

**MINUTES OF THE COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY BOARD MEETING  
HELD IN COMMISSION CHAMBERS, CITY HALL, 100 E. BOYNTON BEACH  
BOULEVARD, BOYNTON BEACH FLORIDA ON  
APRIL 10, 2018, AT 6:30 P.M.**

---

**Present:**

Steven Grant, Chair  
Christina Romelus, Vice Chair  
Joe Casello, Board Member  
Justin Katz, Board Member  
Mack McCray, Board Member

Mike Simon, Executive Director  
Kathryn Rossmell, Board Counsel

**1. Call to Order**

Chair Grant called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

**2. Invocation**

Board Member McCray gave the invocation followed by the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

**3. Roll Call**

A quorum was present.

**4. Agenda Approval**

**A. Additions, Deletions, Corrections to the Agenda**

Mike Simon, Executive Director, commented Ms. Wolf of Cornerstone and Boynton Village LLC requested Old Business Item C be tabled to the next available meeting.

**Motion**

Board Member Katz moved to table. Board Member McCray seconded the motion that unanimously passed.

**B. Adoption of Agenda**

**Motion**

Vice Chair Romelus moved to approve the amended agenda. Board Member McCray seconded the motion that unanimously passed.

**5. Legal: None**

**6. Informational Items and Disclosures by Board Members and CRA Staff:**

**A. Disclosure of Conflicts, Contacts, and Relationships for Items Presented to the CRA Board on Agenda**

Chair Grant had no disclosures, but announced he attended the MLK 50<sup>th</sup> event by County Commissioner Mack Bernard. He thought it was important, as the Board sets parameters for MLK Jr. Boulevard, they keep him in mind when they plan what they want to see going forward.

Board Member Casello and Vice Chair Romelus had no disclosures. Vice Chair Romelus advised she also attended the MLK event and shared Chair Grant's comments. She sat in the Historic Palm Beach County Courthouse, noting a few decades ago, someone who looks like her could not sit in the gallery and would be in the balcony and have her case tried if she were in the courtroom. She was grateful for the progress and looked forward to his efforts in the future.

Board Member McCray disclosed he received an email from Lasendra Hoggins Wilson as did Board Member Katz.

**7. Announcements and Awards**

**A. Movies in the Park**

Mercedes Coppin, Special Event Coordinator, announced the April 6<sup>th</sup> *Enchanted* movie event, from 8:30 p.m. to 10:30 p.m. About 100 people attended and had the chance to win gift certificates to local businesses that were highlighted at the preshow video, which were *Hour Cucina*, *Finest Kind* sport fishing, *Nutrition Cottage*, *That's Amore* Pizzeria and the *Cooperative Real Estate Alliance*. Staff collected 34 surveys, which showed 64% of the attendees live in Boynton Beach and 15% were visiting for the event. Twenty-nine percent learned about the event from social media and 20% from a friend. Twenty-six percent of the attendees were in their 40's and 37% were in their 30's.

The next event will be held on May 4<sup>th</sup> at 8:30 p.m. at the Ocean Avenue Amphitheater featuring *The Incredibles*, an animated action adventure rated PG. Ms. Coppin gave a short summary of the movie. There is free popcorn for the first 100 event goers and parking is free. Prior to the film, attendees will view a short video highlighting five CRA Businesses. Attendees fill out a short survey to be entered into a drawing for gift certificates to the featured businesses.

**B. Music on the Rocks**

Ms. Coppin explained there was no recap given due to Blarney Bash. The next Music on the Rocks will be held on April 20<sup>th</sup>, from 6 p.m. to 9 p.m., at the Ocean Avenue Amphitheater, featuring music by The Flyers, a Delray Beach based rock band. Food

and beverages will be available from the Food Truck Invasion and a mobile bar. Attendees fill out short surveys to be eligible to enter a raffle for gift certificates and vouchers to local businesses. Parking is free.

**C. The 4th Annual Blarney Bash Recap**

Ms. Coppin announced the Blarney Bash was held on Saturday, March 17<sup>th</sup>, from 4 p.m. to 9 p.m. on E. Ocean Avenue. Approximately 3,500 people attended and the event cost came in just under budget at \$24,652. There were 15 vendors: six retail and non-profits and nine concession vendors. Vendor fees collected totaled \$5,311. There were ADA interpreters onsite who assisted 13 people navigate the various areas of the festival. Live entertainment was provided by three bands and dance performances by the Aranmore Academy of Irish Dance. There was a variety of complimentary activities and crafts. There were 168 face paintings and 176 artistic balloons were provided. A demographic survey was offered and 255 were returned reflecting 57% of attendees were Boynton Beach residents, 22% were visiting the area for the event, and 8% work in the City. Seventy-five percent of the survey participants were first time attendees, 22% heard about it from a friend, 21% from an advertisement and 19% from social media.

**8. Information Only**

**A. Marketing and Business Development Campaign**

**B. Public Comment Log**

**C. Public Relations Articles Associated with the BBCRA**

**9. Public Comments**

**Susan Oyer, 140 SE 27<sup>th</sup> Way**, thought the Blarney Bash was outstanding. She was at the Sister Cities Booth and they sold 50 beads and got a lot of attention. They conducted a survey to find out which Sister City they would pick up next and Ireland won. She thought the last movie was great but was disappointed there were no food trucks when they said there would be. The Sister Cities Art Awards would take place on Friday at the Boynton Beach Mall by Christ Fellowship Church at 6:30 p.m. The last time no public comment was allowed regarding the UCC Church sale to the CRA. She had wanted to question who was going to obtain the two Conrad Pickel pieces in the Church. She believed there was a window and a sculpture. She questioned if the artwork would be added to the City's collection.

Board Member Casello commented staff was still early in the negotiations. He did not know the contents of the Church.

No one else coming forward, public comments was closed.

Board Member McCray congratulated the CRA Staff on the CRA Annual Report, it was a job well done, colorful, eye catching, and good for distribution.

**10. Consent Agenda**

- A. Financial Report Period Ending March 31, 2018
- B. Monthly Purchase Orders
- C. Approval of CRA Board Special Meeting Minutes - March 13, 2018

**11. Pulled Consent Agenda Items**

None.

**Motion**

Board Member Katz moved to approve. Board Member McCray seconded the motion that unanimously passed.

**12. Public Hearing**

**13. Old Business**

- A. Discussion and Consideration of Payoff of CRA Homebuyer Assistance Program Mortgage between Lasendra Hoggins Wilson and the CRA  
(Tabled 3/13/18)

**Motion**

Board Member Casello moved to remove from the table. Board Member McCray seconded the motion that unanimously passed.

Board Member McCray asked what the CRA was legally bound to regarding this item. He wanted to know where the item was headed as the owner appeared before the Board several times

Kathryn Rossmell, Board Counsel, responded that presently the CRA agreed to subordinate its interest in her property to a refinancing and the CRA agreed to allow her to refinance. The question is whether the CRA wants to reduce the amount she owes, but there is no legal obligation to do so. If Ms. Hoggins Wilson refinances, per her contract, she would owe \$47,000 and possibly some interest. The requirement for Ms. Hoggins Wilson to repay the CRA was already in the agreement. Attorney Rossmell pointed out since Ms. Hoggins Wilson was in the home for a number of years, and depending on whether she sells to an income qualified buyer or a non-income qualified

buyer, the amount may be reduced depending on the circumstances as there are stipulations for individuals living in the home for a certain amount of time, the amount decreases. Board Member McCray asked if the CRA would have any input regarding any new owner or if the CRA would rely on what Ms. Hoggins Wilson is doing. Attorney Rossmell responded the CRA can evaluate the income and criteria of the potential buyer pursuant to the grant. Staff could only conduct an evaluation of whether the buyer was qualified to keep the grant. The grant would remain in place.

The offer to the CRA was \$5,000 in lieu of the \$47,000.

**Ms. Lasendra Hoggins Wilson**, 508 NW 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue hoped all received her information and gained a better understanding of her offer. She still had the same offer, but at the last meeting, the Board made suggestions and she wanted to know what their thoughts were.

Board Member Casello was upset about her definition of a grant she felt like it was a loan, contending it could be waived. Board Member Casello explained every grant has stipulations as it is taxpayer money and pointed out her request was to forgive up to \$42,000. Board Member Casello felt the CRA should not be in a position to forgive the grant since it was taxpayer dollars. The Board agreed Ms. Hoggins Wilson could refinance or rent the property. He suggested when she obtained funds from the refinance, she invest it back into the property to improve its future value and recoup all the funds.

Ms. Hoggins Wilson explained she was referring to how the grant was originally written as the grants were forgiven after a certain amount of time and the recipient was allowed to be released from the contract. She understood grants have stipulations, but the one she has will always involve the CRA whether she walks away from the property or stays. Either way, it is a loss for both parties. She was trying to do the right thing by asking permission to return the property with no strings attached. If the CRA does not agree to it, the CRA is still a part of the property. At one point, she was concerned it would set a precedent, but people have already walked away and short sold. The CRA did not get out of the deal what was put into it and she did not think her request was unreasonable.

Board Member McCray asked how long the grant was for and learned it was for 30 years. Ms. Hoggins Wilson has lived in the home for 11 years. He commented when the Board accepted short sales, it opened a window. He did not want to open another window.

Chair Grant had reviewed the amendment and if Ms. Hoggins Wilson sold between year 6 and 20, the CRA gets 50% of equity if she sold to a family that exceeded the medium household income. He explained the Board would not know what they will do if they take the \$5,000 buyout, and she could sell it to someone who is not a qualified buyer and make a windfall.

Ms. Hoggins Wilson inquired if the Board was genuinely concerned about who moves into the neighborhood and what they do. It would be great if she would find a buyer, but

she did not think she would with the activities that are occurring in the neighborhood and that was why she did not attempt to sell the home. When she was speaking to various organizations, the home could be used by individuals or families to get situated or for displaced families that do not have anything right now. It appeared to her the CRA wanted to have a part in it, and if so, why make the offer if the CRA would not entertain it.

Chair Grant asked what the CRA would get if she sold to an income qualified buyer, noting clause six only says if she sells to a non-income qualified buyer. Attorney Rossmell explained generally income qualified is below the median income and the section was out of sync. Chair Grant commented the CRA defines an income-qualified buyer as a family whose income exceeds 120% of median household income. If Ms. Hoggins Wilson sells to a non-income qualified buyer, they are not subject to any repayment on the grant. Attorney Rossmell agreed and commented it may be a scrivener's error. Section 5A, defined a non-income qualified buyer whose income exceeds 120% or refinances, the full sum is due back. There was ambiguity in the amendment. Based on the rest of the contract, it appeared Section 6 contained a scrivener's error. The only logical way to read it, was it should be if income is less than 120%. It would have to be corrected. Section 5A was that ruling paragraph that governed the sale to a non-income qualified buyer or a refinance. A refinance indicates the full sum of the grant plus 4% interest is due. During the refinance, Chair Grant asked if the Board could accept something less than the amount owed plus the 4%. Attorney Rossmell explained the Board could take any sum less than as the language acts as a cap.

Vice Chair Romelus thought a decision should be made and any precedent should be unanimous for Ms. Hoggins Wilson and other grant recipient. Ms. Hoggins Wilson wants to refinance the property, get money from the equity, improve the home and rent it. The Board is okay with that, and the Board was not asking for a stipulation if she chooses to refinance the home and rent it. Her concern was displacing one family for another in a bad situation. If that was still the stipulation on the table, she was willing to leave it at that.

### **Motion**

Vice Chair Romelus so moved that Ms. Hoggins Wilson could refinance the property and move on and the Board would not assess any stipulations on her refinance or rental of the property. If Ms. Hoggins Wilson sells the home, the agreement stands as originally stated. If the Board could not take a lesser amount, it will remain per the contract in an amount up to \$47,000 at the time she sells. Board Member McCray seconded the motion.

Ms. Hoggins Wilson explained that was the original case and that was already in place. She was present because she was offered the opportunity to have a buy-out. When she went to the bank, they had the same ideas as the Board. Even with a refinance, when the bank looks at it, the debt still stands, and she cannot refinance. Either way she owes the \$47,000 as it states in the addendum. Board Member Romelus asked if a letter could

be written explaining Ms. Hoggins Wilson does not owe anything if she refinances and the debt only applied if she sells the property. Attorney Rossmell responded they could and explained the Board could amend the agreement. Ms. Hoggins Wilson will take it to the Bank.

Attorney Rossmell summarized per the current agreement, if Ms. Hoggins Wilson refinanced \$47,000 comes to the CRA. Per the motion, if the motion passed, the agreement will be changed to result in the refinance repayment being taken off the table, and she would only owe money if the property is sold. The motion would clarify the definition of qualified and non-qualified income.

That unanimously passed.

**B. Consideration of Addendum to Purchase and Sale Agreement for 211 E. Ocean Avenue, a/k/a Magnuson House**

**Motion**

Vice Chair Romelus moved to approve. Board Member McCray seconded the motion that unanimously passed.

**D. Consideration of Boynton Village, LLC Compliance Audit**

This item was previously tabled.

**D. Consideration of Parameters for an RFP/RFQ for Redevelopment for CRA Owned Parcels within the MLK, Jr Boulevard Corridor**

Chair Grant noted there were multiple comments from CRA Advisory Board on this item.

Board Member Katz favored moving forward with the RFP/RFQ based on comments from the community. He favored mixed uses although not exclusively. If someone wants to have just commercial, he was fine, but he wanted to cast the net at setting an investment value with a combination of land and money as there is \$1.2 million available and leaving it as an open campus. He had no intention of building something for a defined purpose when the market does not support it at this time at this location. He wants a broad RFP to see what comes back. The Board did not have to accept all ideas, but a narrow focus would turn off potential investors. Board Member McCray agreed.

Chair Grant wanted an opportunity to have equity for the community and the only way to do so is through ownership. The original RFP discussion was for a design build and the CRA could ask for a maximum build price and have the ultimate say who owns the property. In the past, the CRA has not done well. He referenced the Little House that has no tenant and the Magnuson House that does not have a permit approved. Chair Grant commented this is a historically black community. The taxpayers in the HOB were paying

the City as much as all the other taxpayers. He wanted people in the community to have an opportunity to rent to own or have some vehicle to allow ownership in the community. The CRA has property on NE 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue, which is part of MLK Corridor. He explained they could build a road from NE 2<sup>nd</sup> Street to NE 9<sup>th</sup> Ave to MLK Boulevard and include it in the RFP.

Board Member McCray commented the Board was not at that point. He favored issuing the RFP and seeing what comes back. If the community buys in, then they move forward.

Board Member Casello asked if all agreed it would be a mixed-use type of build. Chair Grant commented it would be whatever it was zoned for. Currently, there is mixed use and commercial land available. Board Member McCray favored mixed use. Chair Grant asked about including the properties on NE 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue just north of NE 2<sup>nd</sup> Street, in the RFP and there were no objections.

Minister Bernard Wright, 713 NW 2<sup>nd</sup> Street asked what the purpose of the Advisory board was and learned they make recommendations. He asked about the recommendations they made at the last advisory board meeting he attended having to do with redevelopment on MLK. He advised there are 201 signatures from property owners and prominent citizens. He advised the HOB spoke and they want historical and fundamental components from when it was thriving. The same generation exists there. He questioned Board Member Katz's experience in development.

Board Member Katz explained none of the Board members are developers, but Mr. Simon was. He noted Reverend Wright has made his position clear many times and the Board was also clear. Starved of economic development, an attempt to create what his vision for the area was does not fit the economic realities of supply and demand in the marketplace. At some point in the future, if through development, economic prosperity is able to enter into this area, that would lead to the development Minister Wright was requesting such as a concert hall and others, but there was no free market investment desire on MLK Jr. Boulevard. The Board was trying to spur development, but cannot do that by risking \$1.2 million and available property on a vision that lacks a market place.

Board Member Katz understood Minister Wright disagreed with him and they had discussed it several times at different meetings. Other community members disagreed with Minister Wright's vision and felt it could make the community worse. Others said invest in infrastructure and affordable housing to start businesses. Minister Wright's vision was very specific and others at meetings he attended did not agree. He would not support Minister Wright's position. He understands and respects his opinion and thought it could happen in the future, but when trying to revive an economically depressed area, they would not build a concert hall.

Minister Wright commented Board Member Katz speaks for himself and at times for the Board and he felt he was not qualified to do so. He asserted Board Member Katz had not spoken with one developer who said they would not develop the corridor or anyone



about the vision or history of the area. He challenged Board Member Katz to give him documented proof that even 10 residents from the neighborhood attended the workshop. He had previously submitted a petition with 201 signatures and contended the Board should not say what will and will not be there, it should only be what the people want. They are taxpayers and it is their community and culture he was advocating for. He was on Board Member Katz's Facebook page and the minutes reflect everything he said about the community. He commented he was not wrong, but Board Member Katz blocked him from his Facebook page and Board Member Katz was the only one speaking against his vision. The City Attorney knows the legality of the situation and the ramifications. When Minister Wright voiced he did not think it was legal, Board Member Katz was the only one who stood up. He explained Board Member Katz cannot show him the notice or the statute. He spoke about the center before it became the Carolyn Sims Center and explained he was attempting to litigate for a petition for an injunction against this as he is for the people. He commented he did not want to do this, but he would stop the summer camp and stop everything by injunction because there is a civil rights issue. He commented for Board Member Katz to jump up with the City Attorney not saying anything about the legality, it was Board Member Katz saying he did not want this or a concert hall when there is a lot of potential going to studios out west paying the money because they could sing and entertain. He announced they could have it right here and there are promoters right here as he is connected with people and celebrities that came to Boynton and would return and pay homage again. They have a multi-million dollar enterprise that can be put in Boynton Beach and Board Member Katz would reject it when that is what the people want. Boynton Beach could still have this through the grace of restoration and taking into consideration the heart of the people. Kids in the summer cannot go anywhere except in the streets.

Minister Wright explained he was not talking about billiards. He was talking about having a Dave and Busters on 10th where a family can go. When talking about another strip mall, there will be the same thing because his people have the money to go in and be a tenant. They will not have anywhere to go unless the CRA builds something, and they will still hang out. It was important to build what the people need, which is about a better Boynton and they will not have it unless the CRA builds what the people want and there will be gentrification.

Vice Chair Romelus commented the issue on the table is crafting the language to see what they want to see in the RFP with the additional areas of 9<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup>. She thought the Board should be able to meet in Chambers and respect one another's opinions. She commented when situations like this arise, the Chair has a responsibility not to allow personal attacks of Board members. She had stated so before and the Board should set a precedent. Chair Grant agreed and pointed out nothing was foul or untrue and he was timed.

Board Member Katz stated his position and advised he speaks for himself, but he remembers and cites comments from his fellow Board members and that was where he drew his comments. There was no support for the idea just offered. There was discussion

for mixed use and/or commercial development. He agreed with Vice Chair Romelus to refocus to the comments made prior to public comment and develop MLK Jr. Boulevard with a substantial investment of property upwards of \$1.2 million.

Vice Chair Romelus thought the incentives the CRA was offering should be included in the language which was the land prices were being offered at a lower retail value, there was \$1.2 million to assist, the CRA Advisory Board's list of comments and suggestions in the RFP language. She wanted to add, the developer being required to partner with the local business and property owner, whether rent to own or as a part owner. She would like to see it as it would make her view the response more favorably.

Vice Chair Romelus asked if there was a master site plan for the corridor and surrounding community and learned other than the site plan in the HOB District Plan in the 2016 CRA Redevelopment Plan, there was no specific site plan layout that would go through the City's approval process. The design on the screen is in the plan and it identified the layout of commercial at the west end of the corridor at the corner at Seacrest, residential in the middle, and mixed use at the east end. Mixed use land designation was designed as a general idea for developers and the public of what was supported by the community meetings and the approved plan. It did not identify specific uses, brands or entities; it only identified uses. The RFP would provide more specifics from the respondents and would indicate what they would propose.

The site plan he would propose in the RFP is to request from the proposer to have a layout and provide their market layout, what they propose to build taking into account what the Board, the CRA Advisory Board and the public wants. The Board would gauge the proposals based on who does it the best. Board Member Romelus wanted that to be part of the RFP and have a presentation of a master site plan or a conceptual drawing with incorporation of all of these suggestions and historical aspects of the community. She thought doing so would take the onus off the Board and put it on the developer. She wanted language included in the RFP that the CRA would incentivize developers to work local land and property owners to partner with and acquire land through reasonable prices to finish off the lots on MLK Jr. Boulevard on 9<sup>th</sup> 10<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup>.

Board Member McCray disagreed with Minister Wright's comments that there were no meetings held and nothing had been done. He explained there were meetings and charrettes held over 20 years ago and the Board did not jump to conclusions about what was wanted. There were many meetings and moving forward with an RFP and RFQ is the best way to go. Board Member McCray pointed out Minister Wright made a statement that they had no one from the Heart of Boynton and noted Mr. Robert Pollack, CRA Advisory Board Member, lives in the Heart of Boynton. He thought what Vice Chair Romelus and Board Member Katz stated was the best way to go. When the responses are received, the public could weigh in. He asserted the Board was spinning its tires and not getting anywhere.

Board Member Casello agreed the members are not developers, and commented he thought Minister Wright was living in the past and was blinded by his passion for the neighborhood. What worked 20 years ago does not always work today. The CRA issues RFPs to people who know how to develop and they set specifications of what they want and land parcels the Board was willing to invest. He did not see 201 or even 20 people present. Many charrettes were held and the CRA heard from the public. He explained if the CRA was going to invest as planned and they have to get it right as they have one bite of the apple and the landscape has changed. He asked Mr. Simon how much they could invest in the RFP and learned as of this budget year, the Board identified \$1.2 million for the redevelopment of the corridor. There are other line items that can provide additional funding such as architectural, site and survey assistance. He thought \$1.3 or \$1.4 million in cash was currently available, plus the CRA was going into a new budget for next year and they could increase the funds. Board Member Casello was concerned when speaking about cash as the Board was discussing purchasing a church for \$3 million and the Town Square they committed to already. He asked if the CRA was willing to give or sell the parcels at less than appraised value. Mr. Simon explained it appeared from the Board's discussion that they would support doing so, provided a proposal was selected by the Board.

Chair Grant explained there were two parts to the proposal and inquired if the Board was asking for a development team for MLK Jr. Boulevard or a developer to tell the CRA what they think is best. He thought if the Board asks for a development team, there is leeway. They can work with the development team to strategize what they want for the corridor. An RFP is not a two-stage process where they say what they can do and the Board gives them an opportunity to appear later with a plan of what they want to do.

Mr. Simon explained the Board could craft the RFP/RFQ up front by notifying any proposer, that the Board is interested in becoming a partner and being involved in the planning process. It will let the developer know they should be open to suggestions or direction. It is the Board's property and they are investing in it and the Board can write and prescribe in the development agreement what they see fit if the developer agrees to it also.

Board Member Romelus wanted to make the process as intense as the Town Square. She favored crafting the RFP/RFQ combination to have a development team that knows the CRA will be a partner to make the project a reality. She wanted a partnership in her motion.

Board Member Katz contended since they are investing \$1.2 million and the land, in any endeavor where the CRA provides incentives, they are a partner in the planning process. He favored crafting an RFP giving parameters with the understanding the Board may want changes and it provides an opportunity to review a plan without making a commitment to what is presented, just like any other project. The difference between the team for the Town Square project and this project is the Town Square was a \$200 million project and the corridor might be a \$10 or \$15 million project. He agreed with Vice Chair

Romelus's desire to be a part of the plan and ask the community what they want, but if trying to mimic what they did in the Town Square, it may delay the project for a few years as opposed to issuing an RFP and potentially starting development on MLK Jr. Boulevard. He supported having a degree of influence as there will be revisions imposed by the Board of their desired changes.

Vice Chair Romelus agreed and wanted language included in the RFQ that the Board wants a Master Site Plan developed along the entire corridor of 9<sup>th</sup>, 10<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup>. In the future, the project could be a \$50 million project if the developer acquires more parcels. She wanted a long-term partner to develop the region to turn it into a booming area.

**Rae Whitely**, 223 NE 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue, agreed with Vice Chair Romelus and Board Member Katz. It was overdue and must be done right. They have to be more diligent in the plans and partnership to ensure a site plan is developed with community input. He thought they were heading in the right direction and he offered his assistance.

Mr. Simon understood Vice Chair Romelus had expanded the language to incorporate the entire corridor with a master developer to include full east to west end. He asked if the Board was directing staff to include properties in that large of a range, or just from properties the CRA owns and adjacent properties from Seacrest to the midpoint or last property the CRA owns traveling west.

Vice Chair Romelus wanted a master site plan for the entire parcel from Seacrest to the railroad tracks and from 9<sup>th</sup> up to 11<sup>th</sup>. This would put the onus on the developer to work with private property owners and help move the process along. It could incentivize them to get it done faster.

Board Member Casello commented it took years to get the parcels together they have now. He thought if asking a developer to acquire the remaining parcels, they would never get a shovel in the ground. He agreed a master plan is great, but it is difficult to acquire single parcels of land and felt they should go with what they have.

Board Member Katz agreed. He asked Mr. Simon, given the land on this portion was considerable and they do not own much property by the railroad, if it was risky to invest that type of time and money to develop a master plan for parcels they do not own. He did not want to limit the scope of the plan, but did not want to create a plan for the corridor when they do not own 80% of the corridor and risk not developing the corridor.

Mr. Simon was present when Intown was selected to develop the area. When they extended the RFP in 2005 and 2006 to the entire corridor, developers were planning to develop the entire three or four blocks over people's homes. Residents did not know there was an RFP or understand what an RFP was. The CRA loses leverage as a development partner if they expand their authority/vision past what they can control. There are parcels adjacent to theirs that, without being acquired, limits what the CRA could develop as opposed to someone who is able to obtain a few adjacent parcels with

a willing seller. If expanding the parcel by 30 or 40 lots, they can ask a developer to provide a vision of what they see in the future based on the project at hand. There is a plan, there are design graphics that cost a lot of money that professionals use to establish density, current land use and zoning and future land use to give potential developers an idea of what could go there.

Vice Chair Romelus clarified her motion was to build a vision. She was not saying they have to acquire the parcel. The CRA was incentivizing the developer to expand their project and footprint. The developer will be asked to work with the properties the CRA owns and build a cohesive vision for the entire parcel.

Board Member McCray favored sticking with the property they own. They have to do what they need to do with what they currently have. If drafting a master plan, residents will call. Chair Grant agreed the CRA cannot predict the future. Chair Grant wanted to limit the scope of work to what the CRA does own for what is possible, not hypothetical, which is why the RFP is two tiered. He favored selecting the developer first and then pick which development they want to move forward.

Vice Chair Romelus asked if the master plan be part of the RFP and learned it would be an attachment. Mr. Simon explained when looking at the area the CRA owns as the Town Square site as a comparison, and all around the first portion of the entire corridor, the first portion would be the Town Square. All around it, will create a vision for the future. He thought all was on the right track and saying the same thing. The Board was not expecting developers to build a Town Square and have sown up all around it, but things will happen because of it. Having a developer who understands the vision is an excellent criterion to judge the Board's selection on, so they prove to the Board they understand what the community wants. It is very relevant. The master plan was attachment 1. The RFP document will have to come back to the Board.

Attorney Rossmell understood the motion was to do an RFP/RFQ for the property that the CRA owns, but an element is a vision for the larger area without necessarily a plan to develop the properties.

### **Motion**

Board Member Casello so moved. Vice Chair Romelus seconded the motion that unanimously passed.

#### **E. Consideration of Parameters for an RFP/RFQ for the CRA Owned Property Located at NE 4th and NE 5th Avenues, a/k/a the Cottage District**

Chair Grant commented the Cottage District was a completely different piece of land than the MLK Jr. Boulevard corridor and had a different land use and zoning. He walks by the parcel and the community had indicated to him they would like to have a pocket park. He noted there are nearby bus stops for Odyssey Middle and Forest Park Elementary

Schools and Boynton Beach Community High School. If the CRA makes a communal green space in the middle, if the City does not own it, the community will not have access. He wanted to ensure there was a community aspect to the development the rest of the HOB could access. He wanted minimal maintenance and minimal development at the park and he suggested asking KaBoom and other non-profits to help them build a community park so the children in the community have a place to go without crossing Seacrest. He supported reasonable housing at the site that is fairly priced. He commented reasonable housing would be subsidized. Workforce housing would be deed restricted. He did not know how to decide who would get the property, but the homes would be a starter home.

Board Member McCray thought the homes have to look like cottages, not high rises.

Board Member Katz thought Chair Grant and Board Member McCray had the same idea. The original plan for the District was homes with limited square footage, not tiny homes, but smaller homes. He thought the Board did not have to qualify all as affordable because if houses have a certain square footage that are desirable, they will be market priced for the footage. He did not know about putting a park on Seacrest if the goal was to stop youth from crossing Seacrest. He was not averse to having a mandatory green space component. He favored with the land and potential funding as incentives, they try one more time with Town Square, Ocean Breeze East and the funds for Sara Sims Park, now was an opportune time for someone to build homes for a classic or cottage design. He noted the CRA had tried to implement something, but failed because the timing was off and he supported favored recasting the net for the Cottage District and incorporating green space. Mr. Simon explained he was still working with the Community Caring Center and she will come back to the Board next month with a more structured plan how to relocate. Board Member Katz liked modestly priced and sized single-family detached units would be appropriate, but the timing was not right. He thought the timing was better now for what the Board's original concept was.

Vice Chair Romelus asked if the units had to be single-family detached homes. Board Member Katz was open to two units adjoined by a common wall. He was open to anything that adhered to having a restricted square footage to keep the market price in an affordable range and have onsite amenities for those who want to live there. She agreed and would like to see what the developer brings back that fits the Board's vision and matches the surrounding community. She preferred to see the small park on the eastern side of the entire cottage district on 4<sup>th</sup> or 5<sup>th</sup> or on either corner or on the opposite side of the corner lot so it is available to other communities.

Board Member McCray agreed with Vice Chair Romelus not to place the park on Seacrest as when the Town Square takes off, it will be prime property and the park needs to be to the east. The bus stop is on the northeast corner, which made sense.

Board Member Casello asked what will be in the park and learned that was for the developer to design. Chair Grant commented rather than having a bigger back yard

and less units, the Cottage District will have smaller lot sizes because there will be an adjacent park associated with it. The Board is asking for a community park the CRA can help fund and maintain for a year or two. He spoke with Wally Majors, Director, Recreation and Parks. He noted there is a lot of money going to the northwest portion of Boynton Beach for Denson Pool and the Carolyn Sims Center. There was not a lot for the community to use in this section and he supported creating the park as long as it is in the budget,

**Susan Oyer**, 140 SE 27<sup>th</sup> Way, commented the City has an Ordinance requiring 2.5 acres of green space for every 1,000 people and she commented the City is very far behind in green space. She had also approached the City and the Board about purchasing land for a buffer around her property, which will remain in her family in perpetuity. They significantly upgraded the property. She approached the City to buy a strip of platted land that was an empty alleyway. If they are able to purchase the alleyway, half of the alleyway will go to the Girtman's. Ms. Oyer explained she only wants the portion of the alleyway that runs to the end of her property, which is about 118 to 120 feet deep, and it will be grassed and treed. On the south end of the property, her property line is about a foot and a half off the driveway. When the home was built 92 years ago, there was no rule to enforce a boundary. She appeared three time asking for 10 to 15 feet, and was turned down each time, but they keep asking because this will be a problem for anything the CRA would do as they want a buffer. She thought her request was not unreasonable. She requested some type of berm or setback be included in the RFP on the south side of the property that abuts 508 N. Seacrest and 105 NE 4<sup>th</sup>. It would benefit both parties as the CRA does not want to build on top of her house. She requested something reasonable be done to protect both interests. She was aware the project would have to build up by about 16 inches due to climate change, which will lead to flooding on their property unless there is some type of barrier and she understood a berm was the best way to go.

In reference to Board Member Katz's comments, she had been suggesting the older homes, some of which were declared historic that are south of Boynton Beach Boulevard and west of Seacrest, would be taken by eminent domain. She requested the Board consider moving those homes.

Vice Chair Romelus asked if the Board would be willing to entertain moving the property line to accommodate Ms. Oyer, if the negotiated amount worked for both parties. Chair Grant explained the issue is it is a parcel of land. If they wanted to buy the entire parcel at fair market value it would be one issue. If purchasing just a few feet, the land would have to be replatted, and it is not worth the taxpayer's time to accomplish. There are several ordinances that require setbacks for other buildings and the Board has not seen that there will be a problem in the future. It was conjecture that flooding would occur. He did not think there was anything they needed to do unless the Board wants to spend a lot of money to replat. Board Member Katz requested Mr. Simon provide possible solutions, such as selling the lot or portions thereof, or having greater buffers or anything else that could be done to achieve the intent of the property owner. Vice Chair Romelus agreed.

Mr. Simon explained the CRA and staff are submitting an application to the City for an alleyway abandonment of the entire alleyway. There is no sale of the alley Ms. Oyer was referring to as it is not part of that process.

**Barbara Ready**, 329 SW 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue, explained she is the Chair of the City's Historic Resource Preservation Board and the Andrews house is located on Mr. D'Almeida's property south of the railroad tracks, just south of Boynton Beach Boulevard. She commented it is the oldest house in Boynton Beach and constructed with timber from the Coquimbo wreck. She requested if it comes down to the destruction of the house, the Board consider moving the house to the Cottage District although she preferred to keep the home at its original location.

Vice Chair Romelus spoke with the D'Almeidas and informed Ms. Ready they plan to keep the home in its original location and build around it. She pointed out it is already in the plan, but if it changed, it could be located elsewhere in the Town Square plan.

**William Aikens**, 726 NE 1<sup>st</sup> Street, President HOB Neighborhood Association, agreed with the Chair and Board a pop-up park was needed. He noted from Boynton Beach Boulevard to 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue, there are hundreds of children playing in the street. The only way they can find any kind of recreation is in the streets, which is not good. He thought a park should be located there because when the area is redeveloped it was the perfect place to have one. He supported the concept and asked how soon a park could be created. Chair Grant replied the Board wanted to keep it as a parameter for the RFP they will issue because if a park is put in the wrong location, they are stuck with it and residents may lose out. The Board will move as quickly as possible, but wanted it incorporated into the RFP.

**Mark Karageorge**, 240A Main Boulevard, explained the Board has a great opportunity as with the Town Square development, the site's value increased. Previously, the Board did not receive any responses to its RFP for this area for various reasons at the time. He agreed the park should be included in the RFP as a mandatory component of the development because developers do not like to build parks because they do not make any money from them. He also suggested the Board should consider creating a Community Land Trust (CLT) as Delray has had success with them. If working with non-profits they can help make it occur with a developer and ensure quality and affordability. They can also qualify both low and moderate-income individuals and there would be home ownership. He thought the Board should consider the concept. He noted there were past CLT successes and there is a need in this area. It will improve the quality of life for citizens in that area and it enhances the area and there is a nearby learning center within walking distance. The Center can use the park and have additional programming. He thought the Board should appreciate the assets they have and build on them, which also includes the neighborhood residents.



Chair Grant thought they should look into a CLT because there may be purchasers that will rent out their property. He did not want to limit homeowner equity, but he wanted to restrict property owners from renting out their home, or go into foreclosure. By using a CLT, they can help protect the community.

### **Motion**

Board Member Katz moved to recast the net with regard to the prior Cottage District and incorporate a minimum mandatory amount of green space for a park of some nature. He thought given the area and economics, the homes will be affordable houses, so his motion was to have CRA staff and the Executive Director recast that RFP with some of the ideas with the park. Board Member Katz clarified his motion pertained to the most recent RFP that was single-family with the addition of the mandatory green space. He commented he was also not opposed to attached units. Board Member McCray seconded the motion.

Board Member Casello asked if green space, park and playground was defined the same way or if there was a difference. Mr. Simon explained there are passive and active parks and pointed out the CRA owns the land. The CRA had retained land for a park and was requesting the developer provide some type of financial aspect to the overall development. Respondents will want to know the size the Board retained, if they are installing playground equipment or benches or a basketball hoop. Board Member Casello asked if the development will have a style and learned they would. Mr. Simon explained architecturally, the style is in the plan and it is up to the Board on whether they would consider more than just single-family detached homes or other proposals that yield attached homes, but are still single family, or fee-simple ownership. He noted there are villa and garden-styled units.

Chair Grant wanted an active park in the sense children would use the park, and not necessarily a park with benches and trees. He hoped to have at least two tenths of an acre (around 10,000 square feet) or slightly less.

Mr. Simon explained the Board can indicate they want the developer to incorporate an active/semi-active park in a certain square footage range to be designed and incorporated in the proposal somewhere in the north east section, that can be written in and review the language.

Board Member Katz favored green space to be on the eastern side of the property to lock it into a residential community as opposed to the corner on Seacrest. He did not want it to be a hangout and included it in his motion that the green space for whatever size be on the eastern portion of the property. The CRA owns all the land on the eastern portion except the Community Caring Center, which if the Community Caring Center plan moves forward, the CRA will own the entire eastern front of the property which could lead to any types of park or green space design. It opens the CRA's options if the park is locked into a residential community on a side street. A park on Seacrest would have to be fenced which was an additional cost. He favored issuing an RFP, similar to the prior RFP with

the option of more than just single-family detached with mandatory green space of a size recommended by staff on the eastern front of the property. Board Member McCray seconded the motion that unanimously passed.

**F. Consideration of Fiscal Year 2017-2018 Budget Amendment for Property Acquisition Funding**

Chair Grant passed the gavel and left the dais. Vice Chair Romelus moved to take a five-minute break. Board Member McCray seconded the motion that unanimously passed. The meeting was recessed at 8:26 p.m. Vice Chair Romelus reconvened the meeting at 8:31 p.m. and returned the gavel to Chair Grant.

Mr. Simon explained this item was discussed at the March 13<sup>th</sup> meeting regarding unassigned fund balance and funding availability for potential acquisitions or other appropriate uses. In order to use funds from the general fund unassigned fund balance, a budget amendment is needed if the Board wanted to use funds this year as opposed to waiting for the annual budget. The board had approved acquisition of 115 N. Federal Highway for \$3 million in addition to the \$460,000 plus they have now. The unassigned balance of \$2,980,000 would need to be approved in the budget amendment for assignment to the project fund acquisition line item to fulfill the acquisition.

**Motion**

Board Member McCray moved to approve. Vice Chair Romelus moved to approve.

Chair Grant complimented the CRA on a great job to have excess funds to pass over.

The motion unanimously passed.

Board Member Casello asked if there had been any discussion about ownership of the contents of the church.

Mr. Simon explained the Board approved the acquisition, which did not specify any items inside or outside the building being retained by the church or included or excluded in the sale. The Church had until April 8<sup>th</sup> to approve the terms of the acquisition, which they did. Typically with church sales, they do not keep altars or pews, but in this case Mr. Birdsall on behalf of the congregation; asked him to clarify whether or not they could keep some items, such as the cross stained glass window in the front of the building. Mr. Simon advised it was up to the Board. He thought the Board should have the opportunity, as the buyer and the Church, as the seller, to recognize the items in the church in a discussion and not after the fact. If the Board Chair signs the agreement, there will be no specific answer and it will not include or exclude an art fixture or a window. If the Board wants to purchase the property and not allow them to take the building, it should be clarified. He thought it was important to have the discussion to see if it would break the deal. Board Member Katz requested staff approach the church to ascertain if it could be acquired for

the City and incorporated into the Cityscape. If the Church wants to keep it and the Board did not include it as a stipulation, he did not want to see the deal fall through. He believed the church would preserve it and hopefully they would offer ideas. Mr. Simon explained the CRA is purchasing the building and inside the building there is recognized art. The property is owned by the Church, but the artwork is affixed into the structure so to sell the structure, a fixture is generally thought of as non-removal. If the artwork was on the site and the Church owns it and wants to take it, it should be written in the contract. The CRA did not buy the property with the added value of the art included in the value of the property. Board Member Casello thought the CRA could incorporate it into its own landscape or buildings, or if it is important to the Church, he would not object if they took it with them. He wanted the art preserved. Chair Grant understood, if it is a fixture and an exterior window it is purchased as part of the building as opposed to a painting on a wall. He proposed staff discuss it with the congregation to ensure the CRA will preserve any type of art in the building and any fixture they are also willing to preserve those artworks as well. There was consensus.

Attorney Rossmell requested clarification the Board does not wish to clarify the contract to state that or they do. The Church already signed the contract and the Board did not want to let anything fall through. Under the CRA's interpretation, a stained glass window would be considered a fixture versus a piece of art that is hung up. Staff will have the discussion that any other pieces of art would and the CRA would maintain and preserve for the future. If the Church takes out the stained glass window, they will have done something to the building before the CRA purchases it. The agreement will not be changed, but it is a discussion the Board wants staff to have.

#### **14. New Business**

##### **A. Consideration of Purchase and Sale Agreement for the Properties Located at 211 NE 9th Avenue and NE 11th Avenue**

#### **Motion**

Vice Chair Romelus moved to approve. Board Member McCray seconded the motion that unanimously passed.

##### **B. Consideration of Funding of Intersection Improvements Associated with Florida Department of Transportation US 1/Federal Highway Project**

**Thuy Shutt**, Assistant CRA Director, explained this item is not funded in 2017/2018 budget. In August 2017, the Board had discussed what to spend on the enhancements of US 1 as part of the FDOT road resurfacing plans. These were cosmetic items to increase pedestrian safety and/or bike lanes at a larger or more prominent intersection within the corridor that it is not funded by base elements of the resurfacing job. Since the budget had to be adopted, staff did not have the prices and FDOT did not progress far enough along with their plans, the Board did not allocate an amount for improvements.

On March 15<sup>th</sup>, City and CRA staff had a conference call with the FDOT for improvements at three intersections all on US 1 at Woolbright Road, Ocean Avenue, and Boynton Beach Boulevard. Improvements included patterned pavements on the crosswalks to make the intersection more visible. The improvements are an upgrade because the improvements being made by FDOT is more than what staff anticipated in the past. With the City's recommendation, there should be some highlights of the intersection. The FDOT will install lighting at intersections for pedestrians and will have bike lanes and resurfacing. City staff recommended another four intersections in addition to the three already mentioned which were on Gulfstream, SE 23rd, Gateway and MLK Jr. Boulevard. The preliminary cost from the City engineer is about \$58,000 each. These intersections on Ocean, Woolbright and Boynton Beach Boulevard in addition to MLK will be more prominent and more effectively be seen and visible. The other intersection at Gateway and on Gulfstream already has a vertical entrance sign that signifies departure and arrival into Boynton Beach. The improvements would highlight the intersections and give a sense of arrival to the City. Funding would not exceed \$230,000 for the four recommended intersections.

Vice Chair Romelus liked the improvements, but favored adding Gateway Boulevard to the set of intersections and substituting it for Ocean Avenue as it already has several embellishments such as Cavalcade. She noted Boynton Beach Boulevard was nearby and she thought having two embellished intersections next to each other was not good and she favored Gateway Boulevard as the alternate.

Board Member Casello asked if the funds have to be used only for paving and learned it could be used for anything in addition to the resurfacing. She clarified they were using a thermal plastic paint, not pavers and it was cosmetic. Board Member Casello asked how it would improve the beauty of US 1. Ms. Shutt explained it would accent the intersections to have something other than asphalt. The FDOT no longer approves pavers in the right of way based on maintenance issues. The improvements are aesthetic. Maintenance would be handled through an Interlocal Agreement between FDOT and the City for anything in addition to what FDOT cannot maintain.

Board Member Casello commented that initially, the roads will look good, but they do not hold up. He questioned whether the money could be used for anything else on US 1 as opposed to using thermal plastics. Ms. Shutt commented they could look into it. Mr. Simon explained staff was bringing information to the Board that was mentioned at the FDOT meeting. All the items the Board wanted to spend the money on would be paid for by FDOT including the pedestrian and bikeways. They have gone above and beyond what the CRA could have paid for. This is the only option the CRA has with the FDOT for this project. Ms. Shutt explained FDOT will bid the project and design it, otherwise the CRA would have to do that and go through the permitting procedures in the future.

Board Member McCray wanted, in addition to Ocean Avenue, to include Gateway. He favored removing the pavers on Boynton Beach Boulevard and making the roadways beautiful as they will be a focal point with the Town Square.

He proposed to increase the line item from \$230,000 to \$287,000 or whatever it would take including enhancing Ocean Avenue because it would be a destination.

Chair Grant asked what direction the top of the Sailfish logo should face because it makes a difference where motorists would drive. He commented a good example of this type of thermal plastic was on Fern and Tamarind in West Palm Beach. He thought having artwork on the road promotes bike and pedestrian traffic.

Vice Chair Romelus requested clarification the City would have to maintain the thermal plastic and learned they would. Ms. Shutt explained it is a similar material to what is on Atlantic Avenue and NW SW 12<sup>th</sup>. It will withstand some of the heat, but there will be wear and tear on it from vehicle traffic and they would have to seal it. She did not have cost for the plastic but commented the city engineer should have those numbers. The CRA and City were part of the call and the City did not identify anything further than what the State was doing. The medians are not included in the improvements made by FDOT, only the resurfacing, restriping, bike lanes and some intersection lighting and crosswalks.

Ms. Oyer asked if the thermal plastic was used for the I-95 logos. Ms. Shutt did not know, but she had an example of the material. She suggested the top of the sailfish face towards the ocean. As per Board Member Casello and Vice Chair Romelus regarding the wear and tear, she asked about doing something on the corner or on the sidewalk such as ocean waves drawing people to the ocean. She thought there may be less wear and tear, but it would still beautify the area and all would see it.

Chair Grant felt Gateway and US 1 was inviting to motorists driving north to south, and the top of the sailfish should be on the south side. Entering the City from the south, the top of the sailfish should face north. Mr. Simon had images showing the product and the intersection of Ocean, Boynton Beach Boulevard and Federal Highway and the bill of the sailfish was pointing east. Board Member McCray suggested bringing back visuals. Mr. Simon explained the issue for the Board is whether or not the CRA would pay for the thermal plastic. The Board had until December to decide which way the Sailfish bill would point.

### **Motion**

Board Member Katz moved to approve the improvements at the five intersections. Board Member McCray seconded the motion. Board Member Casello thought the money may be better spent beautifying US 1 than putting thermal plastics down at intersections not knowing how maintenance would be needed and how they would be repaired in the future. The motion passed 4-1 (*Board Member Casello dissenting.*)

**C. Discussion and Consideration of Lease Terms for the Property located at  
201 NE 9th Avenue**

Mr. Simon explained the CRA purchased property that had a duplex and the tenant leases had different expiration dates on August 1<sup>st</sup> and May 30<sup>th</sup>. Staff was contemplating providing an extra 60 days for each resident on the lease, allowing them additional time to find another suitable home.

### **Motion**

Board Member Katz moved to approve. Vice Chair Romelus seconded the motion.

Board Member Casello asked if the CRA assisted tenants with relocation fees in the past. Mr. Simon recalled they may have done so with Reverend Robinson, but as a practice, they have not. Mr. Simon would not want to extend the lease longer than the 60 days. The CRA had notified the tenants that they acquired the building and they did not know that they had to move. It was a proactive measure and once vacant, the building will be demolished. Mr. Simon pointed out the site was now part of the RFP of the lot. Chair Grant was concerned about liability, but learned the building passed the inspection report, but was informed the CRA would not want to pay for any significant repairs. Mr. Simon explained the tenants will also be paying rent.

### **Vote**

The motion unanimously passed.

#### **D. Consideration of Request from the Boynton Beach Playhouse for use of the Historic Woman's Club of Boynton Beach**

Mr. Simon explained the CRA received a letter from the curator/operator of the Boynton Beach Playhouse on March 29<sup>th</sup> requesting the Board consider the playhouse relocating due to the Madsen Center demolition as part of the Town Square Project and use the eastern portion of the Woman's Club downstairs for performances. There is a stage and risers with seating to occupy that space with very little damage or alteration to the building. The Playhouse provides a five production series of eight shows each and a children's theater camp in the summer. They would pay \$160 a month, which is their current offset to the Madsen Center. Mr. Simon explained the series occurs from November through May.

Board Member McCray queried if the shows would interfere with rentals at the Woman's Club and learned it could potentially affect the upstairs rental during their season. On Friday and Saturday nights, the upstairs of the building could not be rented, nor could both floors be used at the same time on any night. He clarified there are some weekends no shows are planned and those are the weekends the Woman's Club could be rented.

**Peter Pagliaro** explained the shows are held on three consecutive weekends consisting of Friday, Saturday and Sunday for two weekends and only Friday and Saturday on the

third weekend. Generally, each new production is four to six weeks apart. Board Member McCray asked how much the CRA would lose in rental income for the top floor and learned it would be \$2,500 plus other fees per event.

Board Member Katz noted dedication to one entity would result in the loss of rentals at the facility, and he did not want to reserve months worth of weekends during peak season. The CRA just acquired the property and was attempting to market it. Using the building by the theater could compromise what the CRA was seeking to do. The Board did not want to let everyone in on a charitable basis and the shows would hinder the CRA's ability to make the facility profitable. He did not support renting the facility to anyone unless the cost was equal to the cost of a reservation.

Board Member Casello saw several plays and noted pest control at the Madsen Center is \$150 a month. Using the Women's Club would result in an increase in monthly costs such as utility costs and the City has no means to absorb or pay for them. He hoped when the High School was up and running, there might be space to hold the performances. He commented due to the earlier mentioned issues, he could not support the request and further added the parking was terrible.

Mr. Pagliari commented that five years ago, at a meeting with the City Manager and former CRA Director Vivian Brooks, they thought they would someday move into the Old High School and be the cultural hub of the new Town Square until a month ago. He received a call from the City Manager to look at the Old High School, and then a few days later was informed it was not an option. He explained Atlanta, Georgia allowed its community theater to perform in the back of the big theater of an old high school in the black box. The builder who constructed their current location also told him he could dismantle and reassemble it in a new location within a week.

Board Member Casello asked if the Playhouse had a Plan B and learned they did not have anything concrete. Mr. Pagliari explained this year was their 26<sup>th</sup> consecutive year in business without a payroll. They have lost space before, but were able to immediately find a new location. The community theater is an all-volunteer organization. They have been in Boynton Beach for six years and culturally put Boynton Beach on the map. They thought the cultural partnerships were amazing and it is give and take. The volunteers do not take a paycheck. They do it for the residents and to enhance the City's cultural element. He thought with the Town Square, nothing was more important than having a cultural component such as a live stage theater. He commented West Palm Beach and Lake Worth have one and it draws people who also stop and eat at the restaurants, shop at the shops and drink at bars after the show. Mr. Pagliari explained the Playhouse draws these individuals because their budget is used for advertising in the Sun Sentinel and Palm Beach Post. He reiterated they were not present for their own motives, only the love of the art.

Chair Grant requested clarification the playhouse was not asking to use the west side of the Old High School and learned they were not. He thought the Board does not know



what they can get from the Woman's Club. He proposed to give them a one-year lease as it will draw people to the CRA district, Secret Garden, Hour Cucina and other new restaurants. He thought they could have dinner theater with the Woman's Club. They may not be making as much money as they could, but it is not their vision to make the Woman's Club into a catering hall. He thought the CRA should fine tune the expenditures as they would most likely need valet parking, and there are added costs for utilities and cleaning after each show. The Playhouse was always subsidized. When the Board rented it out for \$1 a year for the Madsen Center and the air conditioner broke, the Playhouse contributed \$1,000 for its repair. Chair Grant thought the City would get more advertising from the Woman's Club by having a Playhouse than by the CRA's own marketing. If they wait a year, they may not have this option. He noted the Boynton Beach Woman's Club needs a new roof and they may not be able to rent the top floor. There are unknowns and variable costs, but with marketing and new restaurants, it could be a dinner theater. He commented the Woman's Club was always supposed to have a community component.

Board Member McCray explained the Playhouse originally came to them out of desperation, but it was not a long-term agreement. The CRA had a marketing plan for the building. He asked if they would consider using the Senior Center and a hall that is not used. He thought there were events ongoing, but not on weekends.

Mr. Pagliari explained in order to continue to be successful, they have to be able to get in there any time for rehearsals during the days, evenings, weeknights and weekends.

Board Member Katz did not want to see them turned away or find another location or City facility. If the Woman's Club is the only option, he thought they may be able to change some of the show runs. He would not be opposed to using the space but on a more limited basis including using it less on weekends or alternating weekends. There is a compromise including addressing the cost as he did not think \$160 would be sufficient. He thought staff could review using different locations so it would not be inoperable during stretches of time in season. He appreciated what the Playhouse does, but the location cannot be used exclusively by one entity for an extended length of time. He hoped there would be a compromise.

Board Member Romelus had a print out of current events at the Woman's Club since July. She asked if the Playhouse could move production dates to less popular months. Mr. Pagliari explained they choose the dates according to the season, which is November through May, as snowbirds return home after Easter. He announced they have to hold the plays on three consecutive weekends. The members have families and jobs and they need a structured schedule. The Playhouse already reduced the number of plays and they could not make further cuts.

## **Motion**



Board Member McCray moved to table this item. He did not want to lose what they had in the Madsen Center and was informed demolition would not occur right away.

Board Member Katz thought he and the City should get together quickly to develop a timeline. He advised he will email City staff to inform them of timetable and look at other options. He seconded the motion to table. Mr. Pagliari explained the City Manager never said why they could not move into the cultural center

Board Member Casello asked if it was because they need current space and storage, and there was no more room on the first floor and the second floor was too big. Mr. Pagliari agreed but had asked for a small space in the back on the second floor. He was unsure of the square footage on the top floor, but commented they only need 1,200 square feet.

Board Member Katz commented at this time, the City is not in a position to make that decision and anyone who made a commitment to him in the past spoke out of turn. Vice Chair Romelus thought the Playhouse would run into the same issue with this building. A portion of the high school would be used for weddings and conferences and they will experience the same problem and lose revenue. She favored City staff speak about using other facilities rather than tabling the item.

Lori LaVerriere, City Manager, explained their need is for permanent space. When they set up their sets for a show they leave it there and they cannot move it so the permanent space needs was a challenge for them on the first floor with all of the recreation programs. Staff can look at the program needs of the art and civic centers but Ms. LaVerriere noted it is already a challenge to maintain the City's current program levels and they want to eliminate some recreation programs to accommodate this. The upstairs conference space will be used by the hotels for conferences and large venues. They cannot partition the areas upstairs. There are more classroom settings for Zumba and dance and art classes. She advised they will revisit the programming.

Vice Chair Romelus did not want to remove programs. She asked if there were other facilities that could be used. Ms. LaVerriere explained they looked. The backroom is a nice space, but it is permanent space. They have to setup, stay there, rehearse and have access. The Playhouse needs dedicated space. She did not know about using the Senior Center. She would speak with Mr. Majors to review the issue and bring something back.

Chair Grant commented there is some information about how the Woman's Club is being used and what dates are booked. The Board acquired the Woman's Club in November, but they have records dating back to the prior July. He noted the Woman's Club is not advertised as a for-profit business and there are costs. He asked if the Woman's Club pays for itself and learned they are operating at a loss. It will not hurt the CRA by having the Boynton Beach Playhouse occupy it for a year on a temporary basis. It is an opportunity for the CRA to have people visit because next year there will be no Movie in the Park or Music on the Rocks unless they find a new venue. Mr. Simon thought there was room to work with the Playhouse, but no matter where the Board considers, it is a

subsidized enterprise. The Playhouse does not generate revenue for the space they occupy no matter where they are. There are 11 to 13 weekends with no shows and 15 weeks there are, and there are months there are no rentals so it would not interfere. There is an opportunity to generate attention to the building by having the Playhouse there or partner with other businesses. Staff would do all they could and hoped the Playhouse would do all they could to make it affordable for both parties and have a partnership.

Board Member McCray asked what the hours of the performances were and learned the evening performances begin at 8 p.m. and end around 10 p.m. The Sunday Matinees start at 2 p.m. to about 4 p.m.

Board Member McCray asked how the Playhouse would feel if there was a wedding occurring during production. Mr. Pagliari explained they would not be able to have a live play on stage with a DJ upstairs as it would interfere with the play. Board Member McCray thought they may be able to work around the timing. He wanted to table the item.

### **Vote**

The motion unanimously passed.

**Barbara Ready** explained she is on the Board of Directors for the Historical Society, and they met at the Woman's Club for many years paying \$500 a year and they were chased off by the increase in the fees. She commented she would love to rent the club for \$160. She thought fair was fair.

**E. Consideration of Transfer of the CRA Owned Property Located at 201 NE 1st Avenue for Use in the Town Square Project**

### **Motion**

Board Member Katz moved to approve. Board Member McCray seconded the motion that unanimously passed.

## **15. CRA Advisory Board**

**A. CRA Advisory Board Agenda - April 5, 2018**

**B. Pending Assignments**

1. None

**C. Reports on Pending Assignments**

1. None

**D. New Assignments**

1. None

**16. Future Agenda Items**

**A. Consideration of Interlocal Agreement between the Boynton Beach CRA and City of Boynton Beach for Funding Associated with the Model Block Project**

Attorney Rossmell requested the Board's authorization for Mr. Simon to execute an amendment to the agreement that was discussed in reference to the Hoggins item. It will be revised and approved before the next meeting. It would be a draft, but if the Board wanted to keep the item moving and give Ms. Hoggins the opportunity to go to the Bank before the next meeting, it would need to be signed.

**Motion**

Board Member McCray so moved. Board Member Katz seconded the motion that unanimously passed.

**17. Adjournment**

**Motion**

There being no further business to discuss, Board Member McCray moved to adjourn. The motion was duly seconded and unanimously passed. The meeting was adjourned at 9:45 p.m.



Catherine Cherry  
Minutes Specialist