

**MINUTES OF THE COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY SPECIAL MEETING
HELD AT THE HOLIDAY INN CATALINA, BOYNTON BEACH, FLORIDA
ON THURSDAY, JUNE 22, 2006 AT 5:55 P.M.**

Present:

Henderson Tillman, Chairman
Stormet Norem, Vice Chair
Alexander DeMarco
Jeanne Heavilin
Marie Horenburger
Guarn Sims

Ken Spillias, Board Attorney
Lisa Bright, CRA Director

Absent:

Steve Myott

I. Call to Order

Chair Tillman called the meeting to order at 6:07 p.m. and announced this was a special meeting regarding the Request for Proposal (RFP) process. The Recording Secretary called the roll and declared a quorum was present.

II. Approval of the Agenda

The CRA did not address this item and moved directly to Item III. Old Business Item A. Consideration of the RFP for MLK (Martin Luther King) Corridor.

III. Old Business

A. Consideration of the RFP for MLK Corridor

Ms. Lisa Bright, Executive Director, Community Redevelopment Agency, was present and explained at the last meeting, staff was given direction via a motion to draft an RFP for the MLK Corridor project area for Phase I and Phase II, to create a cohesive plan for the area along Seacrest to Federal Highway. A preliminary draft of the Request For Proposal (RFP) had been prepared. Ms. Bright indicated staff was seeking additional revisions and was looking to move the document forward as early as June 23, 2006.

Chair Tillman announced he received a memorandum from Quintus Greene, Director of Development for the City of Boynton Beach, regarding some issues contained in the RFP. Chair Tillman requested hearing more about the information contained in the memorandum.

Mr. Quintus Greene, Director of Development, drafted the memo Tuesday afternoon, with delivery scheduled for Wednesday. He explained the City Commission took action on Tuesday evening, so there was a concern whether or not it made any point to send the memo. He elaborated that after discussion, it was determined there were still items in the

memo that should be considered by the board as they reviewed the RFP. He felt the memo was somewhat self-explanatory.

His first concern was project description. As much as the CRA was the issuing agency, he explained under normal circumstances the respondents to the RFP would expect that the entity issuing the RFP has effective land control, and they would be dealing with that entity. Mr. Greene explained in this instance, particularly as the project is described along MLK between Seacrest and Federal Highway, the CRA and the City has minimal land control in that entire area. It does have significant land control in the area previously described as Phase I. He explained if the City Commission did not take the action it had, there was the possibility that it would have had considerably more land control in the Phase I area, such that there would have only been five outstanding parcels that were owned by four individuals. Mr. Greene clarified none of the five parcels were residential parcels and all of the owners were absentee owner/investors, whose primary concerns were money. It appeared to him there was a good opportunity to assemble a developable parcel of about five acres. He explained when you have a developable parcel of about five acres and an RFP is issued, the response would be very favorable on the part of the broader development community because a lot of issues and problems would be eliminated. He explained that in issuing an RFP for the MLK corridor, there are at least 25 residential units, six of which are homesteaded, at least three churches, a charter school and he pointed out any one of them could hold up a development indefinitely. It appeared to him it would be more problematic going that way than what was on Phase I.

Mr. Greene explained the second concern he had was about a word that was removed from the project description. The word had to do with "scale". He explained the neighborhood is primarily a single and two-family neighborhood. He indicated character, scale and integrity is as important here as anywhere else in the City. He indicated City staff had taken that into consideration in its proposed mixed-use rezoning of the corridor to allow for increased density. He clarified they are not trying to dictate to a developer how the character is to be maintained, only that scale should be maintained. The developer would need to decide how they would handle the issue and present it.

Mr. Greene indicated the third area of concern was about a paragraph that was removed. He clarified he had provided a draft RFP to the CRA in April that could be used as a model. Mr. Greene read the subject paragraph as follows, "Consistent with Code requirements it is expected that the physical features and density of the new development will compliment (not replicate) the existing character of the community. Accordingly, building heights should not exceed 45 feet and the style, color and building materials should reflect the open, airy subtropical characteristics of South Florida and the Caribbean (Floribbean)."

Mr. Greene spoke about whether the 45 feet was appropriate. As an example, he referenced the Harbors project, adjacent to Intracoastal Park at Federal Highway and Gateway. He explained that project is 43 feet in height. He asked the CRA to picture the project along Federal Highway backing up to single-family homes in the Heart of Boynton (HOB), on 11th Avenue or the project backing up to the single-family homes in one of the INCA neighborhoods. He was concerned about how to maintain some type of scale. Putting the height issue aside, he explained, the larger issue was the architectural style, character and feel that was being encouraged in the area. He indicated the Floribbean style was outlined, not only in the HOB Plan, but also in subsequent urban design documents that complimented the HOB Plan. Some

of the newer developments in the HOB, as well as those currently being constructed and proposed to be constructed, had adopted many of the recommendations in the urban design documents. City staff explained it was important, when considering a major development in the HOB, that the RFP should tell potential developers there is an expectation that they would also have to comply with the urban design characteristics.

Mr. Greene also discussed the paragraph in the original draft that addressed the role of Faith Based Community Development Corporations ("CDCs"). He explained there are two such organizations in Boynton Beach. One issue discussed was the role the CDCs might play in partnering with full profit developers in the redevelopment of the community. CDCs bring money to the table. There were a number of organizations that work through the CDCs, such as the Local Initiatives Support Corporation, which brings in additional funding which can help leverage private development in the area. Mr. Greene explained the community had concerns about gentrification and indicated he thought it would be a mistake, given the character of the area, and given the concerns expressed by residents, to not ask the developers what role they saw for the local CDCs. Mr. Greene elaborated the community desired to have a local organization be a player in the redevelopment, and recommended the question be asked of the proposers to the RFP what role, if any, was seen for the local CDCs.

Chair Tillman indicated the CRA had no control over the land control issues, and he asked if the other items Mr. Greene identified regarding the HOB plan required a change to the ordinance. He noted the HOB plan was part of an ordinance and the changes would be incorporated into the RFP.

Ms. Lisa Bright, CRA Executive Director thanked Mr. Greene for his draft. She explained the board had given her very clear direction in the motion, that it was the will of the board that the plan be a cohesive plan. She elaborated that was why they used the language in the RFP as being from Seacrest Boulevard to Federal Highway. Ms. Bright indicated in her discussions with Assistant City Manager Hawkins and Mr. Greene, the goal of the plan was to obtain a conceptual plan. Ms. Bright explained the CRA paid \$50,000 for the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council to conduct a planning study, and the board made it very clear to staff that regardless of who responds to the RFP, the study was to be the governing document in conjunction with the HOB plan. There was no intent to move beyond that. With regard to scale, Ms. Bright explained currently there are urban design guidelines in documents to govern those items as well. Ms. Bright indicated there was no problem, from a staff level, if the board seeks to put the Floribbean context back in. Ms. Bright reported they have worked with the Ocean Breeze project that clearly had a Floribbean character and explained incentive money was given for that. The Treasure Coast Study and the development community supported this study and that was the plan to be used for successful implementation.

Ms. Bright explained in regard to the role of CDCs, since the CRA is a significant property owner, and the onus is on the board to make the project happen, it was her experience from other CRAs surveyed, that they typically partner to make sure they got what they needed, and she had assumed this would be worked out in the development agreement. Ms. Bright apologized if she had made an inappropriate legal assumption. She clarified that was why CDCs were not mentioned and why certain language was deleted.

Vice Chair Norem commented he had noted the same four items and was glad the issues were addressed. He believed the first three items previously discussed were covered by the Treasure Coast Planning Study document, which addressed scale. The boundaries were not set just to Phase I, it was the entire Heart of Boynton area. The deleted paragraph was contained in the Treasure Coast Planning Council document and as long as that document was adhered to, he did not think it needed to be repeated. He expressed it would be great for the CDCs to be a partner in the project and noted anyone that wanted to bring a plan to the City and CRA could do so. It was possible another developer would include those entities as part of the process; however, he did not think it should be made a condition.

Mr. Wilfred Hawkins, Assistant City Manager, indicated staff supports the RFP, and thought the points Mr. Greene raised were important. He pointed out another concern in the format of the RFP was there should be the expectation for developers to at least have a conversation and understanding of what CDCs have to offer and that they exist in the community. He suggested asking developers to acknowledge and make preliminary contact with those organizations to get an indication of how they, as developers, can work with or include the CDCs in the development process. He recommended having language that developers make initial contact with these CDCs, and show they have identified the organizations and made preliminary contact with them.

Mr. Hawkins pointed out the community aspect of the issue. He indicated the board should consider this aspect. The community, at the last City Commission meeting held in the Library Program Room, was very specific that they wanted to be made aware and have some level of input into the RFP process. The City Commission agreed to that. He agreed issuing the RFP, and aligning the market for the development was the way to go, but stressed the need to be concerned and considerate of the people in the community that would be impacted. He urged language be included that some form of community input or interaction would be required of the developer, in order for the developer to put together their proposal. He emphasized there are enough identified community members and institutions within the HOB neighborhood for a developer to successfully do this. He emphasized there should be due diligence on the part of the developer, to make contact with these entities. By the developer doing so, Mr. Hawkins elaborated, a line of least resistance is created and it would be easier for the developer.

Mr. Hawkins also urged, as governmental officials, keeping the process as transparent as possible. The important issue was to give a level of comfort to the community, that the project is in the best interest of the community.

Ms. Heavilin commented about the inclusion of Phase II in light of not pursuing eminent domain. She felt strongly the initial development should be limited to Phase I where they have more control of the land. She expressed having a developer try to assemble the rest of the parcels could take years and the board has repeatedly indicated it needs to begin the process now.

Ms. Heavilin also commented about public input. She indicated the board had discussed going back to the public in terms of the changes in the market and revisiting the issue to be sure all parties were on the same page.

Mr. Sims announced he would never vote for any proposal that did not include some of the components of what the community wanted to see and that aspect was made very clear at the last meeting. He agreed any developer submitting a proposal should include some of those components and he emphasized that was a requirement from staff. Mr. Sims announced he was initially in favor of incorporating Phase I and II. He indicated the board knew it would be a tedious process for a developer to obtain properties from property owners, and with the recent developments, he believed the project was in jeopardy. Now three other properties were being incorporated into Phase I. Mr. Sims indicated if they continued with what the Commission decided to do, the process could be delayed. He announced three to five years down the road, if what is currently seen is what they will see, especially with the development going on as it is in Boynton, it would be a sad situation. Mr. Sims thought given the recent developments, it might be a smarter idea to go back and look at Phase I. He announced his biggest concern had always been when Phase I was completed, they would need to go back to the drawing board and start all over again for Phase II, which could be years down the road. Mr. Sims explained if the board decided to do that, he would like to see an alternative time line to when Phase II would start.

Ms. Horenburger thanked staff and announced she intended to amend her original motion to include a statement that the proposer agrees to meet with the community and utilize their comments. She indicated, in reference to Mr. Greene's comments with the project description, that the issuing agency needs to give some expectation to the proposer that the land is available. She felt if the RFP moved forward, it would stop the land speculation along MLK. She was disappointed to hear any complaint about the original motion she made to move forward with the entire project, because she did not hear any complaint or objections from staff, the CDCs or anyone else. Her view was, if they moved forward the way they proposed last time on the entire length of MLK to Seacrest, they would be doing what Riviera Beach did, which was have a master developer. She noted Mr. Kenzie had come into Riviera Beach and undid all the contracts they had for land, much like they just stopped the eminent domain. This stopped the speculation. She stressed if you name the master developer, the speculators would not be there turning properties over and the project would move forward.

With regard to who owned property, Ms. Horenberger explained one or two owners might want to hold onto their property, or would only sell the property at twice its value. In those instances the CRA would then expect the master developer to design the project around that parcel and the City or the CRA would consider taking that parcel for public purposes. She also felt the Treasure Coast Study was very clear about what could be done based on the dollars spent and how to move forward. She had spoken with Mr. Joe Gray who designed the HOB plan this afternoon. He indicated to her the plan that was adopted did not have phases. It was a conceptual guide. Ms. Horenburger quoted him as saying, "Strategically it would be a mistake to not maximize the project and make it the whole length of the corridor. It is not realistic to expect quality development to come in with just part of the project. The rest will never get done. You take the risk if it is not done really well in the first phase, than no one will come and do the second phase. Making it one large project gives it incentives. If we do not do well, we are not going to get Phase II done." Ms. Horenburger conveyed he never envisioned the prices of land would be what they paid already. She elaborated the CRA has not even begun to address issues such as the soils testing or where remediation may be needed. Only then, she expounded, would you get a great project, with uniform streetlights, planned parks, landscaping and other environments. She indicated it was incumbent on the board, or who

ever brought a plan to the board, to protect those single-family residences to the north and the south by having graded or step down development, which already occurs along US 1 and in many other projects in the City. This type of development eliminated having a massive fence across the street from a single-family home. Ms. Horenberger believed this was how they should move forward and how to address scale and character.

Ms. Horenberger addressed the CDCs and indicated if CDCs bring money to the table, the developers would seek them out. She had no problem including language that required the developers to speak with them, but she indicated she would not recommend the developer be committed to them if they cannot bring anything to the table. She cautioned if nothing is done right the first time, there is no second time.

Motion

Ms. Horenberger moved to amend her original motion to include in the original RFP, a statement that the proposer agrees to meet with the community in the HOB and take comments into account in their development proposal.

Chair Tillman indicated although he did not get a second, this was a review process prior to the RFP being issued. He suggested addressing the parts of the process in place, in order to respond to the issues.

Ms. Horenberger suggested removing the evaluation and selection section of the RFP, as it added another time line. It would need to come back to the CRA and then the City Commission. Then, an HOB resident would need to be selected and this would push the process back at least one to three months.

Ms. Bright requested clarification on the discussion about phasing. She indicated, for example, Ocean One was a huge project that has phasing. She explained the time line on that project is a minimum of three to five years. Ms. Bright expressed it appeared to her that the developer would take what they know as Phase I, and focus on that and assemble land. She wanted to be clear that it would be a minimum of three to five years to do the entire street.

Ms. Bright also indicated some of the board members spoke to her about the selection and review process. Mr. Robert Reardon, Assistant Director, had asked the financial records of all proposers be kept confidential and reviewed only by Mr. Reardon, and the financing specialist to determine if the proposer has the financial ability to do the project as well as meet the specific criteria listed in the proposal. She added if there are significant changes, the time line would need to be adjusted and it would be possible the August target would be missed. She indicated staff would be available to review the proposals for the two areas, which were whether the proposal met the criteria and to review the proposer's financial background.

Mr. DeMarco announced he agreed with the memo sent by Mr. Greene and the comments made by Mr. Hawkins. Mr. DeMarco spoke about the 20/20 Vision meeting that was held. An issue identified at that meeting was communication and education. Mr. DeMarco indicated those issues would be very important with the neighbors and residents in the HOB. He added the more they understand the matter, the better it would be for all concerned. He thought the references made pertaining to a Floribbean theme were good ideas. He thought they were moving in the right direction.

Chair Tillman opened the meeting for public comments.

Mayor Jerry Taylor, speaking for himself and not on behalf of the City Commission, indicated he was encouraged at the last meeting with the CRA taking action to move forward with the RFP. He recalled his sense was there was agreement to move forward as one project. He explained the RFP should entice developers and this is a very difficult development to undertake. He expressed his hope there would be more than one developer to put in a proposal. He thought the goal should be to get the RFP out on the street and when a developer comes in and indicates what they could do, he suggested taking it to the community for their input. He reported the community was clear they wanted to have a say with what was desired and it would be tough to gain a consensus. Mayor Taylor indicated the proposals should come back to the CRA, as opposed to having a middleman. He expressed his support to issue the RFP because it was necessary to determine what direction to take.

Mr. Christopher Plummer works with a faith based CDC. He spoke about the issue of phasing and was not sure putting the RFP to a master developer for the entire development, as opposed to phasing, would have a drastic effect on speculation. He suggested if a Phase I RFP was done, the City and the CRA could continue on the same track with acquisition for Phase II. Regarding the input of the CDCs, he clarified the issue was not only about providing the CDC a stake; rather the CDCs were representative of the community. It was not just about receiving input on what residents would like to see constructed, but about components such as equity, participation in business opportunities, and concepts such as homeownership for the persons who currently live in the area as well. He raised two examples of development. City Place in West Palm Beach, he reported, has gentrification. The other example was Atlantic Avenue in Delray Beach. He indicated that because of the RFP, which was similar to this one, they were able to assemble a team of for-profit development and had two CDCs. He explained they were able to allow 13 low and moderate-income families to own town homes and the CDCs to obtain space and create other opportunities for business incubators. CDCs represent the community and the idea was the community should have not just a say in what is built there, but some kind of stake. The proposal should have language that specifies the development would occur without displacing the current residents.

David Katz was present and spoke to the comments made by Mr. Plummer. He indicated any development that comes into the HOB should be sensitive to economic diversity. He announced he was at the last CRA meeting and heard the motion made by Ms. Horenburger and would like to address a few issues in the RFP that he believes have been added subsequent to the motion.

He indicated in the project description, the original motion was to go to 11th and not to the middle of MLK. Ms. Bright confirmed this action.

The next item was the Evaluation and Selection portion of the RFP. Mr. Katz echoed his sentiments that the board was appointed by the City Commission. He thought having a three-person selection committee was passing the buck and it should be the CRA to make the selection, not create another layer of approval, thereby delaying the process. Mr. Katz did not recall that issue as being in Ms. Horenburger's original motion.

Finally, he spoke about the Treasure Coast Planning Council study. He recommended the CRA use it as a guide and not a bible. He indicated the study did not address market conditions and infrastructure. He indicated a for-profit developer cannot be tied to what they think should be.

Mr. David Zimet, Boynton Beach Faith Based CDC. Mr. Zimet, echoed Mayor Taylor's comments. Mr. Zimet indicated he would like to see in the criteria that the developer makes some type of effort or guarantee of an effort to employ people from the neighborhood as part of the project while the project is underway. This would provide opportunities to train people in the neighborhood and provides employment opportunities and experience.

Commissioner Ensler had two comments, one being made as an engineer, not as a Commissioner. He suggested when the RFP is issued it be done in such a way as to not eliminate creativity. He expressed it was important for individuals to come forward with concepts that may be different than what had seen before. This could give the CRA a chance to think about the new concept. He suggested trying to structure the RFP so it would not be too rigid.

Commissioner Ensler spoke about the entire project area and questioned how to move it forward. He expressed it would be impractical to do anything until total control of the area is gained. He questioned what steps could be taken to show the beginning of the plan's implementation and suggested having developers create a proposed approach, regarding Phase I and Phase II, so that the community would not be wondering how to move forward five to ten years from now.

Chair Tillman closed the floor to public comment.

Chair Tillman indicated these comments have been heard before. He explained he tries to stay in line with those comments. He explained his primary goal was to see the HOB move forward. He explained about two meetings ago, issues were raised and the CRA discussed the self-assembly groups, proposals moving forward, bringing in an RFP and listening to different plans. He announced, at that meeting, he made it clear it was a great opportunity for the community to come in and provide a focus group with information about what they want to do. Chair Tillman clarified these issues still need to take form. He emphasized more than any board or policy-making group, the focus group needs to happen. He stressed proposers who move forward in the process should have an opportunity to speak with the community and the community to speak to them. Ultimately, he explained, the community will decide what they want in their community. When the issue comes back to the CRA, whether those ideas should be incorporated into the plan could be made part of the comments. Chair Tillman indicated that process should be incorporated into the RFP that will be issued.

Chair Tillman spoke about phasing. He explained the subject property is a tract of land less than one mile in total from west to east. He explained if a developer comes in with a larger than life idea of what they want to do such as incorporating community concerns, whether the concerns are commercial, residential or have some social concerns, then they can do so. Right now, he stressed, it was utmost for the City to move the RFP forward with due diligence. In order for the CRA to see something come to a realization, they should let market conditions come into play. The opportunity to move the project is right now. The issues being discussed, he explained, should still come forth and those stakeholders and individuals who claim to be a

part of the issue, should let it move forward. Chair Tillman emphasized a lot of meetings would need to take place and a lot of the people would need to stand up and make the meetings happen. He indicated sometimes you need to let things move forward and then people will get involved. Chair Tillman supported moving the RFP forward. Chair Tillman indicated he had no objections to the RFP's coming directly to the CRA for review and selection.

Mr. Sims announced he was in favor of a master developer for the entire corridor and he was ready to move forward with the RFP. He reiterated he was concerned about the project with the recent developments. He indicated he liked the staff comments merging the two issues, which were requiring a developer to develop the entire corridor. The CRA have assurances that the developer would be able to present a time line for completion. Mr. Sims was very clear he did not want to look at a half developed corridor, which would be just as bad as not seeing anything. Mr. Sims supported the merging of both ideas and as long as the language was in writing, he would be satisfied. He wanted to be able to stand on Seacrest, view the project and be excited with what is done three to five years down the road. Mr. Sims also added he was in favor of adding the language mentioned by City Staff.

Ms. Heavilin agreed with Mr. Sims. She indicated some of the comments might be able to be incorporated into the pre-proposal meeting with the developers. She inquired if the time line for the public input was realistic. She elaborated it only gave the developers one month to obtain commentary from the community.

Attorney Spillias explained if the CRA wants it clear to the developer phasing of the development was being proposed, adding language to page 2 could address this. In the alternative, it could also be addressed at a predevelopment meeting or before site plan approval. Then language would not have to be contained in the document. The proposals, he explained, will go through the staff review process and ultimately through the negotiation process, resulting in a development agreement.

Ms. Horenburger clarified the way she envisioned the issue when she made the motion was that it was more like a Request for Qualifications (RFQ). Tell us who you are, tell us your experience and capabilities, tell us your financial ability to do the project and give us your conceptual plan. Then the staff reviews the credentials and financials and then makes a decision about who is qualified to do the project and which developer they like. The developer then goes into the community and gathers input. They develop a real plan and then it is reviewed. All through the process, the developer is receiving input from the CRA, staff, and the community. Time lines would be given. Ms. Horenburger asked if including any corrections and a statement about obtaining community input would hold up the time line.

Attorney Spillias suggested, in reference to having a conceptual approach in the response to the RFP, changing the language. He thought it would be a tight time frame for a developer to work within. He explained by revising the RFP to include language pertaining to conceptual concepts for development of the corridor, the CRA could then get into the details as the process moved along.

The board discussed the changes they felt were needed as follows:

Attorney Spillias spoke about the notice provisions and indicated it appeared there was a consensus that the CRA does not want to have a selection committee. He pointed out that change takes out the July 28th date in the time line. He announced it would not be possible to get this information to the Post by tomorrow, but everything could be moved back four or five days. Attorney Spillias recommended using June 27th for the Publication Notice date, instead of June 23rd. For the pre-proposal meeting, he recommended using July 6, 2006, instead of June 30. The proposal packages could be due by July 28, 2006 giving staff 11 days to conduct its evaluation. Attorney Spillias announced the evaluation does not need to be held in the Sunshine, because the evaluation is not for the purpose of giving advice on which proposal to accept or be held for elimination purposes. They would only be evaluated from a factual standpoint of whether it meets the basic criteria. Staff can indicate to the board if and where a proposal does not meet requirements, but it would be the board's determination and not a staff decision whether to eliminate the proposal.

Ms. Bright suggested removing the language that a signed written statement that the proposer would agree to their development plan being subject to future policy determinations of the CRA Board, as outlined in the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council Feasibility Study.

Ms. Horenburger disagreed. She clarified the language only indicated the proposer agreed the proposal was subject to the determination of the board based on the Treasure Coast Study. She elaborated it makes them aware the study is out there. She commented developers may not be aware of the study and may only find out about it at the pre-proposal meeting.

Attorney Spillias explained there is ambiguity in the language because it appears that future policy determinations would be based on the study and they may or may not be. Ms. Heavilin suggested using "subject to future policy determined by the CRA Board."

Correction of the project description would read the "project area is the area described as N.E. 10th Avenue east of Seacrest Boulevard block between MLK and N.E. 11th Avenue.

Another change would be "The CRA and the City of Boynton Beach ("City") have acquired more than fifteen properties in the subject area ~~and plans are underway to acquire an additional nine properties~~ "

There was agreement to remove the language regarding the Evaluation Committee.

There was agreement to add language that would address how the developers propose to receive and utilize public input, including a written statement that this provision had been met.

There was agreement the notice provision would need to be changed.

There was agreement that language, as recommended by Mr. Greene regarding a Floribbean theme, and making a general attempt to respond to the theme should be included. There was also agreement the same attention should be given to CDCs and serious information about CDCs and what they do should be brought to the pre-proposal meeting to let the proposers know there are benefits to using a CDC.

Chair Tillman indicated his thoughts were the developers would respond to the issues of the focus groups and since CDCs are major stakeholders, that developers would seek their comments.

Attorney Spillias recommended directing staff, at a minimum, to inform the proposers at the pre-proposal meeting there is a strong interest in how they might seek to involve CDCs.

Motion

Ms. Horenburger moved to approve the RFP as the board has directed the attorney and staff to revise it, and to move forward with the time line set out in the draft RFP, which was June 27 for the Publication Notice of RFP, July 6 pre-proposal meeting, July 28th proposal packages due at 4 p.m. and presentation of all proposals, not only the top two proposals, at the August 8th meeting. Mr. Norem seconded the motion, which unanimously passed.

Motion

Ms. Heavilin moved to adjourn. Mr. Sims seconded the motion that unanimously passed. Meeting adjourned at 7:24 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Catherine Cherry-Guberman
Recording Secretary
062306