



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, May 19, 2026

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

Note: Comr. Fesik arrived at the meeting at 1:04 PM.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Led by Kervin Alfred, CRA Secretary

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

[26-371](#) CRA Board Meeting Minutes of April 21, 2026

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 Executive Director Harrison whether there were any changes to the Agenda. Mr. Harrison 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 unanimously by voice vote.

A. AUDIENCE TO BE HEARD

Chair Hardin announced that it was time for "Audience To Be Heard". The following speakers were called to speak before the Board:

Michael Skversky, 1630 SW 5th Avenue, addressed the board by expressing frustration over the lack of transparency from RMA and the CRA. He stated that he had previously called for RMA and the CRA to appear before the Board and account for their work in the MLK area, noting that they had been paid millions of dollars. He criticized what he called "Old Town," calling it a "ghost town," and argued that tens of millions of dollars were now being spent in the MLK Boulevard area without sufficient public accountability. He challenged anyone who had concerns about RMA to speak up rather than complain anonymously online.

Vice Chair Fournier responded briefly, noting that she had previously requested a detailed breakdown of what RMA was doing under its \$33,000-per-month contract with the Northwest CRA. She expressed disappointment, stating that what she received was a four-page letter with high-level bullet points that lacked any detailed accounting of how time and money were being spent, and she requested more thorough documentation in the future.

Moka McGee, 951 NE 27th Avenue, spoke enthusiastically in support of the McNab Family Botanical Garden project. She described herself as a lifelong Pompano Beach resident of over 60 years and said she knew many residents, both old and new, who were excited about the project. She mentioned that the McNab family themselves were fully supportive of the initiative. She questioned why the project was taking so long, reminding commissioners that their job was to represent the people. She shared personal memories of her parents living near McNab Park and expressed hope that the completed gardens would be a place where families could enjoy nature, dining, and community. She thanked the Mayor and certain board members for keeping the project alive while criticizing Districts 1, 3, and 4 for slowing down progress. She concluded by saying Pompano Beach was a piece of paradise and that the project had 99% community support.

Danielle Flenscha, 820 NE 10th Avenue, spoke in support of community development and encouraged residents to do their own research before accepting claims they read on social media. She explained that she had moved to Pompano Beach because of its parks and greenways, that her son was born there, and that she intended to raise her family in the city. She described visiting city hall and witnessing the large volume of drawings and documents that city employees were working through, and she applauded their hard work. She encouraged residents to research CRA funding, explaining that CRA dollars were being reinvested in the district where they were collected, and that the McNab Botanical Gardens project was a self-sustaining initiative funded primarily by businesses in a specific corridor rather than by residential taxpayers. She emphasized that the park would be free to attend and would not require taxpayer-funded maintenance.

Jocelyn Jackson began her comments by initially addressing Comr. Fesik directly, prompting an interruption from the commissioner and a clarification from the CRA Attorney McKenna, who explained that audience

speakers must address the Board as a whole rather than make direct remarks to individual commissioners. After being given her time back, Ms. Jackson spoke at length about the historical significance of Haiti as the first independent Black republic and the first nation to permanently abolish slavery through a successful revolution. She argued that any elected official who mocked or belittled a young Haitian figure during a cultural celebration was demonstrating a profound lack of cultural awareness and disregard for a community whose history demanded respect. She stated that she would call out such behavior whenever she saw it and emphasized that Haitian culture deserved honor, not mockery. She also criticized unnamed officials for consistently voting against development in the Northwest area, for appearing at community events primarily when cameras were present, and for surrounding themselves with individuals facing personal or legal challenges. She cautioned against hosting gatherings with elected officials and staff from other cities and suggested that image appeared to matter more than service to those individuals.

Comr. Fesik responded following Ms. Jackson's remarks by clarifying that the social media post in question was not an attack on any individual or community, but rather a questioning of the City's decision-making. She stated that her post expressed hope that the individual in question would receive the help he needed and that her concern was the City's process for selecting honorees for recognition, such as the key to the city. She noted that the individual had reportedly been arrested twice in recent weeks and argued that the City's decisions in that regard reflected on the City's values. She emphasized that she had no disrespect for the Haitian community and invited them to continue celebrating their heritage throughout the month.

Comr. Perkins followed by drawing attention to Ms. Jackson's earlier comments about slum and blight, noting that Ms. Jackson herself owned property on MLK Boulevard near the Omega Frat House. She stated that there were three or four food trucks operating on that property, that violations had been issued, and that fines were running, yet the trucks continued to operate and serve food. She explained that the neighboring business to the right and the resident to the left had been contacting her repeatedly for years about the property's condition, and she called for the matter to be addressed.

B. REGULAR AGENDA

1. [26-366](#) Request by Office of Housing and Urban Improvement (OHUI) to convey three (3) CRA owned parcels to the City of Pompano Beach for development as affordable housing and consideration of three (3) unsolicited proposals for such parcels received in response to legal advertisement for the Notice of Intent to Dispose of Property.
(Fiscal Impact: N/A)

(Staff Contact: Cassandra LeMasurier)

Cassandra LeMasurier, Real Property Manager, explained that the Office of Housing and Urban Improvement (OHUI) requested three CRA lots on Northwest 18th Avenue to build affordable housing. She stated that OHUI had recently constructed four income-restricted single-family homes directly north of the subject property and did not currently have available lots for additional affordable homes. She described the ownership history of the three parcels, including one landlocked lot conveyed by Broward County to the City and later to the CRA, one front lot purchased by the CRA in 2025, and one southern lot purchased by the CRA in 2006.

She explained that although Florida law did not require advertising for an intergovernmental transfer, the CRA advertised a 30-day notice for transparency and received three unsolicited proposals. She summarized the proposals from Birdsong Management LLC, Parrish and Associates LLC, and Via Hope Inc., noting that Parrish and Associates submitted the most complete proposal, had licensed contractor experience, provided financing information, a pre-qualified buyer, plans, renderings, references, and an estimated completion timeline of eight to eleven months. She stated that staff recommended conveying the southern lot at 785 Northwest 18th Avenue to the City for OHUI to develop affordable housing, and, if the board chose to accept an unsolicited proposal, accepting Parrish and Associates for the two northern parcels, which would be unified into one buildable site. She added that if the board did not accept an unsolicited proposal, staff recommended conveying all three parcels to the City for two affordable homes.

Chair Hardin sought public input on the item and, receiving none, he moved on Board discussion.

Comr. Perkins asked whether the three proposals had been presented to the CRA advisory committee. Ms. LeMasurier explained that the item had been placed on the May Northwest CRA Advisory Committee agenda, but the meeting could not be held because there was no quorum. She stated that the committee received the backup materials but could not publicly discuss the item or provide a recommendation. She also explained that the item had appeared earlier on a February agenda, but because unsolicited proposals were still being received, the committee was asked to strike it from the agenda and wait until all proposals had been received and reviewed.

Vice Chair Fournier asked why the Parrish proposal referred to two modern single-family residences when staff's recommendation appeared to differ from that proposal. Ms. LeMasurier clarified that the three parcels represented two buildable sites because the two northern parcels needed to be unified into one site, while the southern parcel could stand alone. She explained that all three unsolicited proposals requested all three parcels, but staff recommended that at least one lot be conveyed to OHUI because a prior lot intended for OHUI had instead been conveyed to the CRA for drainage related to the Hunter's Manor subdivision. She stated that the CRA effectively owed OHUI a replacement lot and that the board could either convey all three parcels to the City or accept an unsolicited proposal for one buildable site while conveying the other to the City.

Vice Chair Fournier confirmed that staff recommended unifying the two northern parcels for Parrish and Associates and conveying the southern parcel to the City for OHUI. She asked what process OHUI would follow to build on the southern lot. Ms. LeMasurier stated that OHUI generally bid projects through its contractor pool and would submit building plans and permits like any other developer.

The Vice Chair asked Ms. LeMasurier to clarify the orange lot shown on the map. Ms. LeMasurier explained that the orange lot was the property that had been conveyed to the CRA instead of OHUI and was used for drainage for the DR Horton project.

Vice Chair Fournier asked who owned the parcels south of Lot 3 and whether the City was strategically working down the street because there were several vacant lots in the area. Ms. LeMasurier stated that the parcel to the south was owned by the estate of Penny McCormick and had been in probate for several years. She stated that OHUI would like to purchase it when possible, but could not do so until probate was complete because of title issues. She also noted that lots directly west were essentially landlocked and that a future code

amendment could potentially allow a narrower right-of-way to make them buildable. The Vice Chair concluded stating that she was concerned about the landlocked lots behind the subject properties and what would happen to that strip of vacant land as development continued south.

Comr. Fesik asked whether, if the lots were conveyed, the CRA could require a right-of-way on the back side in case the property to the south became available later. She also asked whether the CRA intended to purchase the southern property once it left probate. Ms. LeMasurier explained that the potential acquisition would more likely be pursued by OHUI, not the CRA. She stated that requiring a right-of-way dedication from the backyards of the proposed homes would likely be inappropriate, but a 30-foot right-of-way could potentially be accommodated behind the homes if the City amended its right-of-way standards. She stated that this would require a text amendment to Chapter 100 of the city code.

Comr. Fesik asked whether a text amendment would be required or whether a special variance could address the right-of-way issue. Ms. LeMasurier explained that variances did not control right-of-way standards, so the City would need to amend its code, either for the specific area or more broadly to allow smaller rights-of-way on a case-by-case basis.

Comr. Fesik asked about the timeline for Parrish and Associates to build both sites as proposed. Ms. LeMasurier stated that Parrish and Associates estimated the completion of both homes in eight to eleven months.

Comr. Fesik asked what the timeline would be if the board followed staff's recommendation and put one lot through the OHUI process. Ms. LeMasurier stated that OHUI might be able to complete its home more quickly because it already had plan sets for similar nearby lots and would not need to start from scratch.

Comr. Fesik asked whether Parrish and Associates could use plans from a prior CRA project. Ms. LeMasurier explained that the prior lot had a different configuration and that the previous Parrish proposal did not include fully developed, permit-ready plans because the board had not accepted that unsolicited proposal.

Comr. Fesik asked about compensation from Parrish and Associates on the earlier property disposition and development agreement. Ms. LeMasurier stated that Parrish and Associates was expected to pay the CRA \$220,000, or \$55,000 per townhouse unit, but that payment would not be due until closing because the project was still in the planning stage.

Comr. Perkins asked what the ownership process would be if the board selected a proposal. Ms. LeMasurier explained that staff would prepare a property disposition and development agreement, similar to the process used for Frazier Elite Homes, and bring that agreement back to the CRA Board for approval at a future meeting.

Comr. Perkins asked how a buyer would be found once a home was built. Ms. LeMasurier stated that Parrish and Associates already had a pre-qualified buyer who could obtain financing and meet income-restriction requirements. She added that although these parcels were not deed-restricted in the same way as the Frasier Elite Homes lot, the CRA would require affordable housing commitments from any selected proposal because the land was being considered for affordable housing.

Vice Chair Fournier expressed concern about neighborhood cohesion. She noted that OHUI had already built four homes with its own models, that Parrish and Associates might build a different style of home, and that OHUI could then build another home afterward. She asked that staff consider how the block would look and feel as a neighborhood rather than a series of unrelated houses. Ms. LeMasurier agreed and stated that the concern related to the block face. She explained that OHUI had varied its floor plans, garage placement, entrances, and windows so the homes would not all look identical. She agreed that the CRA should avoid jarring style differences and pay attention to neighborhood cohesiveness.

Comr. Fesik asked whether the properties would be conveyed directly to OHUI or to the City. Ms. LeMasurier explained that OHUI was not a separate legal property owner. She stated that property would be conveyed from the CRA to the City of Pompano Beach and designated for OHUI to use for affordable housing.

Comr. Fesik asked whether designating the property for OHUI would preserve the stated intent and prevent it from being transferred or used differently without further discussion. Ms. LeMasurier confirmed that the transfer would be an intergovernmental conveyance from the CRA to the City.

Comr. Fesik asked how easily the properties could be transferred back and forth if the City later acquired the property to the south and wanted to create a larger development. Ms. LeMasurier explained that a conveyance from the CRA to the City would need CRA Board approval, and a conveyance from the City to the CRA would need City Commission approval. She noted that right-of-way dedications were the main exception and could be handled administratively through permitting or site plan approval.

Comr. Perkins asked whether a home priced at \$428,000 was considered affordable. Ms. LeMasurier stated that it was considered affordable under the current limits. She explained that the 2025 cutoff was \$451,000 and that updated 2026 area-specific adjustments were expected soon.

Chair Hardin made a motion to accept staff's recommendation, with one lot going to the City for OHUI and the other buildable lot going to Parrish and Associates, with a development agreement to come back before the CRA Board after negotiation.

Ms. LeMasurier clarified that if staff could not successfully negotiate a development agreement, staff would return to the board and ask whether it wanted to accept another unsolicited proposal or convey that lot to the City as well.

A motion was made by Chair Hardin, seconded by Commissioner Sigerson-Eaton, that the request be approved based on staff's recommendation: one lot would be awarded to OHUI, and the other lot would be awarded to Parrish and Associates. Staff would negotiate a development agreement with Parrish and Associates and bring the agreement back before the CRA Board for approval. If negotiations

are unsuccessful, staff may proceed with another applicant from the qualified pool. 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

2. [26-367](#) A RESOLUTION OF THE POMPANO BEACH COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY (CRA), APPROVING AND AUTHORIZING THE PROPER OFFICIALS TO EXECUTE A STRATEGIC INVESTMENT PROGRAM GRANT AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CRA AND LFT IRREV TR RELATING TO THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 110 NORTH OCEAN BOULEVARD; PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES.

(Fiscal Impact: \$150,000.00)

(Staff Contact: Kimberly Vazquez)

Kimberly Vazquez, CRA Project Manager, stated that the CRA received a strategic investment program grant application from the property owner, LFT Irrevocable Trust, for the property located at 110 through 130 North Ocean Boulevard. She explained that the CRA had previously approved a façade grant for the same property about a year earlier, that the work had been completed, and that the owner had been reimbursed. She stated that the new grant request involved interior renovations to three vacant commercial spaces at 116 through 120 North Ocean Boulevard to create an event center, office, retail space, common area improvements, elevator replacement, roof repair and replacement, and restroom improvements. She stated that the scope included drywall, plumbing, paint, a fire sprinkler system, mechanical, electrical, structural work, fixtures, doors, and HVAC. She stated that the eligible project cost was \$1,040,000 and that the reimbursable grant would be capped at \$150,000. She described the proposed floor plan, including approximately 3,500 square feet across three bays, partition walls, common hallway restrooms, prep areas for catering, dressing rooms, office space, elevator area work, roof work, and elevator replacement. She stated that the applicant would have to obtain permits within six months, be substantially under construction within twelve months, and complete the work before the two-year contract term ended. She added that the East Advisory Committee reviewed the application at its May 7 meeting and recommended approval as submitted.

Chair Hardin sought public input on the item.

Danielle Flenscha, 820 NE 10th Avenue, stated that she thought the project was a great idea and that the façades along the stretch looked much better than before. She stated that she was excited to see the area look fresher and improved, but asked about parking for the event venue, especially if weddings or similar events were held there, because parking near the beach and parks could already be an issue. Ms. Vazquez stated that event capacity would be based on square footage and that she did not expect large venue events. She stated that the property currently had 70 available parking spaces on the roof of the building, along with nearby public parking if needed.

Michael Skversky, 1630 SW 5th Avenue, criticized the proposed approval and alleged that the property owner was a major campaign donor. He questioned whether the vote would pass quickly without scrutiny and asked why similar money was not being distributed to help other property owners, including those in the Northwest area.

Chair Hardin asked whether there was further public input and, seeing none, noted for the record that the CRA had the same program in the Northwest. Ms. Vazquez confirmed that the program also existed in the Northwest CRA. Chair Hardin stated that the CRA had awarded funds in the Northwest as well.

Comr. Sigerson-Eaton stated that the façade improvements had already made a major and welcome difference in the area. She stated that she was pleased to see the project moving forward with a use and would fully support it.

Comr. Fesik stated that she had several questions. She recalled that when the façade grant was approved, the program was described as allowing up to \$20,000 per storefront or bay, up to a maximum of \$200,000. Ms. Vazquez confirmed that the façade grant allowed \$20,000 per storefront or bay, up to a maximum of \$200,000, and stated that the property had approximately 10 or 11 bays.

Comr. Fesik asked whether combining three units into one bay would change the façade. Ms. Vazquez stated that the exterior façade would not change. She explained that the applicant planned to remove primary walls between the bays and install partition walls so the space could be expanded or divided for smaller events, while still maintaining three separate storefront entrances.

Comr. Fesik asked to see the floor plan and clarified that removing the walls would create event space while still maintaining three separate storefronts. She then asked Amanda Ennis to speak about the project.

Amanda Ennis, 20 SE 14th Street, Boca Raton, FL, stated that she worked in Pompano Beach and represented the owner as his assistant. She explained that the three bays would include proper walls and partitions. She stated that the partitions could be opened for larger events of about 200 to 250 people or closed for smaller events such as birthdays, celebrations of life, baby showers, or intimate weddings, with each host having separate access to the space. She described the common hallway, elevator location, offices, accessible restrooms, changing rooms, prep areas with sinks, and future small offices.

Comr. Fesik stated that the concept seemed interesting because multiple events could occur at the same time while sharing the same rear restrooms and prep rooms. She asked about the roof work and elevator work referenced in the proposal. Ms. Ennis stated that expansion cracks in the roof parking deck had been refurbished and that work on Bay 114, which included the elevator, had not started yet but would be done expeditiously.

Comr. Fesik asked whether the building had completed its 40-year inspection and whether the roof parking deck had been structurally checked to confirm it could still support 70 cars. Ms. Ennis stated that the question had also been raised at the May 7 meeting and that she had received confirmation that the process was in motion. She stated that she could not state with complete certainty that it had been confirmed, but she was confident it was underway and that everything had been done according to requirements.

Comr. Fesik asked why Mr. Galuppi had previously stated that he was not the property owner but had signed this application as the property owner. Ms. Ennis stated that Mr. Galuppi was the trustee. Ms. Vazquez clarified that the property was owned by the LFT Irrevocable Trust and that Mr. Galuppi was one of the trustee members.

Comr. Fesik asked whether questions from the previous meeting about grant applicants with open code violations had been addressed. Ms. Vazquez stated that the grant applications required the property to be in code compliance and to have no liens, and that staff verified that this property did not have liens or code compliance issues.

Comr. Fesik asked whether applicants could have open code violations on other properties and whether that would be allowed under the policy. Ms. Vazquez stated that she had focused on the subject property owned by LFT and was not familiar with whether any other businesses or properties associated with the applicant had code liens.

Chair Hardin suggested that the question should be addressed to Claudia McKenna.

Comr. Fesik clarified that the question was not personal to the applicant but concerned CRA policy.

Claudia McKenna, CRA Attorney, stated that she would need to review the written grant policy to determine whether it addressed applicants who owed money to the City or CRA. She stated that her sense was that the policy likely would include such a provision because giving money to someone who owed money to the City or CRA would be conflicting, and she stated that she would report back.

Comr. Fesik stated that she believed everyone wanted the project to continue because it would look nice once completed, but she wanted the policy clarified or made part of the approval so that any outstanding violations or debts would be resolved before funds were paid out.

Ms. Vazquez stated that the current application focused on the property rather than the applicant and stated that staff could review whether broader applicant-related requirements should be considered.

Comr. Fesik stated that she wanted consistent policies and procedures across grant programs and asked whether leasing three bays to one tenant was within the scope of the grant application. Ms. Vazquez stated that the interior renovations were within scope because the building needed improvements. She stated that staff also considered employment, and she understood that a catering company might operate the event center. She added that the improvements would remain with the property even if the specific event center or tenant did not work out.

Comr. Fesik asked whether work on the interior had already started before the vote. Ms. Ennis stated that work had begun and that the photos shown were outdated. She stated that she had visited the site before the meeting and was working daily with the general contractor, electrician, HVAC contractor, drywall contractor, fire alarm contractor, and fire sprinkler contractor. She stated that permits had been submitted and that work was active, including sheetrock, paint, flooring selection, firewalls, fire doors, ceilings, and light fixtures. She

estimated that the space was about 75% to 80% empty, aside from sheetrock.

Comr. Fesik asked for the anticipated completion date. Ms. Ennis stated that they hoped to finish by the end of summer or earlier. She praised the general contractor as experienced, high-quality, and highly recommended.

Comr. Fesik asked Ms. McKenna to provide a written determination to the board clarifying whether the grant policy addressed code violations, liens, or money owed by applicants, separate from this particular agenda item. Ms. McKenna confirmed that she could provide a statement indicating whether the policy did or did not require that.

Vice Chair Fournier asked about the condition of the bays not included in the grant request. Ms. Ennis stated that she had visited the building that day and saw several areas empty. She described the layout of the remaining bays, including spaces intended for the attorney and Sarah Martel, the event space, office space, common hallway, former hair salon, and former kava bar areas. She stated that some areas were still being worked on and that the common hallway was being improved with tile, sheetrock, paint, and other finishes for future tenant use.

Vice Chair Fournier asked whether the CRA should expect additional grant applications as more work was completed in the building or whether this request represented the full extent of what would be asked. Ms. Ennis stated that she could not answer that and would need to find out.

Vice Chair Fournier clarified that the valuation for the grant was based on the scope of work for the identified bays and included the elevator, while additional work remained to be done elsewhere in the building. Ms. Vazquez confirmed that it was correct.

Comr. Sigerson-Eaton asked whether the grant was a reimbursement after the work had been completed. Ms. Vazquez confirmed that it was a reimbursement grant. She stated that the applicant would have to submit payment documentation, paid receipts, and proof of completed work, and the reimbursement would be based on deliverables submitted to the CRA.

Comr. Fesik asked whether there was a limit on how much a building could receive through these grants, either financially or by number of grants, to ensure funds were spread across multiple projects. Ms. Vazquez stated that there was no specific limit for the strategic investment program. She stated that she would be hesitant to recommend approval of another interior grant for the property because it had already received a façade grant and was now requesting an interior improvement grant. She stated that after two years, if the owner wanted to apply for another grant, she would evaluate it at that time because the property had to be held for at least two years after grant approval.

Comr. Fesik stated that members of the public had asked whether the program rewarded owners for failing to maintain properties and then subsidized improvements. She stated that she wanted the CRA to be mindful of whether its programs could unintentionally encourage slum and blight, not just for this project but for future projects. Ms. Ennis responded that future tenants would negotiate lease terms, including whether spaces were rented as-is or whether tenant improvements would be handled by the tenant or owner. She stated that she did not believe the owner intended to request more grant money for future tenant improvements, though she would

need to confirm that.

Comr. Fesik asked whether tenants could potentially apply to the CRA for improvements as businesses. Ms. Vazquez stated that tenants could apply through the minor interior improvement program, but that program was limited to one grant per property, so only one tenant could receive it.

Comr. Fesik stated that the programs were good and that she wanted to make sure everyone understood their capabilities and limitations for this property and others.

Ms. McKenna followed up on Comr. Fesik's request and suggested that, if the board wanted to amend the program to include a provision about applicants owing money to the City or CRA, she could prepare an amendment for the next meeting. She suggested that after voting on the item, the Board could also vote on giving her direction to bring back an amendment if the provision was not already in the policy.

Comr. Fesik asked whether the board should first request a determination about what was allowed before taking further action and wondered whether the item should be postponed to the next meeting. Ms. McKenna advised against postponing the item. She suggested instead that the board make the grant conditional on confirming that the applicant did not presently owe money to the City or CRA.

Comr. Fesik stated that she would be comfortable with that condition and wanted to discuss it with the board.

Chair Hardin stated that he believed Ms. Vazquez had already affirmed that.

Ms. McKenna clarified that Ms. Vazquez had affirmed that only for the subject property. She stated that Comr. Fesik's broader concern was whether the applicant owed money to the City or CRA on any property or matter.

Comr. Fesik confirmed that it was the concept.

Chair Hardin asked whether that was already the policy. Ms. McKenna stated that she had skimmed a version of the program but was not confident it was the most recent version. She stated that the issue was a policy question: whether the Board was comfortable giving a grant if the property did not owe money, or whether the applicant also should not owe money to the City or CRA.

Chair Hardin asked whether the board would ask the applicant if they owed any money. Ms. McKenna stated that, if it was the board's pleasure, the motion maker could approve the grant subject to confirmation that the applicant did not owe money to the City or the CRA.

A motion was made by Commissioner Fesik, seconded by Commissioner Sigerson-Eaton, that the item be approved as stipulated by CRA Attorney Claudia McKenna, that the grant is subject to confirmation that the applicant does not owe monies to the City or to the CRA. 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. 2026-12

3. [26-358](#) A RESOLUTION OF THE POMPANO BEACH COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY (CRA) APPROVING AND AUTHORIZING THE PROPER OFFICIALS TO EXECUTE AN AGREEMENT FOR PROFESSIONAL SERVICES BETWEEN THE CRA AND FPI SECURITY SERVICES, INC. FOR UNARMED ROVING SECURITY GUARD SERVICES IN THE NORTHWEST CRA DISTRICT; PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.
(Fiscal Impact: \$353,808.00)

(Staff Contact: Kimberly Vazquez)

Kimberly Vazquez, CRA Project Manager, stated that the CRA issued a request for proposals in February for unarmed security services in the Northwest and East districts. She explained that the goal of these services was to reduce crime by minimizing opportunities for criminal activity through a visible community presence. Ms. Vazquez reported that the CRA received 20 responses, which were evaluated based on experience, service plans and approaches, pricing, and adherence to the local business program. FPI was ranked the top firm for its expertise in urban security services, district-specific strategies, and competitive pricing. The agreement presented to the board is for roving security guard services in the Northwest District. Ms. Vazquez detailed the required services, which include foot and mobile patrols, acting as ambassadors, interacting with businesses, residents, and visitors, providing escort services upon request, sharing CRA information, monitoring designated areas, reporting suspicious activities, addressing issues such as trespassing and illegal dumping, and conducting wellness checks. The guards will be equipped with cellular devices to contact CRA staff, BSO, fire, or emergency services as needed. The contract term is for three years, with the option for two additional one-year renewals and a 30-day termination clause. The Northwest District service will operate seven days a week, including holidays, with two guards on duty from 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. and one guard overnight from 7:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. The projected cost for the first year is \$353,808, and staff is requesting approval of the agreement.

Chair Hardin asked whether the item had been reviewed by the Northwest CRA Advisory Committee. Ms. Vazquez stated that it had not been reviewed by the Northwest CRA Advisory Committee because staff did not normally take agreements to the advisory committee.

Chair Hardin sought public input on the item.

W.R. Carney, 101 NW 30th Avenue, asked why the CRA would provide two guards during the daytime and only one guard at night, since the crimes he experienced in the area occurred at night. Ms. Vazquez explained that the two daytime guards were mobile and moved between Old Town and the MLK corridor, while the overnight guard was generally stationed in Old Town.

W.R. Carney stated that the explanation still did not make sense to him.

Vicente Thrower, 1890 NW 6th Avenue, strongly criticized the proposed contract after hearing the listed responsibilities. He stated that he did not see FPI performing foot patrols or walking through the neighborhood. He recalled that when the program first began, one guard regularly walked through the area, but the current guards stay in their vehicle with the air conditioning on. He questioned whether staff had records of FPI reporting illegal dumping, stating that residents were the ones reporting dumping to city staff. He urged the Board not to renew the contract and suggested using the money instead for improvements and grants for existing businesses on MLK, improvements at the senior center, or the botanical garden. He stated that Bojo's had not been renovated since it opened and asked why CRA funds could not help improve the remaining neighborhood buildings. He also objected that staff brought the item forward without taking it to the Northwest Advisory Committee for community input. He asked the Board to do something different with the money.

Tundra King expressed that although she often disagreed with Mr. Thrower, they were in agreement on this particular issue. She noted that during her visits to the E. Pat Larkins Center, she frequently encountered unhoused individuals outside, either asking for money or sleeping on benches near the facility and in the rear parking lot. She found it frustrating that the City was planning significant developments while the same issues persisted. Ms. King emphasized that if the program continued, its requirements and implementation needed to be reassessed, as she had not observed the promised results. She mentioned that she used to see security guards patrolling the area but had not noticed them recently. She described seeing unhoused individuals near the bus transit area, car wash, racetrack, and the E. Pat Larkins facility. Furthermore, she noted that older women leaving the center sometimes needed assistance to walk safely to their cars. Ms. King concluded by stating that the unhoused community needed support and that the current program was not delivering as expected.

Anne Bosworth, 4015 West Palm Aire Drive, agreed with Ms. King and Mr. Thrower. She stated that she had called her commissioner about problems and had been told to call the police when she saw unhoused people or other issues. She questioned why residents should have to call the police if the CRA was paying a security service to handle those concerns. She compared the issue to a security service in her own development, where guards became too comfortable and had to be held accountable. She stated that the CRA needed to hold the security company accountable through action because otherwise, public money was being wasted. She added that homelessness was a citywide issue, but it was not the residents' job to do the security guards' work.

There being no further speakers, Chair Hardin concluded public input and moved on to Board discussion.

Vice Chair Fournier acknowledged public concerns and mentioned attending advisory board meetings where issues with security and FPI were discussed. She noted frustration over the brief monthly reports and observed security vehicles frequently in the East and Northwest CRA areas, questioning the efficiency of the current contract. The Vice Chair inquired about the actual hours of homeless outreach provided by the three BSO deputies funded by the city. She sought input from Cassandra Rhett on whether to bring some work in-house or identify additional support. She suggested reconsidering how to allocate the \$350,000, proposing alternatives like community ambassadors and neighborhood cleanup efforts. The Vice Chair recommended postponing the item to reevaluate funding before committing to another three-year contract.

Nguyen Tran, CRA Director, mentioned that staff had discussed the importance of clean and safe programs, noting that security contracts, such as those with FPI, contribute to the “safe” aspect of this initiative. He explained that their role involves being visible, deterring illegal dumping, conducting checks, and serving as initial responders before the Broward Sheriff’s Office (BSO) arrives. Mr. Tran highlighted that FPI coordinates with BSO, homeless outreach teams, and code enforcement and collaborates with Cassandra Rhett through monthly meetings at the CRA office. He stated that to enhance the area’s cleanliness and foster a sense of safety for private investment, collaboration among code enforcement, local law enforcement, and security services is essential. He also pointed out that while BSO deputies can be expensive, the guards serve as the CRA’s eyes and ears on the street. Mr. Tran added that the East CRA initially considered canceling the contract but later reinstated it after observing the negative consequences of discontinuing the service.

Vice Chair Fournier objected to calling the service “innovative policing,” saying that sitting in a car with air conditioning was not innovative. She clarified that she was not asking to hire another BSO deputy but wanted to know how many hours of homeless outreach the City was receiving from the three deputies already funded. She stated that she wanted to understand the return on investment for BSO, whether Cassandra Rhett needed additional help, and whether the CRA could be more innovative in addressing homelessness, dumping, safety, and neighborhood conditions. She stated that the CRA’s focus should not be limited to businesses and Old Town, and she specifically noted that Avondale was part of the CRA but did not receive the same attention. She stated that the CRA needed to consider whether businesses should contribute to private security and whether CRA funds should be spread more broadly across the Northwest CRA.

Comr. Smith asked staff to review where FPI patrolled. She stated that the discussion had expanded beyond CRA properties to broader city issues, whereas her understanding was that the contract was specifically intended to protect CRA investments and properties. Ms. Vazquez stated that FPI’s current patrol area extended from I-95 east to Old Town, including Second Street, Atlantic Boulevard, MLK Boulevard, City Vista, E. Pat Larkins, the alley, the church area, and back up to Third Street.

Comr. Fesik asked Ms. Vazquez to show the patrol area map to everyone.

Chair Hardin agreed that a map would be helpful.

Ms. Vazquez described the map, stating that Atlantic Boulevard was to the south, MLK Boulevard to the north, Second Street to the east, I-95 to the west, and that the patrol loop also included the two-block area around City Vista and the alley.

Comr. Smith confirmed that FPI worked closely with BSO in those areas.

Ms. Vazquez stated that FPI met monthly with the homeless coordinator, BSO core team, and homeless outreach team. She stated that the guards had contact information and materials so that if they encountered someone willing to accept help, they could refer that person to Cassandra Rhett. She stated that the patrol area could be amended under the contract, but because there was only a limited number of guards, expanding the area was not feasible, so staff kept them focused on the commercial corridor.

Comr. Smith noted that the reports in the packet highlighted numerous homelessness-related issues, suggesting that the City likely faced these challenges across various areas. She mentioned that the Board might be surprised by the extent of the activity once they received more information. Comr. Smith emphasized the importance of maintaining safety for the properties in which the CRA has invested. She acknowledged the discomfort and concerns people may feel when visiting areas with visible homelessness. While she supported continuing the security contracts for CRA properties, she agreed that a broader discussion of homelessness and safety was necessary.

Comr. Fesik asked whether some of the funds could be reallocated to Cassandra Rhett's program or to another form of community- or innovation-based policing that would actually be functional. Ms. Vazquez deferred the legal question to counsel.

Claudia McKenna, CRA attorney, explained that the statute clearly defines what qualifies as community policing innovations. She stated that community policing innovations are policing techniques or strategies aimed at reducing crime by lowering opportunities for criminal activity and increasing the perceived risk of it. This may involve visible police presence through methods such as community mobilization, neighborhood block watch programs, citizen patrols, contact patrols, foot patrols, neighborhood storefront police stations, field interrogations, or intensified motorized patrols. Ms. McKenna also noted that an attorney general's opinion specified that CRA funds cannot be used for social services, and addressing homelessness may fall under this category. Therefore, she emphasized that the CRA must find a creative way to define patrols within the framework of community policing innovations to identify areas with an increased risk of crime.

Comr. Fesik inquired about the procedure FPI should follow when guards encounter an issue during their patrols or while driving. Ms. Vazquez provided an example from the previous week when she observed a man lying on the sidewalk near City Vista and called FPI to conduct a wellness check. She explained that if the guards encounter someone in need of medical assistance, they would contact fire rescue. If an individual becomes aggressive or is trespassing, the guards would call BSO. She emphasized that while the guards cannot make arrests, they can ask individuals sleeping in doorways to move along, address people charging their phones at storefronts, and engage with businesses that frequently have problems with specific individuals.

Comr. Fesik stated that if someone appeared to need medical help, the better response might be to call BSO immediately because minutes could matter. She asked when the security contract was first put in place. Ms. Vazquez stated that the first contract began in 2014.

Comr. Fesik asked whether the contract had been renewed on a three-year schedule. Ms. Vazquez stated that the CRA issued a new request for proposals every three to five years.

Comr. Fesik asked whether staff had reevaluated the actual needs of the areas since 2014 and whether the request had changed significantly over the past 12 years. Ms. Vazquez reported that the CRA continues to address persistent issues such as homelessness, illegal dumping, and vagrancy. She mentioned that Annie Annie Gillis Park had been cleared, but staff still observed frequent dumping in the Northwest District. FPI has followed up with BSO to identify the sources of these dumpings. Additionally, she noted that staff had modified patrol boundaries and adjusted services during monthly meetings; however, the fundamental issues have remained largely unchanged.

Comr. Fesik asked where Annie Gillis Park was located on the patrol map. Ms. Vazquez stated that it was across the street from City Vista.

Comr. Fesik noted that the park appeared to be outside the patrol scope. Ms. Vazquez stated that guards did drive there and that staff could request route changes when recurring issues arose in specific locations, including homeless encampments farther north.

Comr. Fesik stated that local businesses in Old Town were not very happy with the services being provided. She stated that she had seen FPI guards sitting in cars and using cell phones in both the Northwest and East areas more often than she had seen actual patrols. She acknowledged that guards were kind when they interacted with residents and others, but stated that the ultimate goal appeared to be calling BSO. She stated that spending \$353,000 on a very small portion of the Northwest CRA, much of which was vacant due to downtown redevelopment, did not seem justified. She noted it was time to revisit the service, consider other options, focus security more specifically on Old Town if necessary, and seek a more effective solution.

Comr. Sigerson-Eaton noted that the next agenda item concerned the same service for the East CRA. She reminded everyone that years ago, the CRA had eliminated ambassadors or security guards in the East, which resulted in strong public opposition and ultimately led to the restoration of that service. She questioned whether the Board would choose to maintain the East service while denying it to the Northwest community. Although some individuals criticized the service, she argued that occasional sightings of guards sitting in their cars did not demonstrate that this was all they did. While acknowledging that the service might not be perfect, she raised concerns about potential favoritism towards the East side over the West.

Vice Chair Fournier expressed her concerns about the services provided in both the East and Northwest areas, noting that, while the two regions had different needs, the phrases used, such as “moving them along” and “running them off,” were not effective solutions. She emphasized that the service merely relocated problems from one doorway or building to another without addressing the underlying issues. Additionally, she pointed out that the Northwest CRA covers 3,084 acres, and too much time and money were focused on a targeted area, much of which is east of Dixie Highway. She highlighted those areas like Avondale also fall within the CRA and have their own needs. Vice Chair Fournier suggested implementing a program that employs individuals on foot to clean up, engage with people, create a presence, and provide more benefits than guards sitting in vehicles. She expressed her desire for the CRA to develop creative, legally permissible programs tailored to effectively address homelessness, vagrancy, cleanliness, and safety in both the East and Northwest CRAs.

Comr. Perkins stated that while she would not outright oppose the East CRA contract, she recognized the division within the city and the differing needs of each district, particularly regarding crime. She mentioned that she had not supported the security company in the Northwest because she found it ineffective. Comr. Perkins recounted instances where guards simply drove through polling areas during campaigns without getting out of their cars. She noted that City Vista has long struggled with homelessness, particularly behind the building, even though the CRA's presence in the front benefited from security. Comr. Perkins believed that funds could be better allocated for improvements in the Northwest, such as a senior garden or businesses on Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard. She asserted that if staff wanted the Board to renew the contract periodically, they should provide detailed reports demonstrating accomplishments, impacts, and examples of success. Comr. Perkins

also expressed concerns about potential connections between the security company and certain city officials, suggesting that these connections influenced the scoring sheet. She urged that funds be redirected for improvements elsewhere in the Northwest.

Comr. Fesik echoed similar sentiments, stating that she did not believe the CRA needed the contract in the East CRA either. She clarified that her position was consistent across both districts and was not about opposing safety. Comr. Fesik mentioned receiving calls from shop owners and often contacting the BSO herself, effectively doing the work without compensation. She pointed out that she had witnessed an FPI-marked vehicle parked at St. Martin's for over 45 minutes while the guard was on a cellphone outside the car. Her concerns, she noted, stemmed from personal observations and interactions with individuals in the area. Comr. Fesik concluded that the services did not meet the Board's expectations and had failed to do so for some time in either district.

Comr. Sigerson-Eaton warned that the Board was making a significant mistake and suggested that the item was likely to fail. She expressed concern that another firm might emerge in a few months due to renewed safety complaints. Comr. Sigerson-Eaton argued that rejecting the contract would compromise safety for visitors in both CRA areas, especially the Northwest CRA and Old Town. She noted that the service protected senior residents and emerging businesses and restaurants, stating that some individuals already felt unsafe visiting Old Town. She concluded that if the item failed, it would indicate that some commissioners did not prioritize public safety. She said that they would see what happened and stated that she would not support anything related to the issue coming forward again until November.

Vice Chair Fournier stated briefly that she strongly supported public safety and had been discussing this issue for a long time, including by listening to advisory boards and others about the company. She stated that it was time to think outside the box, be innovative, and use the money more effectively for public safety.

Comr. Fesik agreed and stated that no one should suggest that a vote against the contract meant public safety was not important. She stated that the concern was that this particular company was not performing to expectations and that the CRA needed to reevaluate the approach.

Comr. Perkins stated that she knew the service was not working in the Northwest but had thought it might be working in the East. She stated that she wanted to hear more from the commissioner representing the East Side because that commissioner knew what was happening in her district. She reiterated that she knew what the service was not doing in the Northwest.

Vice Chair Fournier clarified that Heritage was not in the CRA. She stated that if FPI was moving people along from CRA areas, they might be moving them into the parking garage at Heritage, where BSO then had to address the issue.

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

Yes: Commissioner Sigerson-Eaton, and Commissioner Smith

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

Comr. Perkins asked what would happen to the approximately \$353,808 allocated for the security contract after the vote failed. She asked whether staff were being directed to do anything with the funds and whether the item would come back to the Board. Chair Hardin stated that nothing further would happen because the contract had failed, and the \$353,000 allocated for the contract would not be spent.

Comr. Perkins asked again what would happen to the \$353,000. Chair Hardin repeated that the money would not be spent. Mr. Tran clarified that the funds would be reallocated during the budget process and that the Board would see the reallocation then.

Chair Hardin confirmed with Mr. Tran that the money would not be spent under the failed contract. Mr. Tran also confirmed that the money would not be spent.

Comr. Perkins asked legal counsel whether the funds could be earmarked. Ms. McKenna stated that the funds could be earmarked during the budget cycle.

Comr. Perkins stated that she wanted to earmark the funds for the Northwest, specifically for the senior center, garden, or improvements to businesses on MLK. She explained that if the Board left the issue without direction, staff could place the money wherever staff saw fit in the budget. She asked how the Board could ensure, before leaving the meeting, that the funds were earmarked for District 4 and, more specifically, for the senior activity center, the garden, or MLK business improvements.

Mr. Tran stated that, as he recalled, the funds were under the housing and neighborhood stabilization line item. He stated that if the Board wanted to create a new project, it could direct funds to it if the use was allowed under the statute and included in the CRA plan.

Comr. Perkins asked whether staff could bring the funding amount back at the next meeting for budget discussion and asked for clarification on the line item.

Comr. Fesik identified the line item as neighborhood stabilization. Mr. Tran confirmed that the line item was housing and neighborhood stabilization.

Comr. Perkins asked whether the funds could be brought back at the next meeting for discussion. Mr. Tran stated that staff could bring the item back. He also reminded the Board that the Northwest incentive program had twice the amount of the East program, at \$400,000, but that the Northwest did not spend all of those funds. He stated that the money was available to Northwest businesses and noted that the last grant he recalled was for Big Daddy Conch restaurant.

Comr. Perkins stated that if staff brought the funding amount back at the next meeting, she could provide a list of items where she believed the money should or could be spent in the Northwest. She asked whether she

needed to make a motion for staff to bring it back or whether staff could do so without a motion. Ms. McKenna stated that Board action was needed because the funds were currently allocated in the budget under housing and neighborhood stabilization. She noted that the Board needed to direct staff on whether to consider the funds at the next meeting, during the budget cycle, or in some other way.

Comr. Perkins asked when the next budget meeting would be. Mr. Tran stated that the draft budget would come to the Board in July.

Comr. Perkins noted that the current meeting was in June and stated that she wanted the item brought back at the next meeting.

A motion was made by Commissioner Perkins, seconded by Vice Chair Fournier, that a discussion item regarding the allocation of \$353,808.00 be added to the June 16th Agenda item.

Comr. Fesik asked whether there was a definition of what housing and neighborhood stabilization programs entailed.

Chair Hardin sought public input on the motion.

Vicente Thrower emphasized that the failed security contract presented a valuable opportunity to assess the corridor and identify areas for improvement. He noted that the area reflects Pat Larkins' legacy and that the Board's actions demonstrated a commitment to advancing the corridor. He mentioned that businesses like Bojo's and OC Phillips Barbershop should have the chance to receive funding for enhancements. Mr. Thrower argued that supporting these businesses would prepare the entire neighborhood for future development and urged the Board to consider allocating funds for corridor improvements.

Tundra King expressed that the funding offers an excellent opportunity to continue enhancing the corridor and improving the Northwest community. She remarked that the neighborhood should not have to wait for the larger downtown project to begin cleaning up and making the area safer. Ms. King stated that the corridor is in urgent need of a facelift and criticized the City for allowing conditions to deteriorate for too long. She thanked Comr. Perkins emphasized that any plan or program developed must include consistent accountability and clear requirements. Ms. King expressed her eagerness to see something new, innovative, and creative emerge from the funding.

Anne Bosworth, 4015 W. Palm Aire Drive, thanked the Board for allowing the discussion to move forward. She stated that residents often felt that decisions depended on who raised an issue, and she appreciated that the Board heard the public's concerns. She stated that the issue was accountability: if someone was hired to do a job, the public should be able to see progress. She emphasized that everyone wanted safety and thanked the Board for moving toward collaboration, compromise, and a solution at the next meeting.

Moka McGee, 951 NE 27th Avenue, stated that the Northwest needed to be cleaned up and made beautiful like the Northeast. She pointed out that public safety was important and suggested that the issue might not be security itself but the way the company operated, such as driving rather than walking or cycling. She stated that safety was necessary for the Northwest to grow like the Northeast, especially with tourists, children, and

grandparents in the area.

W.R. Carney, 101 NW 30th Avenue, suggested that, instead of spending money directly, the CRA could consider offering a tax incentive to business owners who take care of and improve their areas.

Chair Hardin asked for further public input; seeing none, he closed public comment.

Vice Chair Fournier expressed her desire to address the funding issue promptly rather than waiting until November. She emphasized the importance of ensuring that funds are allocated appropriately and not used for unrelated purposes, such as projects in downtown areas or consulting services. Vice Chair Fournier stated that the Board must take immediate action and that the plan should incorporate a public safety component in an appropriate manner. Additionally, she suggested that the Board consider modifying the Northwest grant programs for older, established businesses. This adjustment could reduce the matching-fund requirements, which may be why existing grants are underutilized in the Northwest region.

Mr. Tran stated that it sounded like Vice Chair Fournier was requesting a revamp of the Northwest incentive program. He reminded the Board that OC Phillips had received an incentive from the Board, as had other businesses, and that \$400,000 remained available. He stated that the grant amount was calculated based on what businesses invested.

Vice Chair Fournier stated that if the incentive money was not being spent, then the incentive was not working. She stated that the purpose of an incentive was for businesses to take advantage of it, and if they were not doing so, the program might not be designed properly.

Comr. Sigerson-Eaton stated that grant money was already available for businesses along the corridor. She stated that the Board should review what a CRA could and could not legally do before the next meeting, noting that social services were not allowed and that the Board could not simply give money to the senior center. She stated that she would like to see another ambassador or patrol firm considered and wanted the security vote revisited at the next meeting.

Chair Hardin clarified that the motion under discussion was to direct that the \$353,000 be placed on the next agenda for discussion. He asked for further discussion and, seeing none, called the roll.

The motion carried by the following roll call vote:

Yes: Commissioner Fesik, Commissioner Perkins, Commissioner Smith, Vice Chair Fournier, and Chair Hardin

No: Commissioner Sigerson-Eaton

4. [26-360](#) A RESOLUTION OF THE POMPANO BEACH COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY (CRA) APPROVING AND AUTHORIZING THE PROPER OFFICIALS TO EXECUTE AN AGREEMENT FOR PROFESSIONAL SERVICES BETWEEN THE CRA AND FPI SECURITY SERVICES, INC. FOR UNARMED ROVING SECURITY

GUARD SERVICES IN THE EAST CRA DISTRICT; PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

(Fiscal Impact: \$157,248.00)

(Staff Contact: Kimberly Vazquez)

Kimberly Vazquez, CRA Project Manager, presented an agreement related to the East CRA district between the CRA and FPI services. The contract spans three years, with the possibility of two additional one-year extensions. It covers service requirements for 7 days a week, totaling 112 hours each week from 7:00 AM to 7:00 PM. The total cost for one year of service is \$157,248.

Chair Hardin sought public input on the item.

Tundra King spoke supported holding the contracted security company accountable to the City's standards. She stated that if commissioners representing the ECRA had concerns about the lack of accountability in meeting requirements, such as addressing homelessness and ensuring doors were locked, those concerns should be taken seriously and the contract revisited, as had been done for the West CRA.

Danielle Flenscha, 820 NE 10th Avenue, commented that the McNab Park project would help address homelessness in the area. She noted that while the east side of the city felt relatively safe to her, the area in question was one that came to mind as a concern, consistent with what other residents had mentioned during the meeting.

There being no further speakers, Mayor Hardin concluded public input and moved on to Commission discussion; however, no one commented further on the item.

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

Yes: Commissioner Sigerson-Eaton, and Commissioner Smith

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

C. 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 replied there were none.

D. REPORTS

Executive Director's Report:

Nguyen Tran, CRA Director, reported that the CRA had received its final completed audit and had received a

clean audit for more than 15 years.

Chair Hardin stated that 15 years with no audit findings was significant and likely rare, even if not a record. He noted that the auditor was not present but praised the accomplishment.

CRA Attorney's Report:

Claudia McKenna, CRA Attorney, addressed statements made during the April 28 City Commission meeting about her professional services agreement with the CRA, responding to Comr. Fesik's claims regarding its legality. She argued that the agreement was specifically for legal services, not a general service agreement, and clarified that Section 251C of the City Charter did not apply because the CRA does not adopt ordinances, and her contract didn't require a multi-year appropriation as defined by the Charter. Ms. McKenna explained that legal services agreements were treated differently in procurement and that legal services didn't require commission or CRA Board approval, especially in litigation. She noted that her previous agreements were presented to the CRA Board out of practice and that her current agreement, a three-year contract, was lawful and didn't require board approval because the executive director's increased authority limit was \$200,000. She reported that the CRA had spent approximately \$59,000 on her services from May 1, 2025, to April 30, 2026, and that Mr. Harrison and Mr. Tran monitored these costs. Ms. McKenna emphasized that Comr. Fesik's claims about unlawful actions by city staff required clarification, as she asserted her contract was lawfully executed and not void. She expressed that Comr. Fesik's remarks affected her personal and professional integrity and misled the public. Although she acknowledged the CRA Board's discretion to terminate her contract, she formally requested that Comr. Fesik stop making unfounded allegations against her.

Next Meeting Date: Chair Hardin announced that the next scheduled CRA meeting is set for June 16, 2026.

Comr. Fesik's Report:

Comr. Fesik responded to Ms. McKenna's report regarding the CRA attorney contract and stated that her concerns were not personal. She stated that her questions were about contracts and ensuring the rules were followed, that she had asked for an opinion, received one, and had not planned to raise the issue again. She then raised concerns about how agenda items and reports were handled, stating that she had requested a discussion item, not a presentation or report, on expenditures for the McNab House and Botanical Gardens at McNab Park. She stated that she had been requesting a detailed discussion about the project for more than a year before the City and CRA entered budget season again. She explained that she had reviewed a large amount of information and wanted to understand what was allowed, what was questionable, and what processes had been followed. She began by asking whether the City had a lease with the CRA for McNab Park. Mr. Tran confirmed that the lease was current.

Comr. Fesik later asked whether the lease had been amended. Mr. Tran responded, "Yes," and began explaining the two leases.

Comr. Fesik clarified that the CRA leased the entire park from the City and asked whether the lease and amendment were authorized by ordinance through City Commission approval. Mr. Tran confirmed that it was correct.

Comr. Fesik asked whether McNab Park was part of the transit-oriented district and designated as park and recreation land. Mr. Tran stated that he did not know offhand what the declaration was.

Comr. Fesik stated that, under the lease, the CRA was supposed to spend at least \$1.35 million in qualifying capital improvements by September 16, 2021, and at least \$2.7 million by September 16, 2023. She asked whether that was correct. Mr. Tran stated that he did not know offhand but believed that it was correct.

Comr. Fesik asked whether Ms. McKenna had a copy of the lease. Ms. McKenna stated that she did not have it with her but could bring it to the next meeting or send a response.

Comr. Fesik emphasized the phrase “Qualifying Capital Improvements” and stated that the spending needed to be tied to the premises. She requested that the CRA publicly provide the ledger, invoices, canceled payments, capital improvement classifications, funding sources, payment dates, and lease sections tying the expenditures to the required improvements. She stated that, based on her review, it appeared the CRA may have defaulted on the lease because the obligations had not been met. She stated that the concern was important because additional money was being spent on an unfinished project that many people still had concerns about. She stated that the park needed to be fixed, but questioned moving forward with a project that served multiple purposes. She noted that, based on the records she had received, only \$882,123.69 clearly appeared to qualify as capital improvement spending, related to relocation of the McNab House, while the rest appeared to be design fees, consulting, surveys, demolition, and other pre-construction soft costs. She also stated that the Bermello Ajamil contract appeared to be 87.338% billed, while construction documents were only about 5% complete, and permitting was about 20% complete. She asked what date city records showed that \$2.7 million in qualifying capital improvements had been completed at McNab Park. Mr. Tran stated that staff could provide that report and assured the board that the CRA had not defaulted on the lease. He stated that staff had reviewed the contract obligation and determined that the obligations had been met.

Comr. Fesik clarified that she was not asking whether money had been spent in general, but whether the City and CRA had certified that capital improvement spending under the lease, rather than soft costs, had been met.

Ms. McKenna stated that she believed Comr. Fesik was reading the lease provision and city code too narrowly. She stated that everything done to date related to the capital improvement was the park in its entirety. She added that the CRA was an arm of the City, that McNab Park was a city park, and that the CRA was leasing it to improve it. She mentioned that she did not want the public to misunderstand the arrangement as an arm’s-length transaction between a private corporation and the City, because the City and CRA were working together to complete a public project.

Comr. Fesik stated that she appreciated the explanation but disagreed in some respects with the view that the parties were technically working together. She returned to the spending issue and stated that earlier public information showed approximately \$2.1 million had been expended, not encumbered, as of early 2025. She stated that she looked forward to seeing how the numbers were pieced together, but described that as only one small part of the broader conversation.

Mr. Tran asked whether Comr. Fesik had included the acquisition of the chamber property in her calculation.

Comr. Fesik responded that staff could include whatever numbers they wanted in the report, but noted that Mr. Tran had already provided her with the numbers she referenced. She then asked about a federal pass-through grant tied to the project, stating that it appeared to include \$1 million in federal funds and a \$500,000 local contribution. Mr. Tran stated that the CRA had three grants: one for \$1 million and two for \$500,000 each, totaling \$2 million.

Comr. Fesik asked whether staff had requested extensions for the grants, noting that one grant had a completion date of June 30, 2026. Ms. Vasquez stated that the CRA currently has three grants, all of which have been extended and approved.

Comr. Fesik asked whether the board or the executive director normally received public notice when extensions were requested or approved. Ms. Vasquez stated that staff generally handled the six-month extensions when paperwork was sent requesting status updates and extensions. She stated that the project had been in construction drawings for the past year.

Comr. Fesik stated that she believed such information should be communicated to the public and the board. She then asked whether the CRA still had no restaurateur or restaurant operator participating in the McNab House project. Mr. Tran stated that staff had spoken with approximately three restaurant operators, as well as event operators, and that the CRA would need to solicit for that service. He stated that the staff was short-staffed, so the solicitation was taking longer, but the staff was working on it.

Comr. Fesik mentioned that the project had previously been prioritized with the restaurant as a first phase. She expressed concerns regarding the Broward County Property Appraiser records for the property located at 2250 East Atlantic Boulevard. According to her, from 2020 through 2025, the property was listed for use as forest, parks, recreation areas, and municipal spaces. However, in 2026, the designation changed to vacant governmental. She pointed out that the land valuation rose significantly from approximately \$1,047,940 in 2025 to \$4,584,760 in 2026, while the building value was recorded as zero. She inquired about the process that led to this change and its implications for the City and the park designation. Mr. Tran clarified that the property appraiser does not determine zoning, permitted uses, or the City's designation of the property. He emphasized that these matters are under the City's control. He reminded the Board that the project had successfully gone through the Development Review Committee (DRC), Advisory Architectural Committee (AAC), and Planning and Zoning, with all comments addressed, ultimately receiving a development order. He stated that if the City did not permit the project on that site, the CRA would not have obtained a development order based on zoning, use, and the approved site plan. He reiterated that the staff has always indicated that the project would consist of public open space.

Comr. Fesik asked whether it was a public park or a public open space. Mr. Tran stated that it was technically a public open space. He stated that the public might be used to parks with amenities such as tennis courts or pickleball courts, while this project was truly open space.

Comr. Fesik asked whether the playground would qualify as a park amenity. Mr. Tran stated that there would be children's playgrounds in the sensory garden, as shown in the master plan.

Comr. Fesik asked whether the project was now public open space and not a park. Mr. Tran stated that the

project was 75% open space, which was more than before.

Comr. Fesik expressed concern that the public had been misled about the project changing from a public park to public open space, contributing to anger and trust issues among residents. She noted that the Planning and Zoning presentation treated the matter as minor changes, but she discovered that adjustments for parks and recreation requirements no longer required City Commission approval and could be handled by the Development Services Director. She inquired whether the public purpose adjustment for McNab Park or McNab House and Botanical Gardens would be presented to the City Commission or approved by the Development Services Director. Mr. Tran stated that the code governed the process and that it was a policy decision for the Commission to change it. He stated that staff followed the code.

Comr. Fesik asked whether Mr. Tran would ask the Development Services Director to bring the matter before the Commission due to public concerns. Mr. Tran stated that many people wanted the project completed expeditiously and that staff were under pressure to implement a project approved by the Board and City Commission. He stated that the staff was carrying out that direction unless the board voted to remove the project.

Comr. Fesik asked whether that meant staff would not ask the Development Services Director to bring it forward. Mr. Tran stated that the staff was following the code and would not delay the project further.

Comr. Fesik stated that the response showed the staff chose to interpret the code in a way that avoided a Commission discussion. She stated that the project was a controversial item involving significant money and a possible CRA extension and bond issue. She said that the lack of transparency would be difficult for many people to accept, even if the process was legally allowed.

Comr. Fesik stated that she was not making a motion because she believed she knew how it would go. She stated that she wanted to place issues on the record and allow the public to decide what it wanted the board to do. She expressed frustration that the conversation had been delayed for more than a year and stated that it was inappropriate for others to roll their eyes, make comments, or be rude when she was asking for information she believed the public deserved. She stated that she was not relying on press releases, polished posts, or what she viewed as subterfuge through the legal process to move the project forward.

Chair Hardin stated that if there was a factual inaccuracy, he would encourage anyone with the facts to interject.

Comr. Fesik responded that factual corrections could be placed on the record after she finished her statement. She then discussed social media activity related to McNab Park. She stated that RMA owned property east of the park and was closely tied to the project, and that other influential people with property interests or vested interests had promoted the project and publicly shamed opponents. She asked whether the plan was still to have a nonprofit take over day-to-day operations or manage the facility in some way if the project moved forward. Mr. Tran stated that the operating structure had not yet been decided and would require discussion with the City Manager. He stated that it could be operated by city staff, a hybrid system, or a nonprofit.

Comr. Fesik stated that previous presentations had referenced a nonprofit model. Mr. Tran stated that staff had

visited the Miami Beach Botanical Garden and used it as an example because it operated through a nonprofit that could fundraise and do things the City and CRA could not. He stated that the staff was weighing those benefits.

Comr. Fesik expressed her opinion that McNab Park was being marketed to the public as a public park project, but it was now being referred to as public open space. She noted that the surrounding activities seemed closely linked to future operations, consulting, parking, property acquisition, campaign support, and project control. According to her, the concern was not merely about preserving a house, flowers, pathways, or a sensory garden; it was about who benefits, who gains access, who receives payment, who is positioned for advantage, and who influences the future of public land. She pointed out that the site plan record indicated that a specific nonprofit, represented pro bono by one of its board members, had expressed interest in being involved with the McNab House and Botanical Gardens, and potentially managing it. This information was disclosed at the Planning and Zoning meeting on August 27, 2025.

Mr. Tran asked whether that was a fact and stated that there were no agreements in place with any nonprofit. Comr. Fesik stated that Mr. Hartzell had said he had a pro bono client who had expressed interest in taking over those operations, and that the recording could be reviewed. She then stated that a group promoting the project and creating a Facebook page for it was partly related to her by blood, but that she had no relationship with that person and had not had one since 2024. She stated there would be no conflict of interest on her part. She requested a very detailed, publicly accessible, clickable list of project expenditures, invoices, and related information, stating that the information could be provided but that the decision had been made not to do so.

Comr. Fesik discussed RMA and expressed concerns about redevelopment consulting models in various cities. She stated that a consultant couldn't effectively represent both redevelopment interests and City residents. Comr. Fesik noted that her research into Pompano Beach's setup revealed it was unusual, with consultants and advisors frequently influencing major projects before board review. She cited Economic Development Council and CRA advisory committee minutes for more current information. Comr. Fesik emphasized the need for transparency, citing a July 2018 memo on potential land purchases that could reduce approval requirements. She believed the community had been misled about the project, which she felt was not in Pompano Beach's best interest.

Chair Hardin asked whether Comr. Fesik was saying staff had misled the Board. Comr. Fesik stated that it was her opinion and that her opinion did not warrant interruption.

Chair Hardin stated that it was important to clarify that it was her opinion and asked Ms. McKenna whether there was evidence that staff had misled the Board. Ms. McKenna stated that the discussion was about semantics. She stated that open space contemplated park amenities at McNab and that there was no meaningful distinction between calling it open space or a park. She stated that the project was the McNab House and Botanical Gardens, with all features approved in the master plan. She noted that she did not want the public to think there had been a bait-and-switch or that the approved amenities would not be provided. She stated that the legal reality was what had been approved in the master plan, including the McNab House, botanical gardens, and related amenities.

Comr. Fesik responded that the project may be the McNab House and Botanical Gardens in the plan, but it

had originally been McNab Park and was now being treated as McNab House and Botanical Gardens rather than McNab Park. She asked whether there was any prior employment history or connection between the current Development Services Director and RMA. Mr. Tran stated that Comr. Fesik would have to ask the Development Services Director, and he was not aware of any such connection.

Comr. Fesik stated that she wanted that clarified because the Development Services Director could decide whether the matter moved forward without coming to the City Commission. She also stated that she still wanted all information on what was being done at McNab Park, McNab House, and Botanical Gardens. She stated that she had been sick for several days and was disappointed by what she had learned, saying more would come later.

Comr. Perkins' Report:

Comr. Perkins addressed three items during her report. First, she requested an update from staff regarding the traffic light at NW 18th Avenue and Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard, noting that work on the signal had been ongoing for four years. She was informed that the design had been completed and sought clarification, especially since the Golden Acres project was set to open at the end of the month, which would increase traffic at this already dangerous intersection. Second, she inquired about installing two stop signs on NW 6th Avenue following the removal of the roundabouts. She emphasized that these intersections were also hazardous and mentioned that staff had been waiting for a response from the county on this matter. Finally, she spoke about an event that took place in her district over the weekend. She explained that she had called to ask about the nature of the event, but was later informed by the Broward Sheriff's Office (BSO) that they had told the event organizer she had requested them to shut it down. Comr. Perkins clarified that she never made such a request and was only seeking communication about events in her district. She expressed concern that BSO had previously used her name inappropriately and reiterated her request for officers to refrain from implying that she had lodged complaints or directed their actions when she had not made such statements. She asserted that she could speak for herself and did not need BSO to attribute statements to her.

Comr. Sigerson-Eaton's Report:

Comr. Sigerson-Eaton wished everyone a happy and safe Memorial Day weekend. She then discussed the McNab House and Botanical Gardens project, expressing her enthusiasm for its concept, educational aspect, field trip potential, design, event space, and restaurant with a view of the gardens. She believes the project will be a tremendous success and a great opportunity for the City, noting that many other cities would envy such a facility. Comr. Sigerson-Eaton stated that it would serve as an economic engine and could become self-sustaining through event space rentals and maintenance revenue. She mentioned that the board voted in 2023 to proceed with hiring the architect and developing the master plan, although the project has been in development for a longer period. She emphasized that she would not support any value engineering that would dilute or diminish the project. Comr. Sigerson-Eaton asserted that as long as there are not four votes to remove the Botanical Gardens from the CRA plan, the project must continue towards completion. She also spoke about RMA, a firm that she believes has done outstanding work in the East and Fishing Village areas. She expressed confidence that they would achieve similar success in the new downtown project. Until there are four votes to remove RMA or to cancel the master developer contract for the new downtown, those efforts will continue.

Comr. Smith's Report:

No report.

Vice Chair Fournier's Report:

Vice Chair Fournier highlighted the need for 4 votes each year to pass a budget and advance initiatives. She argued that delaying decisions until November was not in the best interest of residents and that compromise was essential. She discussed a proposed residential development in the Northwest CRA on Sixth Street, pointing out the difficulties in securing financing in the current market. She mentioned the CRA's use of tax-incentive financing for projects like Old Town Square and asked about any smaller tax-incentive programs, particularly for projects with workforce or affordable housing units, emphasizing that "affordable housing" refers to modern, quality housing with income-based rent limits. Mr. Tran responded that Vice Chair Fournier was likely referring to Crown Heights 6 and mentioned that staff had been in contact with the developers. He explained that the previous program, known as the RITA program, which facilitated the development of Old Town Square and Mela Pompano, had expired. He noted that redevelopment programs vary by project stage, as early-stage developments are often more challenging to finance due to the lack of comparable projects.

Vice Chair Fournier clarified that Old Town Square and Mela were market-rate projects and inquired whether the CRA had an existing program or if projects could be evaluated on a one-off basis. Mr. Tran confirmed that there was no existing program since it had expired.

Vice Chair Fournier then asked if a developer could approach the board to request assistance for a project that includes workforce or affordable units, especially if there was a need for support to move it forward. She pointed out that the CRA had already provided substantial tax credits to wealthy developers for market-rate projects and should consider assistance for smaller projects that directly benefit the community. Mr. Tran noted that such a decision would be a policy matter for the board. He stated that staff could present a revamped incentive program, possibly offering a smaller rebate than the 100% tax rebate used for earlier projects.

Vice Chair Fournier expressed that if these projects could not get off the ground, the city would lose opportunities for affordable housing, modern communities, and future tax revenue from vacant lots. She asserted that the CRA would not be forfeiting current revenue, as that revenue would not exist unless the project was completed. Mr. Tran acknowledged Vice Chair Fournier's valid concerns regarding construction and labor costs, as well as the types of housing products. He stated that the program would be worth reviewing if the board wished to pursue it.

Vice Chair Fournier expressed her desire to examine the program, believing it could be revamped to address current market demands and affordable housing needs in the Northwest. She began to formulate a motion for the staff to present a proposal. Mr. Tran suggested that he and Vice Chair Fournier meet to review the existing program, exchange ideas, and assess the funding gap for smaller projects under the current conditions.

Vice Chair Fournier agreed and noted that the CRA might need a significantly different incentive approach in the Northwest than in the East to address disparities. She inquired whether she needed to make a formal

motion.

Mr. Tran replied that he would meet with her to review the program and bring back any ideas that emerged from their discussion.

A motion was made by Vice Chair Fournier, seconded by Commissioner Perkins, to place an item on the agenda to discuss incentive programs. The motion carried by the following roll call vote:

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

Vice Chair Fournier indicated that she had several items to discuss. She planned to speak with Mr. Tran regarding incentive programs, noting that if \$400,000 in Northwest incentive funds remained unused while similar funds in the East were being utilized, the CRA was not effectively supporting Northwest businesses. She suggested that the matching requirements or investment ratios might need to be adjusted, as Northwest business owners might not possess the same financial resources as those in the East. She expressed that the program could be streamlined to ensure that funding actually reaches businesses and the community. Additionally, she inquired about the planned solicitation for a restaurant at the McNab Botanical Gardens. She mentioned that she had previously requested a financial analysis of what a restaurant would require and wanted to review it before issuing the solicitation. She asked whether the CRA had a financial model in place, recalling that a consultant had been hired previously to assist with this work. Mr. Tran responded that the CRA had a cost estimate for converting the house and garage. He noted that an earlier solicitation had been issued, but the project plans were not fully developed at that time, leading to a lack of interest due to uncertainty about many details. He stated that BRV, Biederman Redevelopment Ventures, had assisted in developing an operations plan and explained that the restaurant revenue could not be finalized until a restaurant operator was selected, as it would depend on lease negotiations and sales revenue.

Vice Chair Fournier acknowledged the complications and asked when the staff expected to issue the solicitation for the restaurant operator. Mr. Tran replied that he was currently working on it and hoped to send it to the purchasing department by the end of the month. He noted that the CRA staff consisted primarily of himself and Ms. Vasquez, and that the workload had been challenging.

Vice Chair Fournier then addressed parking in the East CRA. She reiterated her previous comments on the parking garage mentioned at the last Commission meeting, clarifying that she did not support the proposed garage. She felt that simply using the space for a parking garage would be a poor use of the property, as committing to that use would eliminate other opportunities for the site. She asked whether the CRA had considered soliciting a development that included parking along with other complementary uses. She mentioned that a 700- to 750-space garage located far from the beach would not be convenient for beachgoers carrying chairs, coolers, children, and other items, although it could serve some purposes through valet operations. She emphasized that the site needed additional amenities to make the parking function effective.

Mr. Tran clarified that the parking garage was a city project, not a CRA project. However, parking had been addressed in the amended East CRA plan because parking was necessary on the east side. He mentioned that the CRA could discuss the matter with the City, but the solicitation and project responsibility were the City's.

Vice Chair Fournier reiterated her inquiry about whether the CRA had explored a broader development concept. Mr. Tran noted that several solicitations had been sent out in the past, though he was unsure why they had not come to fruition. He recalled that the last proposal included a parking garage with either a hotel or residential units above it, along with a grocery store, making it more than just a garage.

Vice Chair Fournier stated that the more she considered it, the more it seemed lackluster to simply place a parking garage on the property. She pointed out the surrounding opportunities, especially with the nearby jellyfish museum, and expressed concern that the City would miss out if it built just a garage. She advocated for ongoing discussions to explore better options.

Returning to the topic of security, the Vice Chair emphasized that she did not want anyone to perceive that board members were unconcerned about public safety. She stated that public safety was always a priority and hoped the Board could enhance existing measures and develop a more effective plan for the community.

Chair Hardin's Report:

Chair Hardin expressed gratitude to Comr. Sigerson-Eaton for mentioning Memorial Day. He announced that the Memorial Day parade would begin at 9:00 a.m. on May 25, starting at 2401 E. Atlantic Boulevard and proceeding to the Pompano Beach Cemetery. He encouraged attendance at the Memorial Day celebration. He then addressed Vice Chair Fournier's comments on affordable housing, stating that the City had supported affordable housing throughout the city for many years, particularly in the Northwest. He explained that affordable housing developers often faced a funding gap, and that the City had consistently stepped up to help make affordable housing a reality for residents. Chair Hardin mentioned the urgency of constructing a parking garage in the East CRA due to the upcoming loss of parking at the W, expected by September, which affects local businesses and residents. The proposed garage would also house a future grocery store. Initially, a plan to include a hotel and event center was proposed, but concerns about adding density to the barrier island were raised. The parking garage will be funded by a dedicated parking fund, not taxpayers, and will be paid for by parking rate payers.

[26-370](#)

Reports

- East CRA Advisory Committee - May 7, 2026
- CRA Financial Statements - March
- FPI Security Reports - April
- Professional Services Expenditures - April
- McNab House & Botanical Gardens - Report of Activities
- Downtown Pompano Project Update - March
- Redevelopment Management Associates - Detail of Services

The Informational Report was RECEIVED AND FILED.

E. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:02 PM.