## CITY OF CORAL GABLES BUDGET/AUDIT ADVISORY BOARD

Meeting Minutes: Thursday, September 17, 2015

Conference Room First Floor, City Hall, 405 Biltmore Way, Coral Gables, Florida

MEMBERS	0	N	D	J	F	M	Α	M	J	J	Α	S	APPOINTED BY:
	14	14	14	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	
Jose E. Smith	Р	-	-	-	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	-	Р	Р	Mayor Jim Cason
Erin Knight	-	-	-	<u> </u>	-	-	-	-	-	-	Р	Р	Commissioner Jeanette Slesnick
Alex Menendez	E	-	-	-	P	P	Р	Р	Р	-	Р	P	Commissioner Vince Lago
John Holian^	Р	-	-	-	Р	Р	Α	Р	Р	-	Р	Р	Commissioner Frank C. Quesada
Cheryl Goldstein	Р	-	-	-	Р	E	Р	P	P	-	P	P	Commissioner Pat Keon
			1										<del></del>

(Dash indicates no meeting: blank spaceindicate member not yet serving.)

- ^- New Member
- #- Special meeting
- \*\*- Resigned Member

Staff:

Keith Kleiman, Budget Director

Lori St. John, Chief Compliance Officer

Leonard Roberts, Assistant Director of Economic Development

Minutes preparation and Recording Secretary: Nieves Sanchez, Bailey and Sanchez Courtreporting, Inc.

1	CITY OF CORAL GABLES
2	BUDGET/AUDIT ADVISORY BOARD
3	MEETING: THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 2015, 8:00 A.M.
4	FIRST FLOOR, CITY HALL
5	405 BILTMORE WAY, CORAL GABLES, FLORIDA
6	
7	COPY
9	MEMBERS PRESENT:
9	ALEX MENENDEZ, CHAIRMAN CHERYL GOLDSTEIN
1.0	JOHN HOLIAN ERIN KNIGHT
11	JOSE SMITH
12	
13	
14	CITY STAFF PRESENT:
15	KEITH KLEIMAN, BUDGET DIRECTOR
1.6	LORI ST. JOHN, CHIEF COMPLIANCE OFFICER LEONARD ROBERTS, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF
17	ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

## THEREUPON:

Δ

1.3

(The following proceedings were held.)

CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Good morning, everybody So everybody had a chance to take a look at the meeting minutes from the last meeting? Does anybody have my questions about the minutes?

MR. HOLIAN: I just have one question -one comment. Have we been using this the whole
time?

CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: No, that's new.

MR. HOLIAN: This is new, okay.

Well, no problem, because it was just like

-- I don't really read the minutes a whole heck

of a lot. I just glance at them. But that was

pretty amazing. To have it verbatim was a

little spooky.

But I just have one comment. I think, at the end of the meeting, I recommended that Board Members talk to their Commissioners about the audit process. And that was the only thing I saw that -- that was the only thing I looked at, quite frankly.

CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Can we correct the minutes to include that on it? Or can we just make it on the record now, that he -- we'll

1	make it on the record now.
2	MR. HOLIAN: That's fine.
3	CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: I think we are here.
4	Who is missing today? No members are missing,
5	so it should be okay.
ő	All right. Anybody want to make a motion
7	to approve the minutes?
8	MS. GOLDSTEIN: So moved. I will make a
9	motion.
10	CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Okay. I have a motion.
11	Do I have a second?
12	MR. SMITH: Second.
13	CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: All in favor?
14	MR. SMITH: Aye.
15	MS. GOLDSTEIN: Aye.
16	MR. HOLIAN: Aye.
17	MS. KNIGHT: Aye.
18	CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Okay. Great.
19	And now that we have you here, we can talk
20	about the Starbucks lease. I guess it's the
21	second time you're coming back.
22	MR. ROBERTS: Right.
23	So I'm Leonard Roberts, from the Economic
24	Development Department, and the City's also
25	the City's Asset Manager.

Last time I was here, we were in discussions about Starbucks relocating from Ponce and Miracle Mile to Ponce (sic) and Salzedo, in the current Supercuts location.

This Board had some comments in regards to the original deal terms. Those comments included the termination fee -- you guys had comments in reference to a termination fee. In regards to what -- you know, finding Supercuts a place to survive, which we're working with right now. You know, they're working with two brokers.

And also requested, in regards to the six-month abatement, you had requested three months abatement.

And, then, this lease was a ten-year term, with two -- four five-year terms, and you requested that those remaining two options be removed, or at market price.

So we went back to Starbucks, after meeting with the two other Boards, which are the Economic Development Board and Property

Advisory Board, and what they came back to us at, is that -- this Board had no issue with the starting rate, but what they countered back at,

which was at \$45 a square foot -- they came like at a higher price, right, to compensate for that -- I guess, for the additional abatement that you guys requested, the three months versus six months.

The impact of going to \$45 versus \$44 over the first ten-year term is roughly \$20,000.

They increased their termination fee from 70,000 to 100,000. And the options, 1 through 2, they increased the rate, so the City will make an additional \$400,000 over the first -- over the options 1 through 2, for the first ten-year -- the second ten years, which would generate an additional \$400,000 in revenue.

(Simultaneous speaking.)

CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: I'm sorry, you said, they didn't allow the City to go to market rate or are you suggesting a rate?

MR. ROBERTS: No. So the first two options, they would go up, versus -- it was originally, we request -- they had \$60.50, and then \$66. They went to \$69, from 60, and, then, from \$66 to 80, and then options 3 and 4 to market rate.

MS. GOLDSTEIN: Okay. So can I make a --

1 can I question something that you said? 2 MR. ROBERTS: Sure. MS. GOLDSTEIN: You said that this Board 3 4 did not have an issue with the rate, but this 5 Board did have an issue of the starting rate. 6 So I just want to correct you on that. 7 MR. ROBERTS: Okay. So you did have a 8 concern with the starting rate? 9 MS. GOLDSTEIN: Yes, because, if you 10 remember correctly, we knew what -- we knew 1.1 what their current lease was being raised to, 12 or in and thereabouts, correct? 13 MS: KNIGHT: What is that figure? 1.4 MS. GOLDSTEIN: So that space and -- so 15 that space is owned by -- that they're in now, 16 is owned by --17 MR. LEONARD: Terry Hill. 1.8 MS. GOLDSTEIN: Yeah, and they advised them 19 that their rate was going to go up like 20 astronomically. Do you remember what it was? 21 MR. ROBERTS: They didn't give me an exact 22 rate, but I'm projecting it's going to be -- I 23 think it's going to be like -- from my 24 understanding -- they didn't tell me a rate, 25 because, obviously, I would --

1	MS. GOLDSTEIN: We said a rate. I think we
2	said a rate.
3	CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: I think it was said
4	three times as much.
5	MR. ROBERTS: Yeah.
6	CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: But that was just what
7	we thought that's what it was.
8	Yeah, they were hitting them with a three
9	times increase.
10	MR. LEONARD: Yeah. That's what they told
11	me. They didn't give me a rate. They said
12	that the rate has gone up substantially, versus
13	where
14	MS. GOLDSTEIN: And their rate now is?
15	MR. LEONARD: What we're offering is
16	MS. GOLDSTEIN: No. No. The rate in
17	their current space.
18	MR. ROBERTS: Oh, I don't know the rate.
19	CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: A quick question. The
20	base rent per month, that's per month, \$99,000?
21	MR. LEONARD: I'm sorry, that's an error
22	from the last report. I didn't correct it. It
23	was annual.
24	CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Because I was going to
25	say, we're getting the best deal in the world,

1 and I want you guys to know that if we get 1.2 2 million dollars --3 (Simultaneous speaking.) THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry. This is 4 5 where things like that happen. 6 CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: I'm sorry. 7 MS. GOLDSTEIN: I'm sorry. 8 CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Okay, yeah. 9 Base rent per month was, actually, I think, 10 the base rent per year. 1.1 MR. ROBERTS: Yes. That's where it should 12 have been. And the starting rate was \$45 a 13 square foot versus the 44. 14 The impact, over the ten-year period, is 15 roughly \$20,000, an additional 20,000. 16 So you had requested going from six months 17 to three months. The 20,000 doesn't exactly 18 cover it, but the total would have been, let's 19 see, 33 -- I'll tell you right now. Well, it's 20 roughly \$50,000. 21 CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Yeah. I think that 22 came into question, because, I guess, the 23 amount they were putting into spending into 24 leasehold improvements was about a million 25 dollars. We had questioned that, even at \$500

a square foot, how that will help the City versus helping their future business and why they would take any sort of advantage, if they could afford to spend that much on the build-out.

1.0

1.2.

I think that if we did the opt out option, as well -- we wanted like reciprocity off that option. Did that happen?

MR. ROBERTS: Well, what they were willing to do is go from 70 to 100,000. So that covers the annual rent, that originally was for the abatement and for the commission, but now they went up to 100,000, which is roughly a year's rent.

That will give the City more than sufficient time to find some tenant.

MS. KNIGHT: I know that you have a time constraint, and I'm sorry that this is just my second meeting, but what are current market rates on Miracle Mile?

MR. ROBERTS: Per Goldstar, in the CBD, they're roughly \$40 a square foot. On Miracle Mile, rent, per Goldstar, 42 and change.

Now, the actual market asking rates on the Mile are about \$60 a square foot, and so those

1 rates are based upon a flat rate, doesn't include a work letter, doesn't include a 2 3 leasing commission, necessarily. 4 So, for instance, if they were to lease to 5 another tenant -- to a new landlord, the 6 landlord may give them a working letter for an 7 additional CI allowance. 8 This, we're giving the space as is. 9 not touching it. We are not doing any, you 10 know, work towards it. What we're doing in 11 consideration of that is giving them an 12 abatement. 13 MS. GOLDSTEIN: I think we were all excited 14 and encouraged about the lease and the move, 15 but we wanted to make sure the City was getting 16 as much for it for possible, versus excited to 17 put someone there and not go for more. 1.8 MS. KNIGHT: Year 6 to 10, what is the 19 rate? 20 MR. ROBERTS: Year 6 to 10 is 49.50. 21 CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: One last question. 22 other two Boards that you took the deal across, 23 were there comments? 24 MR. ROBERTS: The Property Advisory Board 25 approved the deal yesterday. It hasn't gone to

the Economic Development Board.

CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Okay. And the first time around, they went to the Economic Development Board?

1.0

1.5

MR. ROBERTS: Yes. The first time around, it went to all three boards.

CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: They had comments?

MR. ROBERTS: Yes. The Property Advisory
had the most comments. I mean, they're
primarily realtors.

And most of the terms that we reviewed, I mean, there's a lot of changes they requested, but they felt that this was a pretty good deal, versus where we were. The big thing for them is a market rate, to go to market. They would like to have gone to market a little earlier in the option period, but they felt very comfortable with it, because it's a long-standing tenant, and the end of that Mile is not as active as the Ponce side. So they felt as though the off-set, by bringing an additional business, having Haagan Dazs, having Starbucks on that side, will help to activate that area. So they felt pretty comfortable with it.

1	MS. GOLDSTEIN: And where are we in
2	where is Supercuts in
3	MR. ROBERTS: Finding a different space?
4	MS. GOLDSTEIN: Right. Yeah.
5	MR. ROBERTS: The broker that I know that's
6	working with them has showed them space, but
7	I'm not sure, exactly, if they've signed a deal
8	or not. They're not obligated to tell me if
9	they have.
10	MS. GOLDSTEIN: Okay.
11	MR. HOLIAN: Just to be clear, we did go to
12	market rate in the renewals?
13	MR. ROBERTS: Yes.
14	MR. HOLIAN: Okay. And the base starting
15	rate that you were concerned about, we brought
16	that up?
17	MS. GOLDSTEIN: Yes.
18	MR. ROBERTS: From 44 to 45.
19	MR. HOLIAN: Okay. And the termination of
20	the lease, you're saying, since they're going
21	to 100 grand from 70 or whatever, then that's
22	our other concern?
23	CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Yeah. Giving us a full
24	year to find a new tenant, in case they were to
25	walk off.

1.	MR. HOLIAN: All right. Okay.
2	MS. KNIGHT: And where is Haagan-Dazs
3	going?
4	MR. ROBERTS: They're currently there.
5	They relocated one store over.
6	CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Supercuts is the one
7	that needs to get relocated. They're in the
8	current space.
9	MS. GOLDSTEIN: It's at the corner
10	MS. KNIGHT. Right. I know, but I have a
11	picture I must have missed it.
1.2	MS. GOLDSTEIN: It recently went in.
13	Didn't they go in like last year?
14	MR. ROBERTS: They went in, actually, in
15	July of this year. So they've been there for a
16	couple of months.
17	MS. GOLDSTEIN: It's not like it's been
18	there forever.
19	MR. HOLIAN: Didn't we have a Haagan-Dazs
20	across the street that closed a few years ago?
21	MS. GOLDSTEIN: Coldstone.
22	MR. ROBERTS: Yeah. I think there was a
23	Hagan Daz in the Village of Merrick Park, when
24	they first opened.
25	MR. HOLIAN: Okay.

So if anyone doesn't 1 CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: 2 have any other questions, I appreciate you 3 coming back and taking a look at our concerns 4 and addressing them. 5 Anybody else have any questions? 6 Do we need to go through those three 7 questions, again? Well, you guys answered them 8 MR. ROBERTS: 9 with a motion, but if you'd like, I can repeat 10 them, just to kind of confirm what you guys 11 want. 12 CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Yeah, that would be 13 good. 1.4 MR. ROBERTS: Sure. 15 Okay. So part of the Procurement Code, 16 there are three questions that this Board had 1.7 to answer. Is the lease consistent with the 1.8

property appraisal as required under Section 2-2014?

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

That section says, whenever the City purchases or sells or is involved in a lease of real estate, and the fee simply value of the property being sold or the annual value of the property being leased is in excess of 250,000, the City shall, prior to consummating the

purchase, sale or lease have the property appraised by two real estate appraisers holding an AMI designation in order to determine the estimated market value.

G

1.6

This wasn't over or in excess of \$250,000, so the Board responded, the annual value of the lease is less than 250,000, so no appraisal is required.

What is the immediate impact on the current fiscal budget and the long-term effect of future budgets, the long-term overall effect in the City?

And the long-term effect is that the City will have ten years of rent as a result of this agreement. The proposed rent rate is an increase over the previous tenant's rate.

Consider the City's Mission Statement, are there other alternatives other than entering into a proposed transaction?

This Board responded, and these are responses that I had suggested, so the response was, this transaction is appropriate, as this is lease space that will generate income for the City, a property chain that's an establish business in Miracle Mile and direct pedestrian

1	traffic closer to the 300 Block of Miracle
2	Mile.
3	CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Okay.
4	MR. ROBERTS: Are you also in agreement
5	with those responses?
6	CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: I am.
7	MR. HOLIAN: I am.
8	MR. LEONARD: Okay. Will you guys move to
9	pass this deal?
10	CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: I would make a motion
11	to move for passing the deal as is.
12	MR. HOLIAN: Second.
13	CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: All in favor?
14	MR. SMITH: Aye.
15	MS. KNIGHT: Aye.
16	MS. GOLDSTEIN: Aye.
17	MR. ROBERTS: Okay. Thank you very much
18	for your time.
19	CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Thanks a lot.
20	MS. KNIGHT: You are on schedule.
21	CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: All right. So next up
22	is Lori. Lori is going to be doing a
23	Historical Research Department Audit.
24	Then we've got a budget update.
25	And I do have to be out of here by 8:45.

1	I've got about 30 minutes left. So I don't
2	know how long your is or how long the budget
3	update is, but
4	MR. KLEIMAN: Budget update is very short.
5	CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Just everybody keep it
6	in mind.
7	MR. KLEIMAN: Absolutely. I can be done in
8	five minutes.
9	MS. ST. JOHN: Yeah, this will take at
10	least half an hour.
11	MS. GOLDSTEIN: A half an hour?
12	MS. ST. JOHN: Well, I don't know
13	MS. GOLDSTEIN: You have to assume that
14	we've all read it.
15	MS. ST. JOHN: Okay. If you really all
16	read it.
17	MS. GOLDSTEIN: I did read it. I don't
18	think we need a half an hour.
19	MS. ST. JOHN: Okay. I'll keep it short.
20	MS. GOLDSTEIN: That's my opinion.
21	MS. ST. JOHN: I'll keep it short. If you
22	want more detail, then
23	CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Yeah, that will be
24	good, if we went through like all of the
25	highlights, and then we can be

1 MS. ST. JOHN: I mean, I -- yeah, that's 2 what I'll do. 3 (Simultaneous speaking.) 4 MS. GOLDSTEIN: And there was plenty in it, 5 and it's not to take away from --MS. ST. JOHN: Yeah. No, I just want to 6 7 make sure that everyone's read it. So the Internal Audit Division reviewed the 8 9 operations of the Historic Resources 10 Department. The purpose, scope and methodology is outlined in the report. 1.1 12 For the purpose of presentation, as you 13 know, through the report, the Department is 14 divided into the two divisions, the Historic 15 Preservation Division, and the Museum Division. 16 They have various boards that comprise both 17 divisions. The Museum Division oversees the 18 Merrick House Governing Board and their trust 19 under that. 20 For your purposes, and I'm sure you already 21 know, there are 22 locally designated Historic 22 Districts in the City of Coral Gables. 23 There are several findings related to this 24 review, of which the first finding had to do 25 with the Coral Gables Museum and the

contractual relationship with the City of Coral Gables.

In that contract, there was a provision that we either provide a Staff member or compensation for agreed-upon services. As you can well imagine, the Staff member that we do provide in the museum has very little oversight, because they're -- the person in Historical Resources is not really there to evaluate them, keep track of their time, and what have you. So there really is very little oversight in that regard.

We recommended that they either amend the agreement to either provide for compensation, instead of oversight, or otherwise to manage it, and, you know, have oversight of the receptionist and her hours. That pertains to Finding Number 1.

Number 2, we looked at the other compliance areas with regard to the contractual relationship we have with the museum, and one of the things that came to my attention was that there really was no certainty or knowledge with regard to who actually was keeping track of the contract and the provisions, as it

pertained to the collection of monies, as it pertained to various things within the organization.

1.2

1.3

The auditor's review of the contract revealed a couple of different monetary consequences, of which, really, didn't impact this particular audit.

The concern here that I had in going back in time, and some of you were here, some of you were not, was, the contract management system several years was evaluated and Internal Audit had realized that there was a major deficiency in the area of contract management for compliance and proper controls over managing contractual agreements.

This actually stood out as just one of the many, where there really was not just one person that was handling it, nor did anyone really know who was handling the agreement.

so the auditor had identified, some time ago, the City's failure to delegate the management of a contract, after its execution, and as noted in the recommendation of when, actually, Leonard came on board, he evaluated some of the revenue generating contracts, and

brought in about \$450,000, because people had 1 2 failed previously to follow through with either 3 updates of the collections of monies, even 4 insurance compliance areas. 5 So we recommend that the contract be 6 continually monitored by Economic and Cultural, 7 and that all of the contracts in the City 8 really be assigned to one person for management 9 over its compliance issues. 10 CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Lori, real quick, and 11 in a real simple way, is this, they weren't 12 collecting on the rent or they weren't 13 collecting on -- what part of the contract 1.4 weren't they collecting on? 15 (Simultaneous speaking.) 16 MS. ST. JOHN: There's utility bills that 17 are paid for by them. So that was one area. 1.8 And, then -- and not specifically for this 19 collection of revenues, but that's just one 20 area. It's a small area. 21 CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: When you say, "Them," 22 you mean, the Coral Gables Museum? 23 MS. ST. JOHN: Yes. 24 CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: They were paying for 25 the electrical?

1 MS. ST. JOHN: Yeah -- we --2 (Simultaneous speaking:) 3 CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: We were and we weren't 4 reimbursed? 5 MS. ST. JOHN: Right. Exactly. 6 CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Okay, So we weren't 7 getting reimbursed for certain -- for costs? 8 MS. ST. JOHN: Yes, and that's on the next 9 finding. 10 CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Okay. 1.1 MS. ST. JOHN: So just to go right directly 12 to what he's saying, on Finding Number 3, 13 according to the contractual relationship, we 14 get reimbursed 25 percent of the utility bills. 15 For whatever reason, it's more efficient. 16 Our Public Works Department failed to bill 17 every two months for a period from February 2011 to 2014, in August. We requested all of 18 19 the billings and matched them. 20 In reviewing the billing process, we found 21 that there was a huge delay in the request for 22 receipts. There was a \$4,136 reimbursement 23 from October of 2010 to May 2011, and, again, 24 there was an obligation that was paid later in 25 the year, with a subsequent billing, and in

reviewing some of the obligations, it was found that there was an overpayment of 2,374 by the Coral Gables Museum for the period 2010, October, through February of 2011.

Secondarily -- I don't know if we really need to go into the rest of it. You already read it. It just has to do with utility billings.

We move forward to the timings. Things were being billed a little bit late, so we might have cash receipts, you know, being received in August, you know, several months after the due date, which, according to the contract, is 15 days after receipt of the bill.

Obviously, the recommendation is to reimburse Coral Gables 2,374.

Finding Number 4, and moving forward, we reviewed the organizational chart of the department, and in doing so, we looked at the Merrick House as being governed by the Board, and, obviously, the Board is appointed by the Commission and the City Manager.

There are seven members of the Board, and pursuant to the Resolution, the board has established, you know, written Collection

Management Policies, a creation inventory -inventory and collection records and
acquisition of the assessing policy.

1.6

This is consistent with the Strategic

Management's Mission Statement. Some of their

things include, in their action plan, and I'm

going to take you down to the issue here,

there's an increase in the number of docents.

Part of the finding has to do with the managing of the docents, and, at this point in time, we have three active docents and it's been that way for the past several years.

Upon a citizen complaint that the Merrick
House was not open on many Wednesdays and
Sundays, and they -- you know, apparently the
citizen saw people peeking through the windows
and what have you, I did do an evaluation to
find out, you know, if, in fact, it was closed,
how many docents were there, do we need more
docents and what have you.

Part of this was, who is administering the affairs of the House, and because the Resolution only has the word, administer, it's vague and vast, and so there was a little bit of confusion between the Historical Resources

Director and the Board as to what really that meant.

So, in this particular regard, to jump to the recommendation, you know, we recommend that the Resolution be more clearly defined, as it pertains to the roles and authority of the Governing Board, to achieve the goals of management.

Also, we also recommended that they retain and train docents so that the Merrick House is available to the residents on a more routine basis.

And moving to Finding Number 5, I evaluated, by visual inspection, the Merrick House, which was quite, frankly -- and when you walk inside the house, there are certain parts of it that are quite deteriorated and in need of great repair.

As we know, it's in the Capital Improvements Budget.

At this point, I looked at a report that was done, entitled, Property Conditions

Assessment Report. They estimated the improvements would be 819,000. The 918,000 that you see right after that includes a 10

1 percent fee for architect fees, and this is 2 consistent with the amount of money that's 3 being set aside for capital improvements for the Merrick House 4 5 I won't go into the physical description of the building, because it's actually very well 6 7 laid out, I think, for you. If there's any 8 questions, you can ask. 9 It's my understanding that they are going 10 to be moving forward with that. 11 MS. GOLDSTEIN: We did go through that 12 extensively in the Capital Plan, when you weren't here. 13 14 MS. ST. JOHN: Oh, when I was gone, yeah. 1.5 CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: And it shows on 16 Collections Management -- is there a fee to go 17 into the Merrick House? I thought it was free. 18 MS. ST. JOHN: It is free. 19 CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Okay: 20 MR. HOLIAN: It's a million dollars to go 21 into the Merrick House. 22 CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Because John had 23 brought it up meetings ago, is like we should 24 make it something that's a revenue generating 25 thing, make it more of an attraction, have

people go -- but then I saw something here, that there's no written Collections Management Policy.

Is there a donation or --

1.5

MS. ST. JOHN: Yeah. The recommendation is to actually -- yeah, there are donations -- is to actually adopt the revised collection policy, because it's kind of sitting out there, but nothing has formally been done with that.

CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Okay.

MS. ST. JOHN: So that's the recommendation there.

Let's move to Finding Number 6. Again, with the Merrick House, the grounds were actually in need of routine maintenance, similar to other things that Internal Audit found while reviewing the operational activities of the City. There's a lot of times there's a failure of communication between departments and/or Staff.

In this regard, Historical Resources thought that Public Works was doing it, and Public Works thought Historical Resources were doing it. They were kind of going back and forth.

So I think we have clarified that, at this point, and Historical Resources is going to work a little bit more closely with Public Services, to make sure, you know, we have improved maintenance on the grounds at the Merrick House.

Next, I look at the inventory system, in order to ascertain whether documenting valuable and sometimes irreplaceable property -- a visual inspection actually revealed a couple of folders, in a closed closet, on the bottom floor, and I tested some of those items.

Two of the three items were not where they were supposed to be. One, we couldn't find at all. The employee thought that it was either stolen in 1980, when we had a theft at that time, or maybe it was in the garage, in the back. There was really no monitoring, with regard the specific items in the Merrick House, especially, on the top floor, in the back, there's antiques, some dating in the 1800s, on an open book shelf, in the study, that the interview that I had with the Director revealed that the books had not been inventoried.

MS. GOLDSTEIN: I'm sorry, Lori, to

1 interrupt. 2 Keith, isn't the inventorying of all of 3 this, that was also in the plan of everything 4 in the --5 MR. KLEIMAN: Yes. That's why the budget 6 is so high to renovate. MS. GOLDSTEIN: Right. 8 MR. KLEIMAN: Because everything is going 9 to be inventoried. Everything is going to be 1.0 -- there are special people who come in, who 11 know how to inventory historical artifacts, and 12 they will be taken out and stored. 1.3 MS. GOLDSTEIN: And that's in the --14 MR. KLEIMAN: Yes, that's in the budget. 15 MS. GOLDSTEIN: That was approved? 16 MR. KLEIMAN: That's part of it, yeah. 17 MS. ST. JOHN: Perfect. Thank you. 18 Obviously, we recommended updating the 19 inventory to reflect the property over at the 20 Merrick House, and mostly in consideration that 21 it's going to be renovated. We want to make 22 sure we do that before the renovations. 23 Moving on to Number 8, again, talking about 24 effectiveness of communications, there was a 25 little problem that I identified with regard to

the permit processing. There was some frustration between some of the parties, and it was identified that there was a lack of communication between Historical Resources, Public Works and Development Services.

This actually caused some of the delays.

Things had to go back to Historical Resources,

because they weren't considered in the first

place, and so, after identifying that, we kind

of educated all parties with regard to what it

took to, you know, be on the same page.

We recommended that the Historical
Resources Department review its policies and
procedures, so that we can have more efficiency
of operations regarding the permit process of
historic properties, and Public Works really
needed to communicate more effectively with
Historical Resources, when it came to
identifying historic significant properties,
and making sure that the department was
included in decision-making processes.

Number 9, we interviewed Staff Members of the City, regarding the nature of Historical Resources, and we found -- and with regard to the -- specifically, public request, and how

the public felt about the department, and we found that there was a greater degree of communications that would enhance public relations regarding the essence and the role of the department, and particularly as it pertained to its business processes and how important it was to protect the integrity of the City Beautiful.

1.3

So we have recommended an increase in the form and level of historic information, that provides the City and its residents information via the website, social media or other promotional activities, and providing such information would assist the public in that endeavor, and it'd also serve the needs of both, the City and the public.

Again, moving on to 10, I had an opportunity to interview the archivist in the department; doing so, in order to find out how we were moving forward with an inventory control, because she had joined, on a part-time basis, some time ago. She's now a full-time employee.

But I was brought to a large room now, that's full of archives. She's now documenting

all of that. But in my conversation with her,

I got the sense and verified that she really

didn't have an idea with regard to centralizing

all of the City's historic assets.

1.1

1.2

In other words, she had no idea that there were two boxes of index cards at the Merrick House, nor was she aware of potential historic photographs at the Venetian Pool. And, again, later in the finding, you'll see that she didn't have any knowledge with regard to historic property that would be at the Biltmore Hotel.

In addition, in moving the information to a database, it was important to verify best practices. So I checked with the National Park Service Archives Processing Manual. These are the guidelines used by South Florida Collections Management Center, and I chatted with them with regard to the best way to use data collection, and there's certain, quote, trends for requirements that are outlined by the NARA, and those requirements, you can't just transfer data, on your own, without following certain requirements for retention.

And she wasn't aware of those requirements.

So I brought that to her attention. And then I also brought in the City Clerk and our Retention Specialist to meet up in the same area, to find out whether we had protection of the actual archives.

At that point, we noticed the sprinkler system was up there, and that was a question that I posed to the Director, and she realized it was a problem, but it was Code related. So that was important to evaluate, with regard to preserving and protecting the assets for the City of Coral Gables.

MS. GOLDSTEIN: Lori, let's move on. This is something more non-financial.

MS. ST. JOHN: Okay. All right. This is the last one, and this is important. Finding Number 10, as it pertains to the preservation of assets, I found that, also, at one point, she was not aware of the assets over at the Country Club.

Internal Audit had provided an non-audit service, in consolidating all of the inventory over at the Country Club, for purposes of identifying what we owned.

At that point, because no one followed

1.0

1.7

through with that, some of the assets were missing, when the developer left, and we could -- we couldn't identify what those were, because no one followed through with the control of the assets that we owned.

The lack of control and the custody of the location resulted in the fact that several pieces of art were missing, and we didn't know exactly what those were, because they weren't tracked to begin with.

This brings into mind the Biltmore Hotel audit of 2010. It's very important that we follow-up on this, because the provisions in the audit, while the negotiations between the City and the Biltmore Hotel resulted in the financial settlement, it did not stop the enforcement of the rest of the provisions.

The rest of the provisions are very important, with regard to the property and equipment and identifying historic property and equipment, which we gave to the hotel a long time ago, at the very beginning, and it was outlined in Scheduled C of the agreement between the City and the Hotel -- I mean, pardon me, Schedule G.

No one's been able to find that. I checked with the City Clerk. I checked with the entire -- the City Attorney's Office, and Schedule G is kind of missing. Schedule G identifies all of the historic property that is current at the Biltmore Hotel.

There was also a dispute between the Biltmore Hotel and the City of Coral Gables, and in consultation with outside counsel, he agreed with me, that the interpretation of the lease meant that we, the City of Coral Gables, own the property and equipment and all of the assets over at the Biltmore Hotel.

So it's really important, and I'm encouraging the City to follow through with what is at the Biltmore Hotel, specifically what is historic property, so that we can identify it and keep track of it, so we don't have any problems in the future.

I think that's about it. I'll conclude -CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: And that last concern
that you had, that's something the Historical
Department has taken over?

MS. ST. JOHN: Well, our attorney and outside attorney has recommended that we follow

through with that. I've made a recommendation that the City follow through with that.

I think that that might take the cooperation between Historical Resources and potentially the City Attorney, because it was a contentious agreement. They believed that they owned the property, and we believe that, no, that we own the property.

So I'm not sure whether they'll be able to accomplish that on their own, but, certainly, I'm sure that they would try. If not, then the City Attorney would intervene and assist in that process.

Any questions?

MS. GOLDSTEIN: No. Other than, I just noted that everyone was in agreement with all of your recommendations, and that it was added to do an audio tour of the Merrick House, which I thought was a good idea and kind of takes the pressure off the docent thing.

MS. ST. JOHN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: One person didn't sign, right? I remember that from the electronic -- MS. ST. JOHN: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Craig Leen didn't or --

1 MS. ST. JOHN: No, Craig Leen did. The 2 Clerk --3 CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: The City Clerk. 4 MS. ST. JOHN: Yeah. And I asked him, 5 because everyone always signs. It's the first 6 time, in my seven plus years, that someone 7 didn't sign. And he felt that he didn't want 8 to sign. He didn't agree or disagree. He just 9 didn't feel --10 CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: He was neutral. There 11 was no option for --12 MS. ST. JOHN: Yeah, he just didn't feel 13 like he needed to sign. I can't force someone 14 to sign, but, you know, that was the 15 decision --10 MR. KLEIMAN: We are budgeting money for a 17 docent for FY 16. We are budgeting money, in 18 Historical Resources, for docent services at 19 Merrick House in FY 16. 20 MS. ST. JOHN: That's great. 21 MR. KLEIMAN: That was a request that was 22 done --23 CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Those docents are 24 volunteers, so I guess -- it's volunteers --25 MR. KLEIMAN: Well, I think it's to keep

n	the bouge open more because wight now the
1	the house open more, because right now the
2	house is closed too many
3	CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: So we might have some
4	paid docents in the future?
5	MR. KLEIMAN: Yes, exactly.
6	MR. HOLIAN: I have a question on that. Is
7	there a new plan to manage the house, because
8	when you read all of this, and we're spending a
9	million dollars to repair the house and get it
10	up to speed, is there an adopted
1.1	MR. KLEIMAN: It's a great question, and I
12	don't have the answer to that. I can find out
13	for you.
14	MR. HOLTAN: Unless if they had an updated
15	plan, because if we're going to dump a million
16	bucks in there
17	CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Next year, it will go
18	downhill
19	MR. HOLIAN: Yeah. Yeah. Right.
20	(Simultaneous speaking.)
21	CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: I know, yeah.
22	So we appreciate it.
23	MR. KLEIMAN: That's, actually, an
24	excellent question.
25	CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Thank you very much,

1	Lori.
2	MS. GOLDSTEIN: And it's not really a
3	million, because you have to take off the
4	inventorying, a couple of hundred thousand.
5	MR. KLEIMAN: Well, we actually budgeted
6	1.2 million for the project.
7	MS. GOLDSTEIN: In total?
8	MR. KLEIMAN: In total, yes.
9	MS. GOLDSTEIN: Right, but the actual
10	physical
11	MR. KLEIMAN: It's going to be very
12	expensive to do the inventorying. I forget the
13	dollar amount, but it's very expensive.
14	MS. GOLDSTEIN: Right. So it's not
15	right, a couple of hundred thousands, if I
16	remember correctly.
17	CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: It sounds like they
18	pilferaged the whole thing. There won't be
19	anything to inventory.
20	MS. GOLDSTEIN: So it wasn't like a million
21	going into the actual construction.
22	You don't have to write all of the details.
23	CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Okay. So next item
24	would be an update by Keith on the budget.
25	MR. KLEIMAN: Okay. I know we're short on

1 It's going to be short and sweet. time. There's not many changes at all. 3 I'm just going to hand out the -- this was 4 the change sheet that we brought you up-to-date 5 for the first budget hearing. I highlighted 6 The top part is the revenue, where the revenue came from. The bottom part is what 7 8 it's going toward. 9 It's basically three projects. There's the 10 Garage 2 and 6 renovations, and roof fencing, 11 the 1.5 million dollars; and Channel Markers, and that's 50,000. The funding is on the top. 12 13 So those are the only changes you will see 1.4 in the Capital Improvement Plan, which we went 15 over with this Board when we had the Workshop for the City Commission. I think it was in 16 17 May. 18 MS. GOLDSTEIN: So they took it out of the 19 Capital Plan and put it on the Operating 20 Budget? 21 MR. KLEIMAN: No. No. No. No. This 22 basically is the entire City's budget. 23 basically -- we went -- this was the changes 24 from the July 1 budget to the --25 MS. GOLDSTEIN: I'm talking about like the

1	parking fund, specifically.
2	MR. KLEIMAN: Right.
3	CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Was it re-classified or
4	was it
5	MR. KLEIMAN: It comes out of reserves, and
6	the parking fund reserve goes it gets
7	appropriated
8	MS. GOLDSTEIN: Into the budget.
9	MR. KLEIMAN: into the budget.
10	MS. GOLDSTEIN: Okay.
11	MR. KLEIMAN: Whether it's operating or
12	capital.
13	CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Because there's going
14	to be some this year.
15	MR. KLEIMAN: So those are going to be
16	done. Okay.
17	CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: And the fence is for
18	the kids that were climbing up to the roof?
19	MR. KLEIMAN: No. Well, that's part of it.
20	That's so they can't go around the edge of the
21	roof, but on the very top, there's now put
22	gates on those open windows that were there.
23	CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Okay.
24	MR. KLEIMAN: This gates everything in
25	there. And, plus, now there's a rolling gate,

that closes off the roof, when the roof is not 1 2 needed for parking. 3 CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Okay. 4 MR. KLEIMAN: We're going full board on 5 that. 6 Okay. Now, that was just the changes for the Capital Improvement Plan. The new book is 8 going to be online very soon. We printed a 9 draft for Cathy yesterday. We're going to send this Board, each, a copy of this, okay. 1.0 11 And if you just turn, very quickly, to the 12 presentation that was part of your packet, I'm 1.3 just going to go through the changes, and 14 they're really minuscule between the first 1.5 hearing and second hearing. It will be done within a minute. 16 17 Please turn to Slide 2, and you're going to 18 see, this is just a -- it was a minor 19 re-balancing of two of the funds, because we 20 had some minor personnel changes. So the 21 revenue budget, basically, it just got 22 decreased by forty dollars. It's simple. It's 23 sort of just rounding.

CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: How much did it cost us to change that?

24

25

MR. KLEIMAN: It probably cost more to do it. But, unfortunately, you know, we have to balance to the penny -- or the dollars, I should say.

Okay. The second page, you're going to see, on the expense side, again, it's still next to a change of forty dollars, but as part of the ongoing negotiations with Teamsters, the City is offering, and it's been approved by Teamsters, a health care supplement. So that's \$348,000 that came out of contingency.

We had money in contingency just for the Collective Bargaining. So it's not going to keep us short of contingency for the next year.

We have minor salary changes of almost \$35,000. We budgeted 29,000 extra for a Medical Director for the Fire Department, because we were going out to RFP. The RFP came through. The choice that was made is the same -- the one we had last year, at the same price, so we took back the 29,000.

Item Number 4, \$28,000 for a full page .

advertising. Commissioner Slesnick suggested this at the first hearing. She wanted this in there. So we're budgeting that. It's coming

1 out of contingency, basically, but it's basically that 29,000, we're netting it. 3 Item 5 is just re-balancing contingency, 4 and then 6, 7 and 8 are just re-balancing the 5 funds due to the personnel changes. And that really is -- I can go through 6 7 anything, if anybody wants. It's the same 8 presentation we went through for the Workshop. 9 If there are questions, please just ask. 10 CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: And the health care 11 supplements, the excluded employees, that's a 12 one time, one year supplement to --13 MR. KLEIMAN: No. That's for the --14 generally, the Teamsters and the excluded. 15. Basically the excluded get whatever the 16 Teamsters negotiate, just by default, and, no, 17 what -- now, what the City Commission did, we 18 based the supplement on 50 percent of the 19 family cost to the health insurance, but it's 20 going to be a flat amount. 21 The reason, this year we created it. 22 based on 50 percent. Next year, if the prices 23 go up, it's still the same amount that we're 24 going to give them. 25 CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Okay.

MR. KLEIMAN: Unless it's negotiated
differently in another contract.
CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Okay.
MR. KLEIMAN: But the Teamster's contract,
I believe, is going to be three years, so that
will pretty much be set for three years.
Okay. Any other questions?
And if you do, please feel free to just
e-mail Diana or myself, and we can get the
questions to everybody.
CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Okay. There's no other
issues? Any questions?
Go ahead.
MS. GOLDSTEIN: Yeah, I do.
This is off you don't need to write
this.
CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Should we end the
meeting?
MR. HOLIAN: I don't think you're allowed
to do that.
MS. GOLDSTEIN: You can't?
MR. HOLIAN: I don't think so.
MS. GOLDSTEIN: Okay. Then you can end the
meeting, and then I can

1 MS. KNIGHT: I know you have to go, so I'm 2 torn. 3 CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: No. No. I'm good. Ι 4 have ten more minutes. 5 MS. KNIGHT: Okay. This isn't that 6 relevant, but going back to this report, Finding 9, okay, "During the course of the 8 audit, the auditor interviewed several staff 9 members in the City and received information 1.0 regarding request from the public related to 11 the Historical Resources Department." 12 In the summary, we found a greater deal of 1.3 communication needs to be --1.4 CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: What page are you on? 15 MS. KNIGHT: Page 13. 16 MS. KNIGHT: And then we go into, then, the 17 recommendation. I'm curious as to, does this 18 recommendation happen? Is it just out there? 19 What is the follow-up? 20 I'm just trying to understand this process 21 of the audit, in general. 22 MS. ST. JOHN: You know, that's an 23 excellent question. We have a status of 24 recommendations. It used to be every three 25 months. Now, with the reduced Staff in

Internal Audit, they dropped it to every six months and a year.

1.3

The status of recommendations takes all of the outstanding issues and we follow-up on all of the outstanding issue. Typically what happens is, the City Manager's Office holds the Directors accountable to implement all of the recommendations, accordingly, and then we follow-up, not by audit procedures, but ensuring that -- the Directors' answer as to what actions they have put in place to respond to the recommendations.

MS. KNIGHT: Okay. So in this case, you are sitting with them and just asking Staff, how is it going, when people are looking to find out information about historic properties, and the Staff is telling you, the public seemed frustrated, I get the same call all of the time?

MS. ST. JOHN: Yes. I interview a lot of people in the City, Staff Members, and I've gotten information that comes, and I don't identify people, just people automatically will talk, when I ask them questions, to identify what the issues are.

And some of those issues came back, that 1 2 there was a lot of frustration with the 3 Historical Resources Department, but I think 4 it's the fact that they just weren't really 5 communicating as much as they should, and if 6 they communicated better, and the citizens understood why this had to be done and were 8 more visible, then it would benefit the City in 9 a better fashion. 1.0 MS. KNIGHT: Okay. I just picked that one, 11. not that I have any great concern with Finding 12 9, but I was trying to follow-up 13 CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Just to know what 14 happens with the recommendations. 15 MS. ST. JOHN: Yeah. You know, for the 16 Staff, that's an excellent question. 17 MR. HOLIAN: It's to get a spreadsheet. 18 shows the date, this is what they're 19 recommending, and this is the status. 20 MS. ST. JOHN: Yes, and it shows the dates 21 that we asked for it to be done, the dates they 22 replied. You know, sometimes it takes six 23 months. Sometimes it takes a year. We don't 24 have control over that. 25 MS. KNIGHT: Okay.

1 MR. HOLIAN: Years ago there was no 2 follow-up. There were a lot of 3 recommendations, but no follow-up. 4 (Simultaneous speaking.) 5 CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Like P-cards, like, you know, expensive cards, cards that we would see 6 7 them before, and it would show the status and it would show recommendation and it would show 8 9 approved. 10 MS. ST. JOHN: Right. And payroll. 11 know, there was a lot of problems in payroll 12 previously, that we had overpaid and underpaid 13 employees, and then we had -- those that were 14 underpaid or overpaid, had a schedule of 1.5 repayment. So we followed up, to make sure 16 that that was done. 17 MS. KNIGHT: That was my question. Thank you. 18 MS. GOLDSTEIN: I'll ask my question on the 19 record. 20 Based upon the appointment of Hudak to 21 Chief, how do we feel that will impact head count of the Police Department and the plan on 22 23 a go forward basis? 24 MR. KLEIMAN: Well, I think now that they 25 actually have an Official Chief -- first of

all, it's going to help him operationally, because when you're interim and someone else is vying for interim, I mean, there was obviously some drama going on.

1.2

1.5

Now that the decision has been made, everybody has to follow him. There's no separate factions. They have to follow him.

And, plus, we have the Public Works -- the Public Safety Director, and he is going to make sure that things are going the way that Cathy wants them.

I mean, Chief Hudak is -- I mean, he's very operational oriented. I mean, he's really -- he's going to be terrific. He did have a tough go this last year, because of the separation -- the factions that were going on.

And now that there's one, it should be very successful.

MS. GOLDSTEIN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: And to that point, I wasn't -- leaving the politics behind, just when I would read about it in the paper and stuff, it would say that they were like creating new positions in order to split the Chiefs and stuff and like that, and I would

look at that and say, "We didn't see anything about that in the Budget Board Meetings, and we weren't even brought -- you know, brought up to date with that."

Would that have been, hypothetically speaking, something we would have seen after the fact?

MR. KLEIMAN: First of all, honestly, and this is on the record, I didn't know anything about.

CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Okay.

1.5

MR. KLEIMAN: But, however, the only thing I do know, because Cathy did tell me, it was staying within the budgeted head count of the City. So it was actually going to re-classify some positions, in order to fund it all. So there would have been --

CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: It would have been two different departments, from what I understand. It was like from Finance -- they were going to move the monies from Finance, from a position that was open there, and close the position, or some other department, and then not open it --

MR. KLEIMAN: I'm not sure. See, I have never heard that.

1	CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Yeah. So I was only
2	curious, when I read that. I go, oh
3	MR. KLEIMAN: That is absolutely news to
4	me.
5	CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: I could be confused,
6	but it was definitely closing one position from
7	one department, that had nothing to do with
8	Police and Fire, to open up a new space. So
9	that's why I asked.
10	MR. KLEIMAN: Okay.
11	You know, we have to be very transparent
12	with the budget. So anything that's you
13	know, there's nothing non-transparent when we
14	present it to the Board and the Commission.
15	CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: All right. Great.
16	Thank you very much.
17	MS. KNIGHT: I think we made this the 29th.
18	MR. HOLIAN: Yes, that date is that the
19	right date? I thought it was a Thursday.
20	Wasn't it supposed to be Thursdays?
21	CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: You wanted it on a
22	Thursday.
23	MR. KLEIMAN: I think we changed it to
24	Thursdays.
25	MS. GOLDSTEIN: Once a month it's on a

1	Thursday. Not every meeting.
2	MS. KNIGHT: I see.
3	MS. GOLDSTEIN: I thought you had one
4	MS. KNIGHT: No. I have a standing problem
5	on Wednesdays and I thought it was okay for you
6	to move it once a month, but okay.
7	MS. GOLDSTEIN: Yeah, it is okay once a
8	month.
9	MS. KNIGHT: We only meet once a month.
10	MS. GOLDSTEIN: Once a month. So, yes.
11	CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: So right now it's
12	scheduled for Wednesday, October 28th. I had
13	the 29th in my calendar.
14	MR. KLEIMAN: Right. The 29th. I think
15	this is a mistake.
16	MS. GOLDSTEIN: Sorry. Sorry.
17	CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: So let's just make sure
18	that that's okay, and it goes on the Agenda, it
19	will be the 29th.
20	MR. KLEIMAN: Yeah, if everyone here votes
21	on that. You're all in agreement?
22	MS. GOLDSTEIN: Yes.
23	MR. HOLIAN: Yes.
24	MR. SMITH: Yes.
25	MS. KNIGHT: Yes.

```
1
              CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ:
                                   The same time, just the
 2
         29th.
 3
              MR. KLEIMAN:
                             Right.
 4
              CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: And I think, moving
 5
         forward, we're going to be doing the Thursday
 6
         instead of the Wednesday.
 7
              MS. GOLDSTEIN:
                              Right.
 8
              MR. HOLIAN: That's right. That's what we
 9
         agreed to. It took me three times to get it in
10
         my phone.
11
              CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Now we're off.
12
              (Thereupon, the meeting was concluded at 8:50
13
    a.m.)
1.4
15
16
17
1.8
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	CERTIFICATE
2	
3	STATE OF FLORIDA:
4	SS.
5	COUNTY OF MIAMI-DADE:
6	
7	
8	
9	I, NIEVES SANCHEZ, Court Reporter, and a Notary
10	Public for the State of Florida at Large, do hereby
11	certify that I was authorized to and did
12	stenographically report the foregoing proceedings and
13	that the transcript is a true and complete record of my
1.4	stenographic notes.
15	
16	DATED this 30th day of September, 2015.
17	
18	
19	$\Delta \alpha$
20	
21	NIEVES SANCHEZ
22	NIEVES SANCHEZ
23	
24	
25	