



# City of Pompano Beach



## Detailed Minutes - Final

### City Commission

*Rex Hardin, Mayor*

*Alison Fournier, Vice Mayor*

*Audrey Fesik, Commissioner*

*Beverly Perkins, Commissioner*

*Rhonda Sigerson-Eaton, Commissioner*

*Darlene Smith, Commissioner*

*Gregory P. Harrison, City Manager*

*Mark Berman, City Attorney*

*Kervin Alfred, City Clerk*

---

Tuesday, April 22, 2025

9:00 AM

Cultural Center

---

### Joint Workshop of City and CRA

50 West Atlantic Blvd.  
Pompano Beach, FL 33060

### CALL TO ORDER

The Honorable Rex Hardin, Mayor called the Joint Workshop of the City of Pompano Beach and the Pompano Beach Community Redevelopment Agency to order at 9:08 AM.

### ROLL CALL

**Present:** Commissioner Audrey Fesik  
Commissioner Beverly Perkins  
Commissioner Rhonda Sigerson-Eaton  
Commissioner Darlene Smith  
Vice Mayor Alison Fournier  
Mayor Rex Hardin

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Led by Kervin Alfred, City Clerk

### APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

### A. REGULAR AGENDA

1. [25-299](#) Downtown Development Project Update - Discussion of City Hall Design, First Amendment to Master Development Agreement, proposed Master Project Resolution for Additional Project Elements and Project Incentives and Financing for Civic Facilities.  
(Fiscal Impact: N/A)

**(Staff Contact: Suzette Sibble/Nguyen Tran)**

Comr. Fesik noted she had questions that were not on the agenda and wanted an opportunity to ask them to clarify the record. She was assured there would be time for discussion.

Suzette Sibble, Assistant City Manager, outlined the agenda for the workshop, emphasizing that input was needed from the City Commission and CRA Board on the City Hall and parking garage design. She explained that after incorporating feedback from the commission and community meetings, the finalized design would be presented on April 30, with final approval sought on May 14. She also mentioned a subsequent presentation on funding mechanisms and resolutions related to additional project elements.

Patrick Leonard from Roca Point Partners gave an overview of their involvement, which started three years ago and was formalized with a master development agreement in June. He highlighted the team's experience in building office developments and explained how HOK was selected as the architectural firm. He noted that the goal of the meeting was to present two concepts for City Hall and the parking garage, which featured interchangeable design elements.

Jonathan Rae from HOK introduced his team and emphasized the early stage of the design process. He outlined the process followed so far, including departmental interviews and community visioning sessions, and explained that the building was intended to be flexible, accessible, secure, and resilient to natural disasters. The facility would accommodate projected growth over the next 20 years and was planned to be 116,000 square feet. Community input emphasized desires for greenery, multifunctional spaces, public art, storytelling, and sustainable features like solar panels and smart parking.

Patricia Williams, a resident, asked whether the proposed mentorship program could be expanded to include on-the-job training for local high school students. Mr. Rae responded affirmatively, noting that similar initiatives had been done before and could potentially be arranged with local engineering firms.

Vice Mayor Fournier raised questions about the future of government buildings, expressing concern over investing in a new City Hall when government services are increasingly moving online. She questioned the long-term need for such a facility and whether a hybrid model might be more forward-looking. Mr. Rae and Mr. Leonard acknowledged these concerns and explained that the design was intended to be flexible enough to be repurposed in the future. They also noted that the current City Hall has significant inefficiencies that make continued use costly.

Vice Mayor Fournier continued questioning whether alternative uses were being considered for the building from the outset.

Vance Chatham from HOK and other team members reiterated that the building's versatility allowed for future adaptation and that the parking deck was also a key infrastructure component for the area's development.

Comr. Fesik asked about the envisioned flexible community spaces within the building.

Steven Burgos from HOK explained that some space on the ground floor was designated for public use and could be booked for events or meetings.

Comr. Fesik asked if movable, soundproof pods were considered. Mr. Burgos responded that such solutions would be considered in the detailed design phase.

Comr. Fesik also inquired about the proportion of space allocated for community use. Mr. Burgos estimated it was a few thousand square feet on the ground floor.

Mr. Chatham emphasized that the public nature of the building was a design priority and that flexibility and acoustic considerations were key. He then walked through the site analysis and early design steps. He explained that hand sketches were used to explore how the building could integrate with the community, paying attention to issues like water mitigation and native landscaping to support environmental goals.

Comr. Fesik supported using native plants and suggested incorporating an educational component to promote local flora and fauna, including pollinator-friendly species, to create a welcoming and educational environment. Mr. Chatham responded, affirming that the design team was considering pollinators and native plantings, which support both sustainability and reduced maintenance. He acknowledged the role of low-maintenance ground cover in cost savings and noted that indigenous plants typically require less upkeep.

Comr. Fesik emphasized the importance of using plants that don't require frequent watering and can reduce landscaping maintenance costs, referencing recent city commission approvals for expensive median maintenance.

Mr. Chatham explained the goal of creating functional exterior spaces that remain useful even when the building is closed. These would include shaded seating areas designed to foster community engagement without encouraging encampments.

Vice Mayor Fournier expressed concern that these outdoor spaces could become sites of homelessness, referencing issues at Chester Park. She stressed the need for careful design to avoid creating areas that require costly, constant security and emphasized the necessity of including shade for usability in South Florida. Mr. Chatham acknowledged the concerns and assured the commission that the design process would consider these issues carefully.

Sarahca Peterson, representing Northwest Community Outreach, supported the concept of community gathering spaces but asked if there were ways to restrict access during certain hours to prevent encampments, perhaps using retractable or concealable structures. Mr. Leonard responded that a mixed-use development, when fully active, could help with security through increased activity and presence. He reiterated that future planning would take security and activation into account. Mr. Burgos added that plaza furnishings would be selected to discourage misuse, and flexibility would be emphasized in the design.

Comr. Fesik returned to emphasize that in addition to addressing homelessness and affordable housing, the city also faced vagrancy issues involving individuals who choose to live outdoors and sometimes behave

unpredictably. She urged a balanced design that promotes public use while remaining secure and manageable, referencing persistent problems in Old Town.

Vice Mayor Fournier supported the point and urged the architects to apply their experience with homelessness in other regions to tailor a design suitable for South Florida's unique conditions. Mr. Chatham noted that other southern cities face similar challenges and that his team was incorporating ongoing research and lessons learned to avoid inadvertently creating spaces that enable vagrancy.

David Hall, a resident, stated that while architects can mitigate issues through design, ultimately, resolving vagrancy depends on elected officials having the determination to enforce standards and maintain safe public spaces.

Mr. Chatham then reviewed additional site features under consideration, such as vandalism-resistant furnishings, lighting for safety and ambiance, and areas for public art and memorials to enhance the public experience. He introduced Scheme A, the first architectural concept for the new City Hall. He explained that the building would fit comfortably on the site with an adjacent parking deck, and preliminary sketches and computer models had been created to explore sun exposure and pedestrian access. The design included a large double-height entrance intended to signal openness and civic importance, with simple, intuitive wayfinding inside.

Mayor Hardin raised a concern about the covered connection between the parking deck and City Hall, noting it should allow natural light while providing shelter from rain. He emphasized avoiding dark or unwelcoming spaces. Mr. Chatham agreed and noted that the team was aware of this balance and was working on solutions.

Comr. Sigerson-Eaton suggested better integrating the parking garage with the City Hall structure to create a cohesive, pedestrian-friendly experience. She emphasized the importance of design that encourages activity and vibrancy at street level. Mr. Chatham stated that the team had explored integrating City Hall directly above or adjacent to the garage but found challenges with public access and security. He remained open to continuing the conversation and solutions like covered walkways.

Mr. Leonard and Mr. Burgos both affirmed that more answers would come as the design schemes evolved and that the design team was considering drop-off points, valet access, and elder accessibility.

Comr. Fesik offered an example from Europe-using transparent, artistic structures to allow light in while providing protection-suggesting this could address the concern about dark areas between the buildings. Mr. Chatham explained that the current design includes a louvered shading system, which allows rain to pass through while still offering sun protection. A secondary breezeway would provide shelter from wind and rain, maintaining convenience and usability.

Mr. Leonard emphasized that the team was reviewing multiple design options to ensure this connection worked well in practice.

Mr. Chatham then presented a filtered rendering of Scheme A to help visualize the design more realistically. He highlighted the emphasis on the chamber's visibility from the public green, intended to symbolize civic transparency and accessibility. A service entry was included for events, and ramps ensured accessibility,

reinforcing the design's flexibility and community focus.

Mayor Hardin asked about traffic and road access to the new building. Mr. Chatham explained that Dixie Highway would include a deceleration lane and curb cut for parking garage access, with additional access from an adjacent green space. Walkways and pedestrian paths were being incorporated into Dixie's redesign to support foot traffic. He concluded that the parking deck would provide shared parking for the new City Hall and neighboring developments.

Mr. Leonard explained that the internal road system near the new City Hall site would be pedestrian-friendly, using pavers and limited car access to encourage walkability. He noted that drivers coming from the beach would likely access the parking deck by heading north on Dixie Highway and making a U-turn or by using an internal road from MLK. He emphasized that traffic flow and road design would be refined as part of the broader 50-acre master plan and that the City Hall design would influence those decisions.

Mayor Hardin expressed concern about access, especially for people driving from the beach. He stressed the importance of solving access challenges early since the current traffic conditions around Dixie and Atlantic are already difficult.

Comr. Fesik noted the high volume of traffic on Atlantic Boulevard and warned that additional access points to the site might worsen congestion. She asked if vehicle access could be relocated to the opposite side of the development to reduce conflict with pedestrian zones.

Keriann Worley, a resident, asked if the design team would show the rear of the building and emphasized the importance of ensuring the building doesn't feel disconnected from the city. Mr. Chatham confirmed that all sides of the building would be reviewed and noted that initial designs focused on the high-profile corner. He said later iterations had strengthened the building's pedestrian orientation.

Vice Mayor Fournier raised concerns about accessibility and walkability, arguing that placing City Hall at a congested intersection may make it harder for the public to reach it. She questioned whether enough had been done to study the traffic impact at Atlantic and Dixie, and she emphasized that design must ensure the public can get to the building efficiently.

Mr. Leonard acknowledged that traffic concerns were valid and reiterated that the master plan would include multiple access points. He agreed that solving access for this key location would help guide the rest of the project's development.

Comr. Fesik emphasized that the City Hall was a central anchor to the redevelopment and urged the team not to treat it as a standalone structure. She supported reevaluating traffic and pedestrian flows to ensure a more holistic design from the outset. Mr. Chatham reiterated that the design aimed to move vehicles to the parking deck quickly to prioritize pedestrian use of the development's center.

Mr. Chatham shared a conceptual rendering that placed the City Hall next to a village green, showing how it would relate to the surrounding development. He noted that the site would need to be raised about seven feet to meet FEMA flood requirements, which would affect stair placement and grading.

Vice Mayor Fournier asked how many design schemes would be presented and commented that earlier renderings were more visually compelling. She wanted reassurance that architectural quality would be preserved as the design progressed. Mr. Chatham acknowledged that early models lacked landscaping and visual detail, focusing instead on massing and layout. He agreed that visual appeal and integration with the surrounding area would be addressed more fully later.

Comr. Fesik asked for confirmation that current presentations were focused on building function. Mr. Chatham clarified that both function and form would be explored, but the initial emphasis was on layout and use. He then explained a rendering of the building's vehicular-facing side. He described how the entrance would be recognizable to drivers and how a pocket park at the Atlantic and Dixie corners would create a welcoming element. He reminded the commission that landscaping had been intentionally excluded from the current model to focus on the building's architecture.

Mayor Hardin raised concerns about the covered breezeway between the parking garage and City Hall, wanting protection from rain without making the space feel dark or unwelcoming.

Comr. Sigerson-Eaton asked if the parking structure could be better integrated with the building to improve flow and appearance. Mr. Chatham stated that some integration had been studied, such as placing City Hall above the parking garage, but that design created security and public access issues. He remained open to continued exploration of physical connections.

Comr. Fesik suggested that light-filled architectural canopies, like those seen in Europe, could provide shelter and openness between buildings. Mr. Chatham explained that the current design used a louvered system for shade and airflow, along with a secondary breezeway to protect from rain.

Mr. Burgos outlined the building's interior planning process, explaining that the first two floors would house public-facing departments while the upper floors would be reserved for internal functions. He described a "one-stop lobby" on the second floor where all public transactions could be managed in a centralized location.

Mayor Hardin questioned why high-traffic departments like Building and Treasury were not on the ground floor. He argued that departments most visited by the public should be as accessible as possible.

Mr. Burgos responded that the compact footprint in Scheme A required some public services to be located on the second floor, but an alternate scheme with a larger ground floor was also being developed.

Vice Mayor Fournier raised further concerns about requiring the public to go upstairs for basic services. She pointed out that most of the first-floor space in the current plan was dedicated to employee amenities rather than public needs.

Comr. Fesik questioned the inclusion of a fitness center in City Hall, suggesting that such amenities could be provided elsewhere in the development by commercial tenants. Mr. Leonard said the team was simply following programming directives and was open to adjustments if the Commission preferred more business-related or public-focused spaces.

Ms. Williams shared that wellness centers in public buildings can help lower insurance costs and attract funding through health-related grants. She suggested keeping the wellness center, possibly on an upper floor.

Ms. Peterson added her perspective based on her work in Treasury and Billing. She said those departments receive constant foot traffic and should be on the first floor for accessibility. Mr. Burgos acknowledged the input and said another scheme would address this layout differently. He described a new lobby concept that included a grand staircase and multi-use areas designed to be inviting and functional throughout the day.

Vice Mayor Fournier and others supported this direction but emphasized the importance of maintaining visual inspiration and prioritizing public access over staff perks.

Mr. Burgos concluded by discussing interior design goals, including transparency, open collaboration, natural light, and integration of technology. He noted that break rooms and gathering spaces would be reimaged as collaborative hubs, while finishes and furniture would promote wellness and productivity.

Mayor Hardin inquired if the design team had interviewed city staff and asked about the logic behind placing commonly used services on upper floors. Mr. Leonard confirmed that the first month of the project was dedicated to department interviews.

Mr. Chatham explained the tradeoffs in elevating certain spaces, including building code implications. The Mayor emphasized that public-facing services should be on the ground floor for accessibility.

Comr. Fesik supported the Mayor's concerns and added that City Hall should have a welcoming layout, with public services easily accessible.

Vice Mayor Fournier raised a structural concern that the "one-stop lobby" concept represented a reorganization of city government operations and asked if city management had signed off on it. Mr. Chatham confirmed that they had.

Vice Mayor Fournier asked whether virtual reality tools would be available later in the design process to visualize the building more clearly. Mr. Chatham responded humorously that the current process was already overwhelming without virtual reality. He then introduced Scheme B. This scheme rotated the chamber out from under the building to free up first-floor space, aligning with the commission's emphasis on a more accessible ground level. The design also created a more pedestrian-friendly side of the building while maintaining a larger scale for vehicular exposure. Mr. Leonard added that this scheme also reduced the size of the upper floors to offset the expanded footprint.

Mr. Burgos walked through the interior plan of Scheme B, which included more public-facing departments on the first floor, a relocated chamber, a café, and improved flow.

Mayor Hardin asked whether earlier feedback about floor organization had been taken into account. Mr. Leonard confirmed that this scheme was a response to those comments.

Comrs. Sigerson-Eaton and Fesik offered suggestions to improve the flexibility and openness of the ground floor.

Mr. Rae confirmed that elements like elevator placement could still be reworked.

Comr. Fesik proposed moving the elevator lobby to enhance public access and continue the double-height design.

Mayor Hardin reiterated that staff-only areas like the fitness center and training rooms should not take up space on the ground floor.

Mr. Burgos noted that the same design philosophy continued on the second level, including flexible workspaces and indoor-outdoor connections.

Ms. Peterson raised a design question, asking why the building's form was so boxy. Mr. Chatham explained that the design was still in a structural diagram stage but agreed that curves could be considered, even if they were more expensive.

Comr. Fesik asked about the overall timeline. Mr. Rae explained that the process would span 14-16 months, moving from schematic design through construction documents. Mr. Leonard added that the current goal was to narrow down a preferred concept within a few weeks, incorporating feedback and reaching a version that contractors could price.

Vice Mayor Fournier asked what exactly the Commission would be approving in May. Mr. Leonard clarified that it would be the conceptual scheme, including general floor plans and layout, before diving into the engineering details.

Jocelyn Jackson, a resident, emphasized the need for the new City Hall to be visually impressive and modern, referencing experiences in other cities like Pembroke Pines and Sunrise.

Comr. Sigerson-Eaton supported lighting the parking garage with LEDs for flexible and impactful aesthetics. She also reiterated the need for convenient access to high-use services and favored a larger chamber space that could double as an event venue.

Ms. Peterson praised the expanded chamber design in Scheme B as a welcoming feature.

Comr. Fesik proposed creating rooftop or balcony outdoor spaces to add visual interest and usable wellness areas.

Vice Mayor Fournier agreed, referencing the Spirit Airlines headquarters as a good model.

Mayor Hardin and Vice Mayor Fournier both stressed that City Hall should be visually impressive and not resemble a bland institutional building. Mr. Leonard assured them that aesthetics would evolve with further refinement.



Brian Campbell, a resident, underscored that the building should be a bold architectural statement about Pompano Beach's identity and future.

Ms. Jackson praised the current building department's welcoming design and emphasized the department's importance and workload.

Ms. Worley added that the building's beauty should be visible from all sides, not just at the entrance.

Mr. Leonard concluded by confirming that another public meeting was planned, and the design team would revise concepts based on the feedback.

Comr. Fesik urged the team not to lose sight of traffic and vehicular access concerns amid the many other topics discussed.

Ms. Williams asked whether traffic impacts would be addressed. Patrick Leonard clarified that traffic engineering was being handled separately as part of the broader master plan, not by the architecture team.

Mayor Hardin called a five-minute recess.

Ms. Sibble presented the framework for what the City Commission would be asked to approve on May 14. She explained two main items:

1. A ***Master Project Resolution*** that includes approval of the City Hall design and other project elements-some of which are civic obligations RocaPoint Partners will help deliver, while others are city-driven.
2. A ***First Amendment to the Master Development Agreement*** to reflect changes from input by Commissioner Perkins and the Northwest community.

She explained that the City Hall design process would continue to evolve, especially interior elements, but the commission would need to approve the general layout and major design elements. She also said financing documents would be presented with a not-to-exceed amount for bond issuance. The initial plan had been to demolish the **E. Pat Larkins Center** and construct a larger, 20,000-square-foot facility in a new location. Due to Commissioner Perkins' and community objections, that plan was paused. Instead, the City is now planning to **renovate the current E. Pat Larkins Center in place** without expanding its footprint while preserving the option to build a new facility in the future. The \$10.3 million budget for the new build will remain in the plan to maintain flexibility.

**Vice Mayor Fournier** asked if a dual solution had been considered-renovating the existing center for historical or cultural use and also building a new, larger facility to meet modern needs. Ms. Sibble stated that the original goal was to generate tax revenue by redeveloping the current site but acknowledged that discussions were ongoing.

**Mr. Leonard** noted that the current E. Pat Larkins parcel is centrally located in a way that makes it difficult to partially redevelop and added that moving the parking would complicate the site layout.

Vice Mayor Fournier and Comr. Fesik both proposed hybrid or creative solutions to allow some redevelopment while preserving community functions.

**Ms. Jackson** emphasized that **not all community members oppose building a new E. Pat Larkins Center**. She added that the current facility is too small and not on par with what is needed. She advocated for a meaningful investment that reflects the community's needs.

Mayor Hardin clarified that while the relocation is off the table for now, **funds will remain available** to revisit the idea in the near future if community and commission sentiment changes. Ms. Sibble emphasized that the \$10.3 million would not be spent unless a decision is made.

**Vice Mayor Fournier** expressed frustration that her constituents, who are also affected by the development, had not been consulted adequately.

Comr. Fesik inquired about setback allowances and whether a hybrid design could allow for creatively retaining the current building while using the surrounding land. She suggested blending redevelopment goals with community preservation.

Vice Mayor Fournier and Comr. Fesik proposed that the site could host a **business incubator** or creative mixed-use facility rather than just being sold as a development pad. They envisioned a space that supports startups, preserves history, and integrates with surrounding development.

Mr. Leonard clarified that for now, the resolution removes the new build requirement for the E. Pat Larkins Center from RocaPoint's contract, with the understanding that it could be reinstated.

**Comr. Sigerson-Eaton** suggested building **around** the existing structure, referencing large cities that creatively use air rights and structured developments.

**Ms. Peterson** asked whether the **\$10.3 million was strictly for either a renovation or new construction and not both**. Ms. Sibble confirmed that the amount covers one or the other, not additional funding. She then raised concerns about the **long-term consequences** of postponing the construction of a larger community center. She noted that revenue generated from the downtown project could support future needs if the commission decides to revisit it. She then introduced two **additional project elements**:

- A **vocational-technical (vo-tech) center** initially focused on culinary and hospitality but later expanded to include medical and aviation.
- A **college resource center** aimed at supporting tutoring, college test prep, and financial aid guidance.

Both would be built on the site next to **Annie Adderley Gillis Park**, formerly considered for the new E. Pat Larkins Center. The commission is being asked to approve a **\$6.4 million increase** to the civic budget to allow future construction.

**Vice Mayor Fournier** expressed confusion about how this overlaps with the Pat Larkins Center plans and questioned the need for additional educational facilities given the presence of local schools and colleges.

Ms. **Jackson** criticized the proposal to spend \$6.4 million on new educational programs when local schools already provide those services. She argued that the money would be better used to develop a comprehensive community center that houses multiple services.

Mayor Hardin clarified that including the \$6.4 million in the agreement is not a final commitment to spend it but rather a way to **preserve the option**.

**Comr. Fesik** requested confirmation that the plan was to either use the 6.4 million for a new standalone building or, **if a new Pat Larkins Center is eventually built**, incorporate these services into that facility. Ms. Sible confirmed this was correct.

Ms. Peterson asked for clarification on whether the proposed amenities would be included in a new facility or in the renovated site. Ms. Sible explained that the amenities would not be in the existing facility but rather in a proposed standalone building.

Ms. Jackson and Ms. Sible discussed future development paths, clarifying that the standalone would be part of a potential future scenario.

Ms. Sible then elaborated on a proposed \$2 million cap for local business enterprise participation incentives aimed at supporting pad purchasers or developers and described extensive plans for contractor outreach, job fairs, and building a local contractor database. She requested an extension of land acquisition authority through 2027 to align with the long-term master plan.

Vice Mayor Fournier expressed strong opposition to the city paying for the incentives, questioning why the agreement couldn't simply obligate developers to meet participation thresholds for minority- and women-owned businesses.

Claudia McKenna, CRA Attorney, clarified that legal limitations prevent unilateral mandates by the City and that the incentive concept stemmed from a commission motion.

Mr. Leonard emphasized that the current agreement resulted from City direction and cautioned against frequent amendments.

Vice Mayor Fournier pressed for the inclusion of specific thresholds in the agreement.

Mr. Leonard cited legal risks and the unpredictability of contractor availability.

Mayor Hardin and Mr. Leonard noted that the city already had supporting programs.

Vice Mayor Fournier maintained that developers should commit financially to these goals.

Mr. Leonard reiterated the intention to encourage local participation, especially in civic projects, even if developers wouldn't directly benefit from the \$2 million.

Ms. Sibble confirmed that this incentive would primarily apply to future pad users.

Vice Mayor Fournier continued urging for the agreement to reflect a concrete commitment tied to financial outcomes.

Ms. McKenna offered to review relevant agreements and legal constraints further.

Comr. Fesik asked about the list of attorneys involved in the original agreement. Ms. Sibble acknowledged the oversight and provided names.

Comr. Fesik asked who authored the proposed amendments. Ms. Sibble responded that it was the internal legal team. She clarified that a 30% local business participation target evolved from earlier discussions led by Comr. Perkins.

Comr. Fesik questioned whether the land acquisition extension applied to an expanded area, and Ms. Sibble confirmed it was only a time extension. Mr. Leonard explained that the City currently holds about 450 acres and that strategic acquisitions may vary depending on the evolution of the project.

Comr. Fesik asked whether ongoing design changes might reset the development timeline. Mr. Leonard clarified that planning adjustments were part of the process but wouldn't reset the clock.

Comr. Fesik also inquired about elevation planning. Mr. Leonard stated that an engineering firm had been hired to perform comprehensive studies.

Comr. Fesik asked when those would be completed. Mr. Leonard estimated several more months of work.

Vice Mayor Fournier asked if the land acquisition spreadsheet reflected updated priorities. Ms. Sibble and Mr. Leonard confirmed that it did not fully reflect current priorities and was a working file.

Vice Mayor Fournier asked whether all land needed for City Hall had been secured. Mr. Leonard confirmed it had.

Comr. Fesik thanked the team for their work and clarified that for the May 14th vote, the Commission would be reviewing amendments, City Hall design approval, and financing documents. Ms. Sibble elaborated on the upcoming vote's components, which included the master resolution, job placement consultant approval, and other supporting documents.

Ms. Jackson raised concerns about naming specific races in agreements, citing legal limitations, and suggesting broader language such as "local business participation." Mayor Hardin and Mr. Rae agreed that inclusive language should be used.

Ms. Jackson clarified that her intent was to ensure inclusivity without violating legal standards.

Ms. Sibble described cultural and heritage preservation components in the development agreement, which would involve community collaboration on design and placement throughout the development.

Ms. Peterson asked whether these efforts had funding. Ms. Sibble confirmed they would be supported through revenues generated from the downtown project.

Ms. Peterson asked for clarity on a stakeholder committee's role. Ms. Sibble explained that it would help guide decisions as the project evolved. She also described a community benefits grants program to be funded with \$500,000 from Roca Point's performance payment.

Mayor Hardin questioned the City's role. Ms. McKenna clarified that it was a voluntary agreement between Roca Point and the community. Ms. Sibble noted that the logistics of disbursing funds were still being discussed.

Ms. Jackson raised concerns about funds benefiting areas outside District 4, particularly private schools in District 5. Mayor Hardin and Ms. Sibble emphasized that the City had no control over Roca Point's private commitments.

Ms. Jackson maintained that such funds should remain within District 4.

Mayor Hardin reiterated that the funds were Roca's to allocate and were not subject to city oversight.

Mr. Leonard noted that tax implications and other factors were still being evaluated.

Ms. Sibble shifted to residential workforce housing, noting that although the code required 10%, the target had been set at 25%. She stated that they were evaluating the financial impact of a 20% obligation.

Vice Mayor Fournier asked how that would be formalized. Ms. Sibble confirmed it would be through the development agreement.

Mr. Leonard warned that increasing the requirement could significantly impact long-term city revenues.

Vice Mayor Fournier criticized the financial model's failure to discount future cash flows, arguing it was misleading. Ms. Sibble defended the methodology used by their hired consultants while acknowledging the presentation style.

Vice Mayor Fournier pushed for more realistic modeling with discount rates applied to long-term projections.

Comr. Fesik suggested using a 7% rate as a middle ground between the City's and Developers' assumptions.

Vice Mayor Fournier emphasized the need for intellectual honesty when presenting figures that span decades.

Mr. Leonard added that appreciation and inflation rates also influenced projections.

Vice Mayor Fournier urged for scenario-based models, highlighting the need for caution if expected land sales or tax base growth didn't materialize.

Ms. Sibble stated that they understood the need for sensitivity analyses.

Comr. Fesik asked if the City was considering broader economic shifts, such as potential changes to property tax law in Florida. Ms. Sibble acknowledged the importance of modeling such "what if" scenarios. She discussed plans outside the master development agreement, including hiring a job placement consultant and establishing a small business incubator in the Sonata building. The incubator would provide space, technology access, and mentoring to entrepreneurs, with the goal of transitioning them into local retail spaces. The CRA would lease and subdivide retail areas to create small storefronts for incubator graduates.

Vice Mayor Fournier asked what a proposed rent subsidy program was if it was not part of the MDA. Suzette Sibble explained that it was a commitment the city was making and that the CRA would rent space at market rate and sublease it at a subsidy. She compared financing options, showing that issuing certificates of participation would reduce annual lease payments from \$12.9 million to \$8.2 million, saving the city \$154 million over 30 years. She questioned the default assumption of private financing.

Ms. Sibble clarified that she was recommending self-financing and that it would save money. She elaborated on issuing \$137 million in certificates, which would cover capitalized interest and delay out-of-pocket payments until 2029. She emphasized that this model offered more financial flexibility.

Ms. Peterson asked if self-financing would replace existing budget items. Ms. Sibble confirmed that previous budget amounts would be retained, with additional elements like the Botech College and \$2 million incentive payment included in the new financing. She noted that the certificates mechanism had been used before and that \$137 million was requested to incorporate capitalized interest and provide a cushion for market uncertainties.

Vice Mayor Fournier raised concerns about early lease payments being dependent on land sales. Ms. Sibble and Mr. Leonard confirmed that the model assumed land sales of \$6 million in 2027, \$30 million in 2028, and \$23 million in 2029. Mr. Leonard explained that parcels with minimal infrastructure needs could be sold quickly, and the city hall project could help jumpstart sales.

Vice Mayor Fournier asked about the extra \$17 million being financed. Ms. Sibble said it was to defer payments and add flexibility. She emphasized their coordination with financial advisors and their desire for early payoff options.

Vice Mayor Fournier voiced concern about the timing between 2027 and 2033, as the city would be on the hook for payments if land sales did not proceed as expected. Ms. Sibble explained that the land sale structure incentivized quick development through a value appreciation sharing model.

Vice Mayor Fournier warned that past city projects had failed to deliver on similar promises.

Sarahca Peterson stressed that this project was different.

Vice Mayor Fournier emphasized the need for a coordinated effort to ensure success and asked if Roca Point could sell its stake. Mr. Leonard responded that Roca Point was a long-term partner with city control over the project.

Vice Mayor Fournier noted that even though the structure was different from other projects, unforeseen events could still impact delivery.

Mayor Hardin clarified that, unlike private developments, this was a city-controlled project with legal contracts binding the developers.

Mr. Leonard reiterated that the city-owned 100% of the land and controlled the project pace.

Ms. Sibble concluded with information about CRA bond financing. The City was seeking approval for up to \$65 million with a maximum debt service of \$6.7 million annually through 2049. She stated that the Northwest District's current tax increment could cover the debt without relying on new downtown revenues.

Comr. Fesik briefly noted that she had two questions. She stated she had reviewed the MDA and confirmed that Rob Wire had been identified as the referee and inquired if there had been any consideration for using mediation or arbitration instead. Mr. Berman responded by clarifying that the primary goal was to keep the project progressing without delays. He explained that having someone with the necessary expertise as a referee was intended to prevent any deadlocks, emphasizing that the structured process was designed to maintain momentum in the project's phases. He noted that mediation could be time-consuming and often non-binding, whereas the current setup aimed for streamlined decision-making.

Ms. McKenna discussed the referee process, highlighting its similarities to arbitration in that the referee's decision was final and binding. She emphasized the efficiency of the process, which allowed five days to resolve issues before involving the referee, who ultimately would make a binding decision if no agreement was reached.

Mr. Berman emphasized the importance of maintaining control over decisions within the group. He suggested that while it might have been necessary to compromise with others, the primary goal remained to keep authority and influence over the process, ensuring that their contributions were recognized.

Comr. Fesik expressed a desire for compromise and sought clarification about referees related to a selection process. She mentioned that the first referee needed to be selected by January 31st and asked whether other referees also had to be chosen by that date or if it was a flowing process. She also inquired about the status of the secondary referees and their selection.

Ms. McKenna discussed the process of selecting a single referee between Roca Point and the city contract administrator. She noted that if they could not reach an agreement, a secondary process would take place, but she mentioned that this had not occurred.

Ms. Jackson questioned who was part of the collaboration team representing the community during the

incentive discussions, stating that the community had not been informed and wanted transparency, especially if any collaborators were to be compensated. Mayor Hardin clarified that taxpayer funds were not being used.

Ms. Jackson insisted that as a taxpayer, she had a right to know who was representing the community. Mayor Hardin said there was no official record, though Comr. Perkins was present.

Ms. Jackson requested a community meeting to introduce the collaborators. Comr. Perkins commented that information is not available at this time.

Mayor Hardin confirmed there was no formal sign-in sheet or record of the discussion.

**No official action was taken at this Workshop.**

**B. ADJOURNMENT**

The workshop adjourned at 12:45 PM.

DocuSigned by:

*Kervin Alfred*

D1C913A8ED334CA...

Kervin Alfred, City Clerk

Signed by:

*Rex Hardin*

502CB780EB3E480...

Rex Hardin, Mayor

Signed by:

