



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

Tuesday, December 16, 2025

1:00 PM

Commission Chamber

Meeting

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Hardin called the CRA Board meeting to order at 1:00 pm.

ROLL CALL

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Led by Kervin Alfred, CRA Secretary

MOMENT OF SILENCE

Chair Hardin called for a moment of silence in remembrance of the victims of the tragic incidents involving senseless killings at Brown University and Bondi Beach in Australia.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

[26-137](#) Joint Special Workshop of City and CRA Minutes of October 20, 2025

A motion was made by Vice Chair Fournier, seconded by Commissioner Sigerson-Eaton, that the Minutes be APPROVED. The motion carried by a unanimous voice vote.

[26-139](#) CRA Board Meeting Minutes of October 21, 2025

A motion was made by Vice Chair Fournier, seconded by Commissioner Sigerson-Eaton, that the Minutes be APPROVED. The motion carried by a unanimous voice vote.

[26-138](#) Joint Special Meeting of City and CRA Minutes of October 29, 2025

A motion was made by Vice Chair Fournier, seconded by Commissioner Sigerson-Eaton, that the Minutes be APPROVED. The motion carried by a unanimous voice vote.

[26-141](#) CRA Board Meeting Minutes of November 18, 2025

A motion was made by Vice Chair Fournier, seconded by Commissioner Sigerson-Eaton, that the Minutes be APPROVED. The motion carried by a unanimous voice vote.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Chair Hardin inquired with CRA Director Tran whether there were any changes to the Agenda. Mr. Tran confirmed that there were none.

A motion was made by Vice Chair Fournier, seconded by Commissioner Sigerson-Eaton, that the Agenda be APPROVED AS SUBMITTED. The motion carried by a unanimous voice vote.

CONSENT AGENDA DISCUSSION

The CRA Board may pull items from the Consent Agenda. During Audience To Be Heard, a person may speak on any item on the Consent Agenda, which has not been pulled.

Chair Hardin announced that Item 1 would be pulled for Board discussion.

A. AUDIENCE TO BE HEARD

Chair Hardin asked if there were any speakers who had signed up to speak.

Secretary Alfred called Jocelyn Jackson, who was the only one who signed up, to come forward, but she was not present at the time.

B. CONSENT AGENDA

1. [26-94](#) A RESOLUTION OF THE POMPANO BEACH COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY (CRA) APPROVING AND AUTHORIZING THE PROPER OFFICIALS TO EXECUTE A SERVICE CONTRACT BETWEEN THE CRA AND PFM ASSET MANAGEMENT TO PROVIDE INVESTMENT ADVISORY SERVICES; PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

(Fiscal Impact: 3.5 bps of CRA Investment)

(Staff Contact: Allison Feurtado/Kimberly Vazquez)

Chair Hardin opened the discussion item and noted that it had been pulled by Comr. Fesik for discussion.

Comr. Fesik explained that she pulled the item not due to opposition, but to clarify several contractual issues between the City and the CRA. She noted discrepancies related to fee calculations, portfolio language that appeared to aggregate City and CRA funds, and the absence of a clear termination clause addressing how the two contracts would interact. She emphasized the need to clarify whether termination of one agreement should result in termination of both, given the references to combined funds.

Claudia McKenna, CRA Attorney, responded that the finance department would be better suited to explain the account structure, but stated that it was not her understanding that termination of one contract would automatically terminate the other.

Comr. Fesik reiterated that while the City and CRA contracts were separate, the portfolio language suggested some commingling of funds, and she wanted to ensure the documentation clearly reflected full separation.

Chair Hardin asked whether any funds were actually combined.

Allison Fuertado, Finance Director, explained that CRA funds were completely separate from city funds and maintained in separate accounts. She noted that the investment advisor managed investments for the City as a whole, which included advisory services for the CRA, Northwest, and ECRA, but the funds themselves were not combined.

Comr. Fesik stated that her concern was resolved and that she only wanted confirmation that the separation was clearly reflected in the documentation.

Chair Hardin sought public input on the item, however after noting there was no public input, he opened Board discussion.

Comr. Perkins raised a concern after reviewing Sunbiz records, noting that PFM appeared as inactive with a withdrawal date of October 29, 2024, and asked that staff look into and clarify the discrepancy. Ms. Fuertado acknowledged the concern and stated she would look into it.

A motion was made by Vice Chair Fournier, seconded by Commissioner Sigerson-Eaton, that the CRA Resolution - Consent be ADOPTED. The motion carried by the following roll call vote:

Yes: Commissioner Fesik, Commissioner Perkins, Commissioner Sigerson-Eaton, Commissioner Smith, Vice Chair Fournier, and Chairperson Hardin

Enactment No: CRA RES. 2026-07

C. REGULAR AGENDA

2. [26-140](#) A RESOLUTION OF THE POMPANO BEACH COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY (CRA), APPROVING AND AUTHORIZING THE PROPER OFFICIALS TO EXECUTE A SUBLEASE AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CRA AND GREATER POMPANO BEACH CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, INC., RELATING TO PROPERTY LOCATED AT 100 NW 8TH STREET, SUITE 102, POMPANO BEACH, FLORIDA, AFTER NOTICE PURSUANT TO SECTION 163.380(3)(a) FLORIDA STATUTES; PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

(Fiscal Impact: Annual Sublease Revenue of \$46,620)

(Staff Contact: Nguyen Tran)

Nguyen Tran, CRA Director, introduced the item and explained that the CRA was leasing the space from the Sonata Apartments under a lease that became effective on July 20, 2023. He noted that a prior sublease had been approved for Henry Crockett and the Crockett Foundation for a youth tech center, but the developer's interior buildout took longer than expected, and Mr. Crockett had grant deadlines tied to operations, so he requested termination of that sublease. He described the location at North Dixie Highway and Northwest 8th Street on the ground floor of the Sonata building and stated the buildout was completed during the summer. He explained the CRA had since been working with the Chamber of Commerce, which needed a new location because its current space was expected to be renovated, and its lease there was ending. He stated the long-term plan was to move the Chamber into the new City Hall once completed, making this a temporary location. He noted the sublease terms matched what had been offered to the Crockett Foundation, including a four-year term with two one-year renewal options, a planned commencement date of January 1, 2026, and a three-month improvement period to install office infrastructure such as networking and cameras. He outlined the rent as \$46,620 annually, paid monthly, plus applicable taxes at 6.5%, with annual increases of 3% starting in year two, and noted a Chamber representative was present.

Chair Hardin sought public input on the item, however after noting there was no public input, he opened Board discussion.

Comr. Fesik asked whether the rent matched the rate offered to the Crockett Foundation in 2023 and questioned how that rate related to the buildout status at the time. She confirmed that the Crockett Foundation would have operated a youth tech center serving the community and asked about additional tenant improvement funds included in the proposal. She expressed support for the Chamber's value to the City but emphasized the need for clear transparency and careful documentation. She asked whether other nonprofits or community groups were informed about the availability of tenant improvements and questioned what measurable, enforceable community benefits justified using tax increment funds to build out office space. She raised concerns that the rent appeared below current market levels and suggested that the CRA might be leaving potential revenue on the table that could otherwise support community programs. She questioned the timing of the public notice, noting it was issued on December 12 while the item was already on the agenda, and she argued that the board should not vote before the public had a full opportunity to submit proposals. She stated that she believed the item should be moved to January to avoid approving a contract before the notice

period elapsed, and she warned that reduced rent for an economic partner raised additional questions compared with providing the same opportunity to Northwest-serving nonprofits. She later asked whether staff conducted targeted outreach to Northwest-serving organizations and questioned what safeguards were in place, given the Chamber's existing partnership structures with the City. She also raised concerns about the Chamber subleasing space as co-working or an incubator while benefiting from a below-market lease, and she asked for safeguards to ensure small businesses were not overcharged and that the incubator concept served the intended community benefit. She reiterated she was not opposed to the Chamber but wanted assurance that public notice, fairness, and legal requirements were being fully honored, and that the agreement would reflect the community-serving intentions originally contemplated with the Crockett Foundation.

Vice Chair Fournier stated that she shared many of Commissioner Fesik's concerns and recalled that when the board considered the Crockett arrangement in 2023, the discussion emphasized the need for a market-rate deal and avoiding anything that appeared subsidized. She questioned why the board was now considering the same \$15-per-square-foot terms and an additional \$50,000 in improvements, and she stated the notice period had not elapsed, creating optics that could discourage other proposers. She requested legal clarification on the market-rate issue and highlighted a lease inconsistency regarding the security deposit amount versus language suggesting first and last month's rent. She indicated that, because of these issues and the need for the notice period to run, she wanted to table the item until January, though discussion continued before a motion was finalized. She asked how the sublease could commence on January 1 if the notice period would not lapse until January 11, and she emphasized that if the Chamber's situation was not urgent, a short delay could preserve fairness and clarity. She also read the lease language restricting the premises to office and ancillary uses unless the CRA approved other uses, reinforcing that any workforce or other programming would require separate board action. She described prior concerns about representation and participation in chamber activities and stated she still supported the Chamber's presence but wanted clarity on past representations and a fully elapsed notice period to avoid confusing headlines that might deter proposals.

Comr. Sigerson-Eaton raised a point of order when a tabling motion was introduced, stating others needed a chance to ask questions first. She asked when the 30-day notice would expire and sought clarity that the notice had been issued on December 12, meaning the period had not yet elapsed. She stated that CRA statutes required the notice to allow competing interests and argued that subsidies and below-market terms could be appropriate tools for activating redevelopment areas. She emphasized that the area was improving, that chamber traffic could support nearby businesses, and that the transparency requirement was being followed through notice. She expressed support for the Chamber as a strong community partner and viewed the arrangement as aligned with the CRA's mission.

Comr. Perkins asked whether any space would remain available beyond what the Chamber needed and was told that the Chamber sought about 1,500 square feet, with the remaining space intended for co-working and incubator concepts. She described her understanding that Mr. Crockett had felt pushed out due to delays and lack of timely movement by the City and CRA, which led him to terminate. She noted she had not been aware of the Chamber plan until it appeared on the agenda and stated she wanted earlier communication about discussions affecting her district. She asked whether there had been prior plans for business-related programming at the site and was told that an incubator concept remained part of the vision for the unoccupied portion. She reiterated support for the Chamber but emphasized the need for commissioners to be informed earlier so concerns could be addressed before the public meeting.

Comr. Smith stated he had heard from the community that developing small businesses was important, particularly in the Northwest, and he expressed confidence that the Chamber had the resources and commitment to support that goal. She favored approving the item at the meeting while acknowledging that a new proposal could emerge before the notice window closed. She expressed concern that, if the board did not act, the Chamber might relocate elsewhere and the City would miss the opportunity to place the Chamber near downtown and in the Northwest area.

Evencia Janvier, President and CEO of the Greater Pompano Beach Chamber of Commerce, clarified that the Chamber's current lease ended at the end of February 2026 and explained that after February, the Chamber would be on a month-to-month arrangement without long-term protection. She described the Sonata space as an open floor plan without offices, conference rooms, storage, or infrastructure, and she stated that earlier certainty would allow time to complete wiring and buildout. She argued that the \$50,000 tenant improvement amount would be used for permanent infrastructure improvements that would remain with the property after the Chamber's temporary term ended. She addressed concerns about the Chamber's geographic balance, stating relocation to the Northwest would improve access and engagement across the city and better align the Chamber with redevelopment and manufacturing corridors. She stated the Chamber intended to expand support through co-working, collaboration, and entrepreneur-focused programming and described the move as a strategic investment in the City's economic future.

Mr. Tran explained that the CRA had negotiated an under-market rent structure in the development agreement, stating the CRA paid about \$10 per square foot for ten years and had structured subleases like the Crockett deal at \$15 per square foot to cultivate tenants and activate the area. He stated that if another nonprofit tenant were selected, staff would similarly consider reduced rent to support community benefits. He acknowledged that the agreement would not be executed until after the notice period elapsed and stated that if another proposal were received, staff would report back and potentially return the item to the Board. He explained that incentives and improvements would remain with the property for future tenants. He also stated that staff wanted a single entity to lease the entire space and administer co-working or incubator concepts, because managing multiple leases would be more complex, and he suggested staff believed the Chamber was the best partner to deliver the intended outcomes.

Claudia McKenna, CRA Attorney, explained the statutory notice process, stating that the law required at least 30 days' notice prior to executing a contract and contemplated that a specific contract would be noticed to allow others to review and submit competing or improved proposals. She explained that, after the notice expired and if no competing proposals were received or those proposals were rejected, the CRA could execute the contract. She noted that any lease provisions identified as needing changes could be modified and corrected.

Chair Hardin guided the discussion, confirmed the notice timeline, and asked about the practical ramifications of delaying approval. He clarified that any workforce or business development programming envisioned for the location was not included in the lease and would require separate negotiation and Board approval. He asked about correcting lease errors, including the security deposit inconsistency, and was told the issue would be corrected and that the Chamber had requested the lower deposit amount even though the wording needed alignment. He stated that he supported the Chamber being located there, but also emphasized the need to

understand the impacts of delaying the item as the board continued its discussion.

A motion was made by Vice Chair Fournier, seconded by Commissioner Sigerson-Eaton, that the item be postponed to the January 20, 2026, CRA Meeting.

Comr. Perkins stated that if the item were postponed until January, the Chamber would still have ample time.

Ms. Janvier explained that time was not guaranteed because the buildout required more than just wiring. She noted that wiring alone would take about two weeks, and constructing walls and completing the remaining buildout would take roughly an additional six weeks. She stated that the Chamber's lease ended at the end of February, after which they would be month-to-month without certainty, and she noted that moving forward at the end of January would delay completion of infrastructure and buildout.

Comr. Fesik reiterated that she wanted to find a path that worked while ensuring the CRA handled the process correctly and provided proper notice to residents, businesses, and nonprofits. She stated she wanted more collaboration to make sure the lease terms were correct and suggested the Chamber could potentially seek interim arrangements with its current lease while the CRA addressed outstanding questions. She noted that delaying could also involve adjusting the commencement date, which would reset the three-month rent-free improvement period. She agreed with the Vice Chair that there were still unanswered questions and emphasized the need to be able to tell residents the CRA had pursued the best opportunity in a transparent and sound manner. She noted she intended to follow up with staff with additional questions over the coming weeks if the item moved to January.

Comr. Sigerson-Eaton stated her understanding that the CRA had complied with the statutory requirements and asked for confirmation, to which Ms. McKenna confirmed that the CRA had complied with the applicable Florida statute regarding disposition of CRA property.

The motion to postpone the item failed by the following roll call vote:

Yes:Fesik
Fournier

No:Perkins
Sigerson-Eaton
Smith
Hardin

A motion was made by Vice Chair Fournier, seconded by Commissioner Sigerson-Eaton, that the CRA Resolution - Regular be ADOPTED. 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. 2026-08

3. [26-135](#) Consideration of unsolicited proposals from Frazier Elite Homes, LLC and Parrish & Associates, LLC to construct an income restricted single family home on the CRA property located at 1910 NW 7th Street, Pompano Beach, FL.
(Fiscal Impact: \$50,000 Revenue from land sale)

(Staff Contact: Cassandra LeMasurier)

Nguyen Tran, CRA Director, stated he was presenting the item due to staff absence and explained that two related items had been separated. He noted the CRA received unsolicited proposals for two lots, including 1910 NW 7th Street, and explained that the 1910 lot carried an affordability deed restriction from a prior transfer. He stated the CRA advertised the proposal pursuant to Florida Statute 163.380 with a 30-day notice inviting additional proposals and received a second proposal from Parrish and Associates. He described the lot as narrow, about 7,300 square feet, near the Jesus Christ Supernatural Church, and stated it had been vacant for a long time. He explained that staff presented both proposals to the Northwest CRA Advisory Committee, which formed a volunteer subcommittee to evaluate the proposals because of time constraints in regular meetings. He identified the subcommittee members as Danielle Elzahr, Keriann Worley, and Velma Flowers and stated that staff used a point-based evaluation approach similar to a formal solicitation. He reported the subcommittee scored Frasier Elite Homes higher than Parrish and Associates for the 1910 lot and recommended Frasier Elite Homes. He described Frasier Elite Homes' plan as a 2,290-square-foot, three-bedroom, two-bath home with a two-car garage, with an estimated sale price around \$450,000 and a target occupancy timeline of 12 months. He stated that the proposal included a pre-qualified buyer with a loan pre-approval and additional investor equity. He noted that the Northwest CRA Advisory Committee recommended the board accept the proposal and direct negotiation of a property disposition and development agreement, and he stated the proposer team was present for questions.

Chair Hardin asked whether the recommended proposer wished to present, but they stated they were available to answer any questions. The Chair then invited public comment on the item.

Phyllis Smith, Greater Collier City Civic Association President, noted that dumping had occurred on the site and stated construction of a home would help stop that problem. She also noted that both proposers had ended with close scoring and stated the evaluation approach had been fair by recognizing strengths, and she supported moving forward to address dumping issues on both sites.

Chair Hardin closed public input and opened Board discussion.

Comr. Fesik stated that she supported addressing dumping and supported the need for affordable housing and the idea of a home at the site, but she focused her concerns on process and procedure. She argued that the CRA could not act on the disposition of CRA property without satisfying Florida Statute 163.380 and adopting procurement requirements, and she stated the evaluation process did not involve procurement oversight and

improperly delegated duties to the advisory board and its subcommittee. She requested that the item and the next related item be deferred so the CRA could conduct a procurement-compliant solicitation. She asked whether procurement certified the evaluation as compliant with the City's procurement and contracts manual. She questioned whether the statute authorized delegation of duties to an advisory board and continued to argue that mimicking an RFP was not the same as an RFP. She stated her intent was to ensure the community saw the Board asking the right questions and acting transparently, and she later asked whether the process should be considered a competitive selection. She emphasized she supported the home but wanted clearer rules and more consistent, understandable procedures for residents and suggested the issue might require later policy review or outside legal input. She challenged whether Section 163.380 nullified stricter local procurement procedures and cited her understanding that when local governments adopt stricter procedures, they must follow them in addition to the statute. She asked whether the City Attorney was familiar with the procurement manual and asserted disagreement with the legal interpretation given.

Mr. Tran responded that there was no procurement manual process specific to unsolicited proposals and stated that staff tried to mimic procurement best practices for fairness and transparency. He explained that for unsolicited proposals, the statutory requirement was the 30-day advertisement, and staff then brought the item as a consideration to the board to decide whether to proceed and negotiate a development agreement. He stated that the board could reject the unsolicited proposal and instead direct a formal solicitation. He stated that staff still conducted publicized meetings, maintained minutes, used scoring sheets, and completed conflict of interest forms, even though he believed those steps were not required for an unsolicited process. He also explained that CRA staff had spoken with many parties interested in CRA land, but that few followed through with formal proposals, and he described the statutory notice period as effectively creating a competitive opportunity.

Claudia McKenna, CRA Attorney, stated the discussion had veered off track and clarified that the statutory requirement for the CRA to follow city purchasing processes applied to procurement of commodities and services under Section 163.370, not to disposal of property. She stated Chapter 163.380 governed the disposition of CRA property and did not require using the City's procurement procedures for that purpose. She stated the advisory committee bylaws allowed formation of a subcommittee and that the advisory committee could have evaluated proposals as a full body, but chose the subcommittee approach to handle the work more efficiently. She emphasized that the board was considering whether to accept an unsolicited proposal and that further disposition steps would still occur, including notice under 163.380. She stated that she was not aware of anything inconsistent with 163.380 in the process described. She noted that neither the City nor the CRA had adopted a policy requiring the CRA to follow a different procedure than the one provided by 163.380 for the disposition of CRA property. She stated that if the board wanted additional policy requirements beyond the statute, the board could adopt them.

Comr. Perkins stated she had previously heard community chatter suggesting something improper and had attended a meeting, but was asked to leave due to concerns that the matter could come before the board. She stated she later called Claudia McKenna for clarification about the subcommittee process and became comfortable with it. She asked to see the house rendering again and emphasized that the home was a welcome improvement and would help address dumping and trash problems. She stated she supported the proposal fully. She asked for clarification about prior CRA practices of giving away lots and asked how the CRA previously justified free lots and whether that was still done. She questioned how staff determined which lots

could be given away and expressed curiosity about differences between past and current practices.

Mr. Tran explained that outcomes depended on unsolicited proposals and market demand, and that when the CRA anticipated significant interest, staff preferred to run formal solicitations with appraisal values and evaluation criteria.

Comr. Perkins also stated that elected officials needed to ask questions publicly for the benefit of residents who were listening, especially if policy changes might be needed in the future.

Comr. Sigerson-Eaton stated she found it disparaging to imply staff was not acting legally or transparently and asked for repeated confirmation that the CRA was meeting legal requirements. She asked Ms. McKenna to reiterate that the process complied with the law and was not ambiguous. She also stated there was no rational motivation for the City to act improperly and expressed that she felt insulted by suggestions otherwise. She emphasized the City's intent to deliver infill affordable housing and stated the process was correct.

Chair Hardin thanked the family for planning to purchase the home and noted appreciation for their perseverance while the board worked through the discussion. He also ruled Comr. Fesik out of order at one point and limited her to questions only as the discussion continued.

Vice Chair Fournier asked whether a buyer was already lined up for the home and sought clarification on how the City ensured the buyer was appropriately qualified. After learning a buyer was present, she stated her concern was ensuring independence and avoiding conflicts of interest so that affordable housing opportunities went to eligible residents rather than individuals with inside access. She emphasized that transparency should ensure broad access to opportunity and stated she wanted safeguards so residents could compete fairly.

Mr. Tran stated that eligibility verification would occur and that staff could also evaluate whether any relationships or conflicts existed, and he indicated he would consult the housing department regarding existing policies and potential due diligence steps.

A motion was made by Vice Chair Fournier, seconded by Commissioner Sigerson-Eaton, that the Item for Consideration/Discussion be APPROVED. The motion carried by the following roll call vote:

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

No: Commissioner Fesik

4. [26-136](#) Consideration of an unsolicited proposal from Parrish & Associates, LLC to construct 4 attached single-family townhomes on the CRA property located at 300 NW 27th Avenue, Pompano Beach, FL.
(Fiscal Impact: \$220,000 Revenue from land sales)

(Staff Contact: Cassandra LeMasurier)

Nguyen Tran, CRA Director, stated the item was linked to the prior one and explained it had been separated because the evaluation for the 300 NW 27th Avenue site ended in an overall tie. He stated that Leon Frazier of Frasier Elite Homes withdrew his proposal for this lot so he could focus on the single-family home lot, which left Parrish and Associates as the remaining proposer and aligned with the subcommittee recommendation. He described the location as south of the King Freddie Lodge/Masonic Lodge in Collier City. He explained the proposal involved two attached buildings across two lots, creating four total townhome units. He stated that Parrish and Associates had four qualified buyers. He outlined pricing options, stating the proposal contemplated \$55,000 per unit for land acquisition, and offered an alternative where, if the land were donated, the sales price could be reduced to about \$440,000 per unit, while with land acquisition, the price would be about \$495,000 per unit. He described the product as a three-bedroom, three-and-a-half-bath townhome intended to be higher-end, with an estimated development schedule of 12-18 months. He cited total project cost estimates under different land scenarios and provided estimated tax revenue per unit. He concluded and stated that the proposer was present for questions.

Chair Hardin asked whether the proposer wished to present, but they stated they were available to answer any questions. The Chair then sought public comment on the item; seeing none, he closed the public comment and opened the Board discussion.

Vice Chair Fournier stated that she was seeing discrepancies between Mr. Tran's numbers and figures in the backup documents, citing different total cost values and attempting to reference specific pages. She stated that, based on the pro forma, the construction costs appeared materially higher than the alternative proposal and argued that this difference would be passed on to buyers through higher monthly payments and long-term interest costs. She questioned how the committee could have ranked the proposal better financially if the goal was affordable housing. She stated concern that the proposal either passed land costs directly to buyers or required the CRA to donate land, and she argued that, with a project of this magnitude, the CRA should run a competitive solicitation rather than proceed after one bidder withdrew. She emphasized that the withdrawn proposal appeared more affordable and argued that the board should consider whether "better finishes" justified significantly higher lifetime costs for buyers. She later clarified that the other bidder's land offer had been larger than the staff's shorthand description and reiterated that, apples-to-apples, the remaining proposal appeared to carry substantially higher costs.

Mr. Tran stated that he was presenting another staff member's material and did not have full backup details available, but he explained the key difference was whether land cost was included, which affected the per-unit sales price. He suggested the higher cost could be tied to the product's scope and finishes, including an additional half-bath and upgraded interiors. He cited examples of Parrish and Associates' higher-end product quality and stated the Board could direct staff to negotiate a land-donation structure if lowering the sales price was the priority. He also stated that requesting a new solicitation would add time, risk losing pre-qualified buyers, and increase costs for proposers who would need to redo their work. He framed the decision as a business and policy choice, noting that opening a solicitation could bring in outside developers, whereas the current proposers were local, minority-owned builders.

Chair Hardin asked what the downside would be to issuing an RFP. Mr. Tran responded that the primary

downsides were time delay, potential loss of qualified buyers, and additional cost and effort for proposers and staff, with minimal direct advertising costs. Chair Hardin acknowledged that much of the prior effort could be wasted if the item were restarted.

Comr. Perkins asked for the cost per townhome and inquired about potential ways to reduce it. Mr. Tran provided a per-unit cost estimate and stated that the board could pursue a land donation to lower the sales price, explore down payment assistance through the housing department, and discuss whether material and finish choices could be adjusted, although that would require developer input. Comr. Perkins stated that she wanted the project to proceed and, if possible, for costs to come down.

Comr. Smith stated that first-time homebuyers deserved high-quality materials, supported the project as a homeownership opportunity rather than a rental, and emphasized that the three-bedroom, three-and-a-half-bath layout was suitable for larger families. She praised Parrish and Associates for designing a larger product and stated the townhomes would provide ownership options for families returning to Collier City. She stated she supported the proposal and welcomed the four families.

Comr. Fesik stated she remained concerned about process, optics, and transparency. She argued that the item involved substantial money and highly sought-after land, and stated that she preferred deferring the item to run a publicly solicited bid. She also stated the CRA should clarify its approach to unsolicited proposals going forward so the City would not face situations where the optics looked improper. She reiterated her preference for a formal, competitive process rather than relying on an advisory board subcommittee approach.

Vice Chair Fournier later stated that she believed the item should be put out to bid due to its magnitude and tried to frame her remarks as questions after being told she had already spoken twice. She asked whether Frasier's product had been of low quality. Mr. Tran stated he could not say that and emphasized that Parrish and Associates' product was larger and upscale.

Vice Chair Fournier asked whether an RFP could generate multiple proposals and push developers to reduce costs and profit margins. Mr. Tran stated that the current path offered the benefit of working with local minority-owned builders and that opening it broadly was a gamble.

Vice Chair Fournier asked about the December 1 meeting minutes, suggesting the bidders effectively "split" the projects. Mr. Tran stated the minutes did not fully reflect his prior conversation with Leon Frazier, who had intended to withdraw before the evaluation and later stated that publicly after the tie.

Vice Chair Fournier asserted that there was an error in the scoring sheet regarding average financial capabilities for Parrish and Associates.

A motion was made by Commissioner Fesik, seconded by Vice Chair Fournier, to solicit a formal Request for Proposal (RFP) to construct on the CRA property.

Comr. Fesik stated that she understood her position was unpopular, but emphasized she wanted the CRA to do everything the right way. She stated that holding firm to existing processes and procedures could create opportunities to negotiate a better land price or lower costs for residents. She noted the way the proposal came

forward did not give her confidence that the CRA was doing the best thing for the residents it was supposed to serve. She stated she wanted the project properly advertised, properly evaluated, and brought back in the best possible form, and she noted that if Parrish and Associates still emerged as the best option under that process, she would support that.

Comr. Perkins requested that Parrish and Associates come forward to say a few words before the vote.

Mr. Tran stated an additional downside to putting the project out again was that the existing proposal materials were already public, so other proposers would be able to see what Parrish and Associates offered and what the evaluation criteria were. He stated this could reduce the chance of getting local participation from a qualified builder.

Chair Hardin asked the speakers to identify themselves for the record.

Joshua Parrish identified himself as Joshua Parrish of Parrish and Associates.

Laura Parrish identified herself as Laura Parrish of Parrish and Associates. She stated that she wanted to clarify the numbers and asserted that their price point was lower than Frasier's. She stated that they included a 10% cushion in their underwriting to account for unforeseen issues and mentioned their price point was not far off from Frasier's.

Mr. Parrish stated that they underwrote conservatively around \$200 per square foot and aimed to deliver a quality product, including tile, countertops, and frameless shower glass. He stated that their goal was to provide an affordable home while still offering residents a product comparable in quality to what people might find in beachside areas. He stated that their typical profit margins were around 17% to 20% and said they reduced margins as much as they could justify while remaining fiscally responsible and keeping the units obtainable. The project carried significant risk at that scale and argued that, after accounting for selling costs, holding costs, permitting, and execution, they needed approximately \$50,000 to \$55,000 per residence to make the project viable.

Vice Chair Fournier stated that when comparing apples to apples with the land being purchased, Frasier's per-unit pricing was lower, and Parrish and Associates' per-unit pricing was higher.

Chair Hardin stated for the record that appropriate processes had been followed and asked Mr. Tran whether there had been any "shenanigans" or backroom deals.

Mr. Tran stated that there had not been, and that staff had been as transparent as possible, providing the board with as much information as they could.

Chair Hardin asked CRA Attorney McKenna to confirm compliance with laws and regulations. Ms. McKenna confirmed compliance.

The motion to solicit a formal Request for Proposal failed by the following roll call vote:

Yes:Fesik
Perkins
Fournier

No:Sigerson-Eaton
Smith
Hardin

A motion was made by Vice Chair Fournier, seconded by Commissioner Sigerson-Eaton, that the Item for Consideration/Discussion be APPROVED.. The motion failed by the following roll call vote:

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

No: Commissioner Fesik, Commissioner Perkins, and Vice Chair Fournier

D. ADDITIONAL AUDIENCE TO BE HEARD

Chair Hardin asked if there were any additional speakers signed up to speak under Audience to be Heard, to which Secretary Alfred called Jocelyn Jackson to come forward to speak:

Ms. Jackson stated that she was speaking on behalf of residents near what is commonly referred to as the “ugly corner” near MLK and the 1800 block behind the corner store. She described the area as pitch dark with no lighting and stated this was a serious safety issue. She also addressed the treatment of advisory board members and developers, stating that if the City appointed volunteers to advisory boards, it should respect their work and recommendations. She stated that the discussion during the meeting humiliated and disrespected volunteers, developers, contractors, and families seeking homeownership, and she expressed that the tone of the meeting discouraged participation. She emphasized that many decision-makers did not live in the Northwest District and therefore did not experience daily issues such as prostitution, homelessness, and unsafe conditions, and she stated that dismissing project costs felt dismissive of the community and its residents.

E. REPORTS

Executive Director’s Report:

Nguyen Tran, CRA Director, stated he had no report, but he extended holiday greetings to everyone.

CRA Attorney’s Report:

Claudia McKenna, CRA Attorney, stated she had no report and wished everyone a happy holiday and New Year.

Next Meeting Date: Chair Hardin announced that the next CRA Board meeting would be held on January 20, 2026, unless otherwise noted.

Comr. Fesik's Report:

Comr. Fesik made a procedural statement for the record. She stated that recent meetings had involved new rules being applied in a way that she believed attempted to silence certain board members. She cited multiple Florida statutes and constitutional provisions, stating that all members of the CRA board exercised equal authority and that the presiding officer did not have unilateral authority to restrict or silence board members during agenda items. She stated that questions to staff were not debated and did not count against speaking time, and that such questions were necessary to fulfill duties under the Florida Sunshine Law and ethics requirements. She expressed concern that limiting board member participation could raise ethics and oversight issues and stated she would continue to ask clarifying questions necessary to perform her duties. She requested that meetings adhere to the charter, state law, and Robert's Rules so all board members could carry out their elected responsibilities. She then raised a second issue regarding a professional services contract executed in April 2025 with Claudia McKenna. She stated that the contract had not been brought before the CRA board and that she had previously requested clarification from both the City Attorney and Ms. McKenna without receiving an answer she found acceptable. She mentioned that, although the mayor could sign contracts, doing so without board approval would violate the CRA process and be procedurally improper. She compared the situation to performance reviews and approvals required for other senior contracts and stated the board was denied the opportunity to review or evaluate the agreement. She stated that the Mayor and Ms. McKenna had executed a new three-year service contract unilaterally and asserted this should be corrected.

A motion was made by Commissioner Fesik, seconded by Commissioner Perkins, to declare the contract with Claudia McKenna be null and void, and bring back a new contract for Board consideration. Note: This motion was later revised by the following motion.

Comr. Perkins noted that she did not recall the CRA ever conducting a formal evaluation of Ms. McKenna.

Ms. McKenna responded that she was not an employee but a consultant. She clarified that she served as the CRA attorney and stated that the board always had the right to evaluate her services at any time, without needing to wait for a formal performance review.

Comr. Perkins stated that clarification made a difference and remarked that she would like to evaluate some consultants in general, although she did not have any particular issues at that moment.

Chair Hardin asked for clarification and inquired of Ms. McKenna whether the board could simply void the contract.

Ms. McKenna stated that the board could not void the contract because it was a lawful contract. She stated that the appropriate action would be to move to terminate the contract if the board wished to do so. She explained that the CRA executive director had authority to execute the contract, that it was within that authority, and that it was therefore valid.

Chair Hardin stated that, based on that explanation, Comr. Fesik would need to modify her motion to terminate the contract rather than void it.

Comr. Fesik stated she wanted additional clarification before modifying her motion. She stated that she had previously asked for clarification from both Claudia McKenna and Mr. Harrison and did not feel she had received a satisfactory answer. She inquired whether the mayor could unilaterally sign a contract without board approval and pointed out that Mr. Harrison's signature was not on the contract.

Ms. McKenna responded that the mayor did not unilaterally sign the contract and stated that the assertion was factually inaccurate. She explained that the contract went through the CRA executive director, then to Mr. Harrison for review, and that Mr. Harrison authorized the mayor to sign it. She stated she did not review her own contract and that it was reviewed by other attorneys in administration. She stated the contract did not exceed Mr. Harrison's signing authority and emphasized that she had not requested an increase in her hourly rate in ten years. She stated that she stood behind her service record and legal advice, and reiterated that the contract had followed proper administrative procedures.

Chair Hardin thanked Ms. McKenna and asked Comr. Fesik whether she wished to modify her motion.

Comr. Fesik stated she was not attempting to discount Ms. McKenna's services but believed the contract should have come before the board for review or at least notification. She stated the board had previously requested that contracts come before it and that she had not been notified of this agreement. She expressed concern about executive action replacing board governance and stated she wanted the board to have the opportunity to review and approve contracts of that nature.

Chair Hardin stated that this concern was separate from terminating the contract and reiterated that the board could not void it. He asked whether Commissioner Fesik wished to proceed with a motion to terminate.

Comr. Fesik stated that she wanted further clarification but ultimately acknowledged that if the contract were legal, she would consider modifying the motion. After further exchange, she stated she would withdraw the motion due to the complexity of the issue, but she wanted it on the record that she expected contracts of this nature to come before the board and not be a surprise.

A motion was made by Commissioner Fesik, seconded by Commissioner Perkins, to terminate the contract with Claudia McKenna, and bring back a new contract for Board consideration. Note: This motion was later withdrawn.

Ms. McKenna stated for the record that under current policy, contracts that did not exceed Mr. Harrison's authority do not come before the board. She stated that if the board wished to change that authority level, it could do so by policy, but under existing rules, the contract was properly executed.

Vice Chair Fournier asked whether Mr. Harrison could have a different, lower signing authority specifically for CRA contracts, given the smaller CRA budget.

Ms. McKenna confirmed that this was a policy decision the board could make and that the board could set a separate authority threshold for CRA contracts, though she reiterated that the current contract was within existing authority.

Vice Chair Fournier stated that this distinction was what she and others were struggling with and that the issue was more about process than the specific contract.

Comr. Fesik stated that her concern was about the lack of notification and board awareness, not about the individual contract itself. She stated she was willing to move past the issue for now and revisit it when Mr. Harrison returned. She raised a second issue regarding the lack of regular monthly updates on major CRA projects, including McNab Park and the downtown redevelopment project. She stated that without routine updates, board members lacked sufficient time to review information and ask questions before items appeared on agendas. She requested monthly reporting that would include vendor lists, scopes of work, total costs to date, work completed, marketing expenditures, and upcoming timelines so the board could better track progress and ask informed questions. She then raised a third issue, stating that the board had previously requested and even voted for a workshop related to consultants and communications oversight. She stated that given the scale and cost of current CRA and City redevelopment projects, the board needed a dedicated workshop to clarify consultant roles, oversight, and communication practices. She stated she wanted a complete list of all consultants, subcontractors, strategists, marketing firms, media contractors, and affiliated entities receiving public funds. She emphasized that the intent was transparency and collaboration, not criticism, and stated she wanted these matters discussed openly so the board could better understand project structures and communications.

A motion was made by Commissioner Fesik, seconded by Vice Chair Fournier, to hold a workshop for reviewing consultants and communications. The motion failed by the following roll call vote:

Yes:Fesik

Perkins

Fournier

No:Sigerson-Eaton

Smith

Hardin

Comr. Fesik stated that she wanted to conclude her remarks and reiterated that her primary concern was the lack of transparency and oversight. She stated that being limited to offering opinions only during reports was not effective oversight and expressed frustration at being pressured to wrap up while raising substantive concerns. She stated that residents frequently raised concerns with her and that requests for clarifying meetings, workshops, or additional reporting were too often dismissed quickly. She stated that overlapping roles among consultants and staff, particularly in political-style messaging, made transparency even more important. She noted that refusing transparency workshops invited suspicion and further questions from the public, which she wanted to avoid. She emphasized that her intent was to clear the air in the new year and foster open conversations. She concluded by wishing everyone happy holidays and announced her District 1 meeting at the Emma Lou Olson Center from 7:00 to 8:00 PM that evening.

Comr. Perkins' Report:

Comr. Perkins expressed condolences to Bishop Simeon Taylor, retired pastor of The House of God Church in Pompano Beach, and extended sympathy to his family and church community. She reminded residents of her Christmas ham giveaway scheduled for Sunday from 2:00 to 4:00 PM at Hunters Manor Park, noting it was a drive-through event for Pompano Beach residents. She then reflected on the experience of commissioners who frequently asked questions, stating that such questioning was often used to make them appear uninformed. She stated that the lack of communication and unequal access to information among commissioners forced questions to be asked publicly rather than resolved privately. She noted she had requested monthly reports for many years without success and stated that some commissioners received information while others did not. She stated that serving on the dais taught her to navigate institutional barriers and emphasized that better communication and trust would reduce unnecessary conflict. She closed by wishing everyone a Merry Christmas.

Comr. Sigerson-Eaton's Report:

Comr. Sigerson-Eaton stated she had no formal report and wished everyone happy holidays, including Hanukkah, Kwanzaa, Christmas, and the New Year. She shared a quote from Abraham Lincoln on truth and deception, then concluded with holiday greetings.

Comr. Smith's Report:

Comr. Smith offered blessings to everyone celebrating Kwanzaa, Hanukkah, Christmas, and the New Year. She wished everyone safety and stated she looked forward to reconvening the following year.

Vice Chair Fournier's Report:

Vice Chair Fournier stated she believed the discussion about signing authority was important and should be addressed in 2026. She expressed hope that compromise and common sense would prevail and suggested reconsidering the CRA's signing authority threshold, given its smaller budget. She declined to make a motion but encouraged reflection on the issue. She asked for an update on the Revelry parking lot.

Mr. Tran responded that Public Works had removed a dangerous foundation, placed asphalt millings, and was working to acquire wheel stops and investigate power access for lighting.

Vice Chair clarified the lot's location and its importance for overflow parking. She raised broader concerns about contract renewals being signed without competitive bidding, stating that while such actions might be legal, they did not promote competition or public confidence. She referenced concerns about lobbying and golf-related contracts and stated that failure to bid on projects contributed to discomfort about how land and work were awarded. She stated she would be more comfortable with land donations occurring through competitive bid processes. She concluded with a Helen Keller quote and holiday wishes.

Chair Hardin's Report:

Chair Hardin addressed concerns about how meetings were conducted and stated he followed Robert's Rules of Order as advised by Mr. Berman. He explained that commissioners were allowed to speak twice per item

for ten minutes each time, but could continue asking questions afterward. He stated that his intent was never to prevent commissioners from getting answers and emphasized that asking questions was part of a commissioner's duty. He concluded with holiday greetings.

Comr. Perkins raised a point of order and stated that Chair Hardin often raised his voice despite having a microphone, which she found disturbing. She asked that he consider moderating his tone during meetings.

Chair Hardin acknowledged the comment, stated he tried not to raise his voice, and noted that emotion sometimes affected him. He thanked Comr. Perkins for the feedback and wished everyone happy holidays.

26-142

Monthly Reports

- Financial Statements - September and October
- Northwest CRA Advisory Committee - November 1, 2025
December 1, 2025
- FPI Security Reports - November 2025
- Professional Services Expenditures - November 2025

The Informational Report was RECEIVED AND FILED.

F. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 4:10 PM.