overstuffed closet” that needed to be emptied and reorganized-an analogy for resetting priorities and improving accountability. She said spending was out of control, and projects favored certain

areas while neglecting essentials like safety and infrastructure. She called for stronger, more responsive leadership and said many residents urged her to “hold your ground and fight for us.”

Comr. Perkins noted that projects in her district, including the Northwest 6th Avenue improvements and the BSO substation, had been funded for years but never executed. She said money for a senior activity center had been delayed while other districts received upgrades, showing a lack of fairness and priority for her community. She accused city leadership of bias, noting that her long-standing requests were repeatedly ignored while others’ projects advanced easily.

Comr. Sigerson-Eaton disagreed with Comr. Perkins’s claims, asking staff to clarify the status of the senior center and other projects. She pointed out that the City had already purchased property near the senior center at Comr. Perkins’s request and that many Northwest projects were funded through the G.O. bond, which Comr. Perkins had voted against. Nguyen Tran, CRA Director, confirmed that the Northwest 6th Avenue project began in 2023 and that the new substation was newly added to the current budget, explaining delays caused by design and procurement. Mr. Watters clarified that the senior center was funded in the capital budget for 2028 after a fire station project was removed, and that moving it earlier would require finding funding capacity.

Comr. Sigerson-Eaton added that numerous Northwest improvements-parks, fields, and facilities-had been completed through the G.O. bond, and she disagreed that she received special treatment.

Comr. Perkins responded that the Board was again divided 3-3 and not making progress, though she appreciated that the discussion allowed everyone to express concerns. She said all commissioners loved Pompano Beach but needed to do better for residents.

Chair Hardin read a letter from the Northwest CRA Advisory Committee opposing any reduction in tax increment financing.

Vice Chair Fournier stated that she was confused about that memo, as the issue had already been settled legally months earlier. She questioned who prompted its creation and corrected a statement she attributed to Comr. Smith, clarifying that CRAs were indeed funded by taxpayer dollars.

Comr. Smith responded that while CRA funds came from tax increment financing, they were reinvested into projects that directly benefited taxpayers through improvements.

Vice Chair Fournier explained that TIF money represented taxpayer dollars that would otherwise go to the City’s general fund. She argued that both East and Northwest CRAs siphoned funds from the city budget and that ECRA should sunset after its successes, allowing those funds to return to the City for other priorities. Mr. Tran replied that CRA investments generated significant tax base growth, benefiting the City and other public entities. He emphasized that the CRA’s economic initiatives created revenue and improved land values across Pompano Beach.

Vice Chair Fournier acknowledged the success of the ECRA but maintained it was time to sunset it rather than use it indefinitely for bond debt.

Suzette Sibble, Assistant City Manager, added that the CRA was funding land acquisition for the substation project because the City had faced difficulties acquiring property, and the CRA's budget set aside \$4 million for that purpose.

Comr. Smith emphasized that the Northwest CRA was much broader than downtown redevelopment, supporting multiple neighborhood projects, land acquisition, affordable housing, and safety programs.

Mr. Tran detailed that the CRA had undertaken affordable infill housing, redevelopment, park improvements, and public safety initiatives while using downtown as an economic driver to fund these community projects.

Comr. Perkins reiterated that she began discussing the substation years earlier, explaining that the issue dated back to the demolition of the old station near the Marquis Apartments and arguing that delays were due to shifting priorities.

Comr. Fesik questioned the logic behind redeveloping McNab Park, arguing that a community park should remain green space rather than a commercialized project. She criticized how funds were justified under "slum and blight" and said community policing should be prioritized over unnecessary security contracts. She urged her colleagues to return to compromise, find common ground, and focus on realistic solutions instead of circular debate.

Mr. Tran attempted to clarify her comments, but Comr. Fesik reiterated her call to move the conversation toward practical resolutions. She asked Ms. McKenna and Mr. Watters to outline possible legal and financial paths forward that could help reach a consensus.

Ms. McKenna explained that removing the Downtown or McNab projects from the budget would require amending the CRA plan. She asked commissioners to identify specific budget line items they objected to so staff could determine if adjustments were legally possible.

Comr. Fesik asked how to pursue amendments and suggested that staff should already have been preparing potential solutions. She encouraged focusing on what could be done, not what could not.

Ms. McKenna stated the main challenge was the differing views among commissioners and their communities. She noted that while the projects were lawfully part of the existing CRA plan, those opposed could work toward future amendments. For now, she urged the Board to find acceptable adjustments within the current budget that would allow it to pass and avoid a legal and financial crisis.

Comr. Fesik stated that after two hours of discussion, the Commission still had not reviewed the budget on screen and that nothing in the plan had changed since the prior meeting. She expressed frustration that commissioners were being pressured to approve a budget that did not reflect what residents wanted, likening the situation to inheriting an unwanted old sofa - something kept merely because of history rather than usefulness. She emphasized that decisions should reflect current community needs, not outdated plans, and criticized the lack of leadership and opportunity for genuine dialogue. She said members were being strong-armed into approval and declared she would not support that approach.

Ms. McKenna acknowledged Comr. Fesik's concerns but reiterated that the law required adoption of the current CRA budget as written unless the CRA plan itself was amended. She explained that differing community opinions made immediate change impossible and that while commissioners could discuss reallocating "new money," any broader reform would need to occur later through formal amendments. She urged the Board to adopt the lawful budget now and continue working afterward to address leadership and policy concerns.

Mr. Tran clarified that the FPI Roving Ambassadors program had once been canceled but reinstated after noticeable increases in loitering and homelessness. He explained that the employees used their phones to complete official reports rather than make personal calls.

Comr. Perkins stated that her comfort level would rise if additions such as an educational and vocational component, a college resource center, and a Sports Hall of Fame were added to the downtown project.

Ms. McKenna replied that those items could be included by amending the Master Development Agreement (MDA), rather than inserting them directly into the current budget, and that the cost would likely be around \$9 to \$10 million. She said if the commission supported the idea, it could be brought forward for amendment at the next CRA meeting.

Comr. Perkins stressed that district commissioners should always be involved in projects located in their areas, noting she had not been consulted early in the downtown planning process. She supported the project in principle but wanted stronger inclusion of Northwest needs so the district would not feel isolated.

Ms. McKenna committed to meeting with Comr. Perkins and Ms. Sibble after returning from a short trip to craft an amendment reflecting those additions for presentation at the next CRA meeting.

Comr. Perkins voiced concern that if the vote ended 3-3, the amendment would fail.

Ms. McKenna responded that several colleagues-including Comr. Smith, Chair Hardin, and Comr. Sigerson-Eaton-had previously indicated support, and she believed an updated amendment could succeed.

Ms. Sibble then reflected on the ongoing mistrust and said it was time to "hit the reset button." She explained her duty to find cost-effective financing and described ongoing efforts to develop down-payment assistance and workforce training programs within legal limits. She emphasized her willingness to work with the Commission and legal counsel to create community programs while maintaining compliance with state and federal rules.

Comr. Perkins stated that little progress had been made over the past year, but agreed to meet again with Ms. McKenna and Ms. Sibble to continue working on an amendment. Mr. Tran confirmed that funding existed for infrastructure work through a \$64.5 million bond and that the CRA was committed to covering underground utilities and related costs.

Comr. Perkins noted that residents wanted to see more visible results above ground, not just underground projects. Ms. Sibble proposed shifting some down-payment assistance funding from 2027 to 2026 by adjusting

allocations tied to substation land acquisition, to make resources available sooner to the community.

Comr. Perkins agreed that the change would be workable and helpful. She then raised concern about plans for the E. Pat Larkins Center, stating that most residents preferred renovation rather than demolition and rebuild. She said past Northwest facilities, unlike the well-funded centers in other districts, lacked quality design and investment, and she wanted to ensure the new center met community expectations. Ms. Sibble replied that no architect solicitation had been issued because of community division and assured that she intended to engage residents fully. She acknowledged mistrust but promised open collaboration and transparency. Ms. McKenna added that she would work alongside Ms. Sibble to ensure all steps complied with legal requirements while meeting community goals.

Comr. Perkins reiterated her intent to follow the will of residents and the family of E. Pat Larkins, but remained open to future discussions if opinions changed.

Comr. Smith stated her support for adding educational, sports, and historical features to the downtown project if funding could be secured.

Comr. Perkins thanked her and said she would distribute written details to colleagues for review.

Chair Hardin confirmed there was no further comment from the Vice Mayor and asked staff to display the CRA budgets to review “new money” that could be adjusted.

Ms. McKenna confirmed that unallocated new funds could be reassigned if consistent with the CRA plan.

Ms. Vasquez presented figures showing \$7.8 million in new tax-increment revenue for the ECRA and \$2 million for the McNab project, noting some funds were already committed to operations and debt service.

Vice Chair Fournier proposed placing roughly \$4.5 million of unallocated new funds into a “project escrow” or reserve account to be assigned later by Board vote. Ms. McKenna and staff agreed that such a motion would effectively amend the budget, allowing the funds to be distributed as future projects were approved.

A motion was made by Vice Chair Fournier, seconded by Commissioner Fesik, to amend the ECRA budget by taking the TIF revenue after operation expenses and putting it into a project escrow line.

Chair Hardin restated the motion, clarifying that it would move all unallocated new TIF funds into a separate account.

Vice Chair Fournier confirmed that the precise amount would equal all new TIF revenue minus operational costs and existing debt service.

Ms. Vasquez cautioned that doing so would leave no funds available for incentives, security, or professional services, as those expenses were part of the new TIF allocation.

Vice Chair Fournier replied that the money would still exist but would remain in escrow until the Board decided

how to use it.

Ms. McKenna asked how existing contracts would be paid. Vice Chair Fournier stated that vendors could present their invoices for Board approval. Ms. McKenna noted that consultant payments came from the professional services line, which would be affected by the amendment.

Comr. Fesik supported the motion but asked whether the \$18 million bond item could also be delayed. Ms. McKenna explained that the bond funds were a carry-forward and could not be removed, although no bonds would be issued without Board approval. Ms. Sibble cautioned that delaying payments could violate the Prompt Payment Act and cause problems for small vendors.

Ms. McKenna proposed a temporary solution: the use of non-response memos to authorize payments if a majority raised no objection.

Vice Chair Fournier agreed to that approach until the Board's October meeting, when it could decide how to allocate the TIF revenue.

Chair Hardin asked whether the Board intended to approve individual invoices. Vice Chair Fournier clarified that only the October meeting would establish a new allocation; bills due before then would be paid under the current fiscal year's budget.

Comr. Smith asked what the Board's role would be in October. Vice Chair Fournier stated that the Commission must set policy by deciding how to direct funding.

Comr. Smith questioned whether this would resolve anything or lead to another 3-3 split, expressing concern that the plan appeared focused on controlling the RMA consultant contract.

Comr. Sigerson-Eaton asked if consultant and legal contracts would be affected. Ms. Vasquez and Ms. McKenna confirmed that existing obligations must still be honored to avoid breach.

Vice Chair Fournier insisted that RMA's costs in the ECRA were small and that the broader issue was how to manage millions in TIF funds.

Comr. Fesik urged a vote to move on after nearly three hours of discussion.

Chair Hardin warned that zeroing out the \$175,000 professional-services line could jeopardize existing contracts.

Ms. McKenna reiterated that payments could not be made without further Board action.

Vice Chair Fournier argued that her motion was a reasonable compromise to defer spending decisions until October.

Comr. Sigerson-Eaton suggested restricting the escrow only to funds associated with the McNab House

project.

Vice Chair Fournier declined, saying her motion already represented a compromise.

Ms. Vasquez noted that the FPI security contract would expire in November and that an RFP could follow, making October an appropriate time to decide its future.

Chair Hardin stated that he could support the motion if the \$175,000 professional-services line were excluded from escrow and the amendment tied to final budget approval.

Vice Chair Fournier refused to remove the line item, stating she wanted all new TIF revenue included.

Comr. Smith reiterated that she would support the motion only if the \$175,000 were removed and requested more public workshops to prevent future deadlocks.

The amended motion to amend the ECRA budget to take the TIF revenue after operation expenses and put it into a project escrow line and tie this to the approval of the ECRA budget failed by the following vote:

Yes:Fesik

Perkins

Fournier

No:Sigerson-Eaton

Smith

Hardin

A motion was made by Chair Hardin, seconded by Commissioner Sigerson-Eaton, including all of the previous elements of the last motion with the exception of consultants and professional services line item, and to wrap that with the approval of the ECRA budget. The motion failed by the following roll call vote:

Yes:Sigerson-Eaton

Smith

Hardin

No:Fesik

Perkins

Fournier

Ms. Sibble reiterated that because both the East and Northwest CRAs operate under a single agency and one shared trust fund, their budgets are interconnected. She reminded the commission that voting to approve one

budget but not the other would leave the CRA without a complete, lawful budget before the October 1 deadline.

Ms. Vasquez added that staff could apply the same approach used for the East CRA-placing funds into a reserve or escrow account and bringing allocations back for approval in October-if the Board decided to do so for the Northwest CRA as well. She confirmed that staff would be able to prepare those adjustments and present them in the next meeting.

Comr. Smith cautioned that another 3-3 split vote was possible on the Northwest budget. She noted that such a deadlock would again leave millions of dollars in new funding unallocated, creating uncertainty until October.

A motion was made by Commissioner Smith, seconded by Commissioner Sigerson-Eaton, to include all the previous elements of the last motion by Vice Chair Fournier, and to add that if there's a 3-3 vote in October, the Commission will follow the CRA budget as presented.

Comr. Smith explained that her goal was to ensure progress while still allowing for meaningful discussion. She proposed holding a workshop before the October vote so commissioners could better understand each aspect of the budget and openly debate proposed changes.

Vice Chair Fournier objected, arguing that the amendment removed any incentive for compromise in October. She said that if the default outcome was simply to adopt the CRA's original proposal, there would be no motivation for other commissioners to negotiate, making the October process meaningless.

Comr. Smith responded that her intent was to create space for genuine dialogue and learning, not to eliminate negotiation. She emphasized the importance of a workshop where all arguments could be presented clearly before the next vote.

Comr. Fesik expressed impatience with the repeated debates and urged the group to move forward and vote.

Ms. McKenna suggested a practical alternative: instead of reopening all \$4.5 million in new TIF revenue, the Board could "park" only the \$2 million associated with the McNab House project-an area of less contention. She noted that this approach could yield a unanimous vote and allow the Board to revisit other issues in October.

Chair Hardin asked Comr. Smith, as the motion's sponsor, whether she would amend her motion to reflect Ms. McKenna's suggestion, to which Comr. Smith agreed.

Vice Chair Fournier objected again, stating that this revised motion rolled back the earlier compromise and reduced the scope of review from all new TIF funds to just \$2 million. She argued that it undermined the intent of his previous motion, which sought to review all expenditures.

Chair Hardin responded that the adjustment represented a middle ground to help the Board adopt a budget and meet legal deadlines.

An amended motion made by Commissioner Smith, seconded by Commissioner Sigerson-Eaton, to approve the ECRA budget with the parking of approximately \$2 million, that is allocated in the revenue for the McNab House Botanical Gardens. The motion failed by the following roll call vote:

Yes: Sigerson-Eaton

Smith

Hardin

No: Fesik

Perkins

Fournier

- 4 [25-573](#) A RESOLUTION OF THE POMPANO BEACH COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY (CRA) APPROVING THE NORTHWEST FINANCING AND IMPLEMENTATION PLAN AND ADOPTING THE FINAL ESTIMATES OF REVENUE AND EXPENDITURES FOR THE FISCAL YEAR COMMENCING ON OCTOBER 1, 2025, AND ENDING ON SEPTEMBER 30, 2026, APPROPRIATING THE FUNDS SHOWN THEREIN AS MAY BE NEEDED OR DEEMED NECESSARY TO DEFRAY ALL EXPENDITURES AND LIABILITIES OF THE NORTHWEST DISTRICT OF THE CRA FOR SUCH FISCAL YEAR; PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES.

(Fiscal Impact: N/A)

(**Staff Contact:** Kimberly Vazquez)

Vice Chair Fournier proposed a motion to approve Agenda Item 4, the Northwest CRA budget. Chair Hardin asked if there was any desire to discuss the Northwest CRA budget, since there was no resolution on the ECRA budget. Both Comrs. Perkins and Fesik stated to proceed with the vote on the budget with no changes.

Comr. Perkins stated that her changes would be added to the developer's contract.

A motion was made by Vice Chair Fournier, seconded by Commissioner Fesik, to approve Agenda Item 4, the Northwest CRA budget. The motion carried by the following roll call vote:

Yes: Commissioner Perkins, Commissioner Sigerson-Eaton, Commissioner Smith, and Chairperson Hardin

No: Commissioner Fesik, and Vice Chair Fournier

Enactment No: CRA RES. 2025-17

Ms. McKenna reminded the Board that they were required to pass the East CRA budget before adjourning, emphasizing that it was not optional.

Chair Hardin called for a short recess and reconvened the meeting ten minutes later. He then invited Comr. Perkins to speak.

Comr. Perkins directed a question to Mr. Tran, explaining that she had received three phone calls from residents about statements allegedly made at a CRA advisory meeting at the E. Pat Larkins Center. The callers claimed that Mr. Tran said the new downtown area was seeking only “elite developers and contractors.” Comr. Perkins asked whether that statement was true. Mr. Tran clarified that his words had been taken out of context. He explained that the discussion in question concerned the Grisham assemblage, which included the Westview Cemetery office property. Mr. Tran stated that large developers were typically involved in the downtown core because Roca controlled much of the area, but the Grisham site could provide opportunities for smaller, local development firms. He confirmed that he never said the downtown project sought only elite developers.

Comr. Perkins accepted the clarification and expressed appreciation for the response. She also encouraged fellow commissioners and staff to attend the Northwest CRA advisory meetings, stating that they had become disorganized and difficult to manage. She noted that she had spoken with the Chair of that advisory group, but the issues persisted.

Vice Chair Fournier raised a point of order, noting that earlier in the session, she had observed Comr. Fesik leaving the chambers with law enforcement officers. She stated that it was disrespectful for the meeting to continue without waiting for her, as the Board typically waited when she was delayed.

Chair Hardin replied that he had misunderstood the situation and thought she had simply stepped away, not left with law enforcement.

Comr. Fesik reentered the meeting and apologized, explaining she had stepped outside briefly.

Vice Chair Fournier reiterated her concern that other commissioners were not afforded the same consideration when delays occurred, suggesting a double standard existed.

Chair Hardin thanked the Vice Chair for her comments but disagreed that a double standard existed. He explained that he believed Comr. Fesik had left voluntarily during the break and that the meeting resumed late because several members were slow to return. He emphasized that misunderstandings happen and then turned the discussion back to the ECRA budget.

- 3 [25-572](#) A RESOLUTION OF THE POMPANO BEACH COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY (CRA) APPROVING THE EAST FINANCING AND IMPLEMENTATION PLAN AND ADOPTING THE FINAL ESTIMATES OF REVENUE AND EXPENDITURES FOR THE FISCAL YEAR COMMENCING ON OCTOBER 1, 2025, AND ENDING ON SEPTEMBER 30, 2026, APPROPRIATING THE FUNDS SHOWN THEREIN AS MAY BE NEEDED OR DEEMED NECESSARY TO DEFRAY ALL EXPENDITURES AND LIABILITIES OF THE EAST DISTRICT OF THE CRA FOR

SUCH FISCAL YEAR; PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES.

(Fiscal Impact: N/A)

(Staff Contact: Kimberly Vazquez)

A motion was made by Commissioner Sigerson-Eaton, seconded by Chairperson Hardin, to approve the ECRA budget as written with the \$2 million set aside. The motion carried by the following roll call vote:

Yes: Commissioner Perkins, Commissioner Sigerson-Eaton, Commissioner Smith, and Chairperson Hardin

No: Commissioner Fesik, and Vice Chair Fournier

Enactment No: CRA RES. 2025-18

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 12:05 PM.