

City of Coral Gables City Commission Meeting
Agenda Item G-9
June 28, 2022
City Commission Chambers
405 Biltmore Way, Coral Gables, FL

City Commission

Mayor Vince Lago

Vice Mayor Michael Mena

Commissioner Rhonda Anderson

Commissioner Jorge Fors

Commissioner Kirk Menendez

City Staff

City Manager, Peter Iglesias

City Clerk, Billy Urquia

Deputy City Attorney, Cristina Suárez

Assistant City Attorney, Gus Ceballos

Public Speaker(s)

Estrellita Sibila

Jackson “Rip” Holmes

Aura Reinhardt

Agenda Item G-9 [3:55 p.m.]

Discussion regarding the Business Improvement District's (B.I.D.) petition language and petitioning procedure.

(Sponsored by Commissioner Anderson)

(Sponsored by Mayor Lago)

Mayor Lago: Moving on to G-9. G-9, discussion regarding the Business Improvement District's petition language and petitioning procedure. I'd like to see if we could have staff come up here

City Commission Meeting

June 28, 2022

Agenda Item G-9 - Discussion regarding the Business Improvement District's (B.I.D.) petition language and petitioning procedure.

and discuss. City -- well, the City Attorney can give us a little bit of a rundown. I put this on the agenda, along with Commissioner Anderson because it's been brought to my attention some concerns in regards to the balloting language, and I wanted to make sure that we were very clear and concise on the record and get both sides of the issue to really understand moving forward what's acceptable and what is not acceptable. So, I'd like to have our City Attorney give us a little background in regards to their opinion and what they believe is the correct thing moving forward.

Deputy City Attorney Suárez: So, Mr. Mayor, there was a concern raised by a property owner within the geographic boundaries. This particular owner is the owner of a condominium unit. And the concern that was raised is that while the petition is sent to the -- in the case of a condo, it's sent to the condo association. The individual unit owners are not provided with the petition, but the individual unit owners are assessed. And so, we've reviewed this, and while we don't believe that it is contrary to the plain language of Chapter 170, the Commission may have a different view as to how it maybe should be done. And so, I know you all wanted to discuss this and hear from both sides. I understand that the petition process is currently underway, and it is set to close on June 30th. So, one thing that can be done is if you wanted to make it -- the petition consistent with the assessment is that you could -- when this comes back -- because there will still be two public hearings on the assessment rolls. There'd be the preliminary assessment roll, and then approval of the final assessment roll. You could decide or direct that that be done -- that the condo association be the ones that are assessed. That's one option if you all wanted to change the way it's done.

Mayor Lago: Do you have --? The last time we discussed, they hadn't met the necessary threshold. Do you have an update in regards to the petition threshold?

Deputy City Attorney Suárez: I'm sorry.

Mayor Lago: Do you have --? The last time you and I had a discussion about it, I think it was two days ago, they still hadn't received the necessary threshold.

Deputy City Attorney Suárez: I think someone from the BID is here, and they can answer that. I think -- Mr. Clerk, I think we heard that they have.

City Clerk Urquia: They have. They received 91 already.

Mayor Lago: Okay, perfect. Commissioner Anderson.

Commissioner Anderson: As with everything in life and here in the United States, we like to have representation and have a vote. It's I think unfair when someone doesn't have a vote, but yet has to pay the bill for the item received. So, the suggestion that the condominium association receive the bill is something that I think would be more consistent with the transparency requirements and voting requirements, so at least that the condominium association has some skin in the game. Because what requirements are there otherwise for them to notify the unit owners that they will receive an assessment, but yet not have a voice in whether or not they want it or not. So, that's my suggestion is that the condominium association be the party that'll be assessed and not the individual unit owners since it's indeed the condominium association receiving the ballot.

Commissioner Fors: And the association will -- I mean, because to play the devil's advocate, I mean, the owners of the condominiums do vote for their association representative, but I think it does make more sense to send it to the association, which presumably will divide it amongst the owners accordingly, right?

Deputy City Attorney Suárez: I'm assuming they would divide it according to whatever procedure...

Commissioner Fors: Right.

Deputy City Attorney Suárez: They determine for apportioning that fee. It may -- you know, I don't know how they would do it, each condo association.

Mayor Lago: You know...

Deputy City Attorney Suárez: It'd be according to their...

Mayor Lago: My concerns fall in line with Commissioner Anderson's comments. And obviously, I have the privilege of serving on the BID, but I want to make sure that we're very thoughtful and careful because we're talking about a lot of money here. We're talking a lot of money. And we need -- we, as a body, have to make the right decision, as we always try to do the right thing. And this is not the first time this is brought up to my attention. So, if my colleagues don't have anything else to say, I'd like to hear from the public in regards to their concerns.

City Clerk Urquia: Okay. We do have two speakers requesting to speak today, Mr. Mayor. The first one is Estrellita Sibila.

Mayor Lago: Ms. Sibila, how are you? The floor is yours.

Estrellita Sibila: Good, thank you. And thank you again for putting this on the agenda. I have several documents that I'm going to hand out to you all at the end of this, but I really want you all to listen because this is a very important issue, and this is a taxation issue. And really what we have today is an issue where there's a tax assessment roll, and that tax assessment roll has 346 parcels. There are 346 people that needed to be noticed about this petition who did not get all those people notice. Seventy-one -- sorry, 175 of these 345 owners did not even get a petition or a notice, and these aren't just condo owners like myself. There's other people on this tax roll that

did not get a notice, that did not get a petition, and does not have an opportunity to vote. Now, what does this mean? If you're required to have half of the property owners voting to allow you to assess us a tax to give you the privilege of having us, be taxed additional monies beyond what we already pay in tax to the City for a special benefit, why don't we get to vote? Now, the petition was one thing. We didn't get a notice of the assessment roll. I, myself, along with 51 percent -- the majority of these people that you're looking to tax -- did not get this. We're talking about \$230,000 of these particular voters that were not included. Now, the City will tell you that all the condo owners received a notice. I will tell you the notice that was presented to the condominium first doesn't include the correct condominium name in its entirety. Second, it doesn't even include the list of the assessed parcels that are subject to this tax. It doesn't even include correct language giving us an opportunity to say yes or no. And mind you, that changed at some point. Because at some point when this process started, we all had a choice. We were given a petition with neutral language on the ballot, which simply stated what the purpose of this tax was, how much the tax was, and vote yes if you support, or vote no if you don't. So, now what has happened to that language? Somehow, it's turned into a ballot that says we support it all, sign here. I don't know if we're supporting. If you read the plain language of the petition itself, it's completely unclear. And then if you look at the petition, not only are they giving us propaganda that goes along with it -- those who did receive it, of course, not all of us -- the petition itself has inconsistencies throughout. And these inconsistencies are tax dollars that you're charging us. It's not just about whether I'm a condo owner or somebody else has a land parcel. That distinguish -- that's not distinguished in that state law, and that's what we have to follow here. More importantly, the ambiguities are so many and how many mistakes are okay, right? So, not all the property owners got it, maybe a condo is okay, but how about the other property owners that are on the assessed roll that didn't receive it? Are we ignoring them too? Who do we choose to ignore, and who gets to participate? Multiple petitions include more than one ownership entity also. So, even if I wanted to sign on behalf of these entities, some have two petitions. One says on behalf of an LLC, and another one, on behalf of an Inc. I cannot even sign that because I wouldn't have the proper authority, even if I wanted to sign that on behalf of these properties that are receiving the petition.

Now, at least one of the parcels that was included in this tax assessment roll is specifically depicted as a non-BID parcel in the map. Can we trust that they're getting this right? They're not sending it to the right people. The wrong people are getting it. They're included in the vote. I don't get a vote, but I get a tax. This petition was circulated starting May 6, but no preliminary assessment roll was even available until last week. We're basically being asked to write a blank check every year for the next five years that this would exist, for the next five years. The final number that I want to leave you with is \$5 million. Five million dollars is what these property taxes are going to cost us, the people within the BID boundary. Fifty-one percent of us don't even know what's happening, don't even have a notice to vote, don't even have an opportunity to participate in this petition. Now, what does it actually cost us to circulate the petition to each owner? We're talking \$200. Will you tax me \$5 million to not spend \$200 in getting the petition correctly circulated to everyone that deserves to have a vote? Now, more importantly, I have all this documentation that shows how this was previously done. I'm hoping it was an error that they've made in the past that property assessed tax owner isn't somehow not equivalent to the 346 parcels that are included on that special tax assessment roll. I don't understand where the disconnect comes because the City's methodology to calculate how much tax we pay in the condominium has been already regulated so that I pay the same amount as every other affected owner that has a vote. Now, talking numbers, these are hundreds of thousands of square feet of property. We're not talking about me in my little condominium. We're talking about hundreds of thousands of square feet, hundreds of thousands of dollars, and more than 51 percent of the people that are going to be taxed got no notice and no chance to vote. And that just does not sit well with me, and it just shouldn't sit well with you all either. It's taxation without representation. We're being asked to write a blank check. We're being told that we can't participate and that I've been noticed through an entity that is incorrect, was not sufficient to even let me know what parcels are affected, and does not describe what they're actually asking allegedly my condo association to do, and on behalf of whom? So, where exactly, and how does that notice --? How is that sufficient? How is that sufficient to tax me? How is that sufficient for you to know that the majority of the affected property owners are for this tax? Thank you very much.

Mayor Lago: Thank you very much.

City Clerk Urquia: Next speaker is Mr. Jackson “Rip” Holmes.

Mayor Lago: Mr. Holmes. Good afternoon, sir.

Jackson “Rip” Holmes: Thank you very much. I’m going to urge you -- I do urge you to cancel this election. I don’t think this is a true election, I think that the disenfranchisement is really breathtaking. And so, I just want to emphasize I’m urging you to cancel and redo this election. And when it’s redone, there are certain things that I think should be changed. Number one, I don’t think that the authority as to who runs this election should be delegated to the people whose very jobs depend on which way the election goes. I mean, this is something -- I hate to say this, but it’s -- I’m going to send this probably to the late-night comedy shows, how to win an election without really trying. Get a municipality to give you the authority to run your own election. This is just - - right there is really, really strange, right? Why do they have the authority to run their own election? I think it should be done by the City. Number two, the idea that we have so many tax folios who are not even getting noticed and not getting a right to vote is just really -- it’s -- actually, it’s mind-boggling to me. I think we should redo it, and we should notice every single person who is paying a tax. There may be some uncertainties as to how votes are apportioned, but that’s not really that hard. You know, if someone has a small parcel versus a large parcel, I mean, we all have gotten past our course in algebra. That can be broken up, apportioned appropriately. I don’t think that -- What else should be changed? There is no “yes or no” option on this. In my own family, I had to explain to people in my family who do not participate in City government that you can vote no by not voting. I mean, it’s really -- isn’t it just -- I mean, again, we get to the -- this thing, how do you win an election without really trying for Saturday Night Live. You have a ballot that gives you only one option.

Mayor Lago: Thank you very much.

Mr. Holmes: Let me finish please. I've got a lot more to say.

Mayor Lago: Please.

Mr. Holmes: I mean, look, this taxation carries with it substantial legal penalties. If someone doesn't pay, they can have their property taken away from them, and I think it's -- it needs to be changed. I mean, I have pretty much stayed away from the City Commission because of personal issues that I'm dealing with, but I really can't imagine that any of you want to be taxed without having even being noticed. The idea that serving a condo association is the equivalent of serving the individuals, I know from personal experience, I'm the one who informed Ms. Sibila that this vote was going on. She didn't get notice from her condo association. She was shocked. She said, "Are you kidding?" I'm the one -- she didn't get notice from her condo association, alright? So, that's not a safe or proper way to give notice. I think it -- going on further, when this ballot goes out, they say in there you have the option of voting yes. If you have any questions, call us. The idea that the people at the BID can be counted upon to give people honest answers is belied by the fact that we have the former BID director, Marina Foglia, who told us that as she was working there, she was asked by the people at Terranova -- wait a second, please -- to go up to eight stories, and to say that the whole BID supported the Terranova project going up on -- eight stories on Miracle Mile. She said, "I can't do that. Terranova is about 15 percent of the ownership, and 85 percent of the ownership are the rest of the people, and most of them don't want it. I can't lie and tell the Coral Gables City Commission that the BID supports this eight-story building when it's not true." They said, "Okay, good. You're fired." So, these are not people that you can say, "Oh, don't worry. They're going to tell everyone the truth." I mean, honestly, I just -- I don't think the City should be associated with this kind of election. I ask that you cancel it.

Mayor Lago: Thank you, sir. I appreciate it. Have a wonderful day. Thank you. Mr. Clerk.

City Clerk Urquia: That's it, Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Lago: Would the BID like to say anything on the record? Please. Will you sign --? You can sign it after, but please come on up.

Aura Reinhardt: Mr. Mayor, Commissioners, City Attorney, City Manager, and staff, thank you very much for the opportunity. As you know, the BID is celebrating 25 years of championing the downtown and its businesses. And it's also the year, in fact, that we turn to our members for support to extend the existence of the BID for another five years. The BID is proud. We're very proud of what we have done with our stakeholders since 1997. We don't do this by ourselves. We do it with our stakeholders because we do it for them. We create a favorable environment that increases commercial and cultural activity within our district. Very importantly, the BID also encourages a spirit of cooperation among our constituents, and we welcome conversations such as the one we're having today that allow us to maintain a high standard of operation in our work with the City and with our cultural and business partners. Because it's together that we energize the City of Coral Gables and the downtown, and together we bring value to our residents, our businesses, and to the property owners. I'm happy to work with the City in any kind of path you suggest that we take forward. As we all know, we have, since 1997, followed very careful management of our process of election and our process of taxation. And we have -- when we have changed those processes -- in fact, as we know, we were a yes/no vote for '97, 2002, and 2007. And then we chose to change it to a one-step system instead of a two-step system. Some of you might recall the two-step system was the first mailing had to go out to Miami-Dade County, and we have to get confirmation from all of our property owners and their IDs. And once that came back to us, then we went out with the ballot. It was decided back then for the 2012 election that we would have a one-step situation because with a signed document and one that is notarized, we were getting the two-step and one-step, and that was something we all agreed, the City, and the BID, and the State. As you know, along the way, we've had confirmation from our State Attorney

General for when we shifted our taxation and our voting, so we feel confident that it was done the right way. I'm here to say that there's always a chance that there's change in our environment in the downtown, there's change in our membership, and there's change in how we are developing our businesses and developing our streets and our landscape. And I would like to right now say that we're happy -- the BID is happy to work with the City in whatever direction you'd like us to take. Thank you.

Mayor Lago: Thank you very much. So, Madam City Attorney, I'd like to understand -- and Ms. Sibila brought up a few points that I'm a little bit concerned about. Being elected by the people, we give everyone the ability to cast their vote, and that is done in an election which is fair and impartial. And as long as you're a registered citizen in this country, you can vote for this. I mean, simple. As long as you live in the City of Coral Gables, you're a resident, you can vote for the elections. I'm perplexed in how this is going on. How are 51 percent of the individuals --? Because I got to face this person, and this is not going away. This has been going on for a while, and this is why it's on the agenda today. How are we allowing that 51 percent of the potential voters do not vote in this election?

Deputy City Attorney Suárez: So, Mayor, the statute doesn't prescribe who needs to vote when it's a condo association, when it's a condo building.

Mayor Lago: I understand.

Deputy City Attorney Suárez: Okay. So, again, it hasn't been done contrary to the statute. But if the Commission wants to change it, certainly the Commission can do so. If you would like it to be that because the condo association is the one that gets to vote, you can make that consistent so then the condo association is the one that's assessed. And my understanding is that for a condo building, it's -- for all of these, the assessment is as to the ground floor square footage, and then

that is apportioned. So, when it's a condo building, it's apportioned among the unit owners, so they're only really paying a portion of that.

Mayor Lago: So, two points -- two questions. Number one, when you look at other BIDs throughout Miami-Dade County, throughout the state, what are they doing?

Deputy City Attorney Suárez: I don't know the answer to that, Mayor. We can certainly research that for you.

Mayor Lago: I think that's critically important to find that answer, number one. And number two, as our attorney, what would your recommendation be? Is this just a policy matter, or is this an actual legal issue that you think that we need to get in front of?

Deputy City Attorney Suárez: So, I think that...

Mayor Lago: This is the moment where I thank God that I have five lawyers up here because I'm looking for my lawyers up here.

Commissioner Anderson: I'll speak...

Mayor Lago: And we got Gus. Gus, come up here. Get up here, get up here.

Commissioner Anderson: Come on.

Mayor Lago: Give us some (INAUDIBLE).

Commissioner Anderson: Join in, Gus.

Mayor Lago: Come on. We need a sixth lawyer up here.

Deputy City Attorney Suárez: But we have Ms. Levi-Garcia as well too.

Commissioner Menendez: Group photo.

Mayor Lago: Oh, I didn't see her.

Commissioner Menendez: Group photo, group photo.

Mayor Lago: Oh, Naomi's here too. Naomi can provide a little guidance.

Unidentified Speaker: I don't work for the City, but I'm a lawyer.

Mayor Lago: No, no, but we're dealing here with the City. Let me get back to you now. So, Madam City Attorney...

Deputy City Attorney Suárez: So...

Mayor Lago: Since we don't have an answer for the first question, which is okay, it's fine. We...

Deputy City Attorney Suárez: So, Mr. Mayor, you can -- I think you could allow the current petition process to conclude, if you -- if that's what -- you know, the will of the Commission. And you could give -- you could either today decide to give direction that you want the assessments to be directed to the condo associations to make it consistent with the petitions that went out. You could also decide to -- at the next July meeting, you could decide to go a different way. You could wait to the July meeting, see what the final numbers are after June 30th and make a decision then as to what you want to happen. In any event, this will come back. This is a -- this has to be

scheduled at least two times to come back for public hearing for setting the preliminary and final assessment rolls.

Mayor Lago: But I'm a believer in doing things once and let's do it right. This has been brought to our attention. I have a concern that 51 percent of the individuals are being excluded from voicing their opinion, but they're paying taxes. What do you think, Commissioner Fors?

Commissioner Fors: I have a question because one thing I was really picking up what you were putting down in terms of each parcel having an opportunity to vote. But then the City Attorney just said that the assessment that you're getting is based solely on the square footage of your ground floor, which is your common elements, right? So, you're not being tax based on the square footage in your unit, just of your -- that specific area of your common elements. So, my question to you is, isn't all the decisions and all the control of your common elements -- if it's really the case that you're only being taxed as against that ground floor common element, isn't all control and decision-making basis with those common elements, including assessments against it, something that gets taken care of by the democratic process within your association and voting out Board of Directors? Because I could totally understand if the special assessment were against the entire square footage of the entire building, including your unit, but don't you think it makes a difference that it's just that area of the common elements, and that the person literally in charge of that is no one unit owner, but the association? And they're checked by the unit owners voting them in and out.

Ms. Sibila: So, I guess ultimately the question is who deserves to know that this is going on, and whether the condo association has the duty and obligation to send -- to put forward this message on your behalf. Chapter 170 says nothing in this statute will allow the City to not provide actual notice to the affected property owners, and we're the ones that are getting the tax bill. The disconnect is that you won't be able to file and foreclose on the association, which is really what this tax is all about and what the power that it gives you, for us to be able to be taxed. Otherwise,

you don't have a person to be able to foreclose upon. You wouldn't be able to foreclose upon the common elements of my building.

Commissioner Fors: I think you can.

Ms. Sibila: Well...

Commissioner Fors: I would say you can.

Ms. Sibila: And is that what the City wants to do? They want to foreclose...

Commissioner Fors: No, no, no.

Ms. Sibila: On entire buildings if...

Commissioner Fors: The City doesn't want to.

Ms. Sibila: One of the owners chooses not to participate in the...

Commissioner Fors: No, no, no.

Ms. Sibila: In the bill?

Commissioner Fors: No, no, no. But would you not admit that this tax is not against the square footage that you own solely in your unit?

Ms. Sibila: Oh, no. I agree that it's in proportionate share to the lot area of the parcel. Now, there is multiple other owners, let's say the Colonnade, that owns an entire City block. So, they own

130-something thousand square feet, and they're paying more than, let's say, Mr. Holmes' parcel that's only 2,500 square feet. I have people in my condominium that own more than 2,500 square feet once you go back and do the regression to come up with our proportionate share. So, to say that one parcel that might be 800 square feet should have less of a vote after we've recondensed down to our proportionate share is unfair. Some of these condominiums have 70,000 square feet that they're paying for, some have less, but it's not -- the issue is of fairness, the notice, and the taxation, and whether or not the notice exists to the proper party, whether the proper party is the one that's paying the tax, and whether that's the party that would lose their interest and their property rights should a failure occur.

Commissioner Anderson: You know, I'm troubled by the voting process that was done here because every resident has a right to vote for who the leaders are, and we determine the tax, and everybody then receives the tax, but everybody has a voice, and this appears to be fundamentally flawed. I don't know if the BID has looked at some of these comments here, the petition provided to the condo association, which is not a tax assessed parcel. Fourteen tax folios are not included. And you know, and then another parcel here that is not on the -- is on the assessment roll but did not receive a petition. You know, I applaud you for the homework you've done on this. But when you look at the original 1997 ballot, you know, you have a total budget amount, and it's pretty clear. You don't even know what you're voting for here it appears, you know, because you don't know what your tax is going to be. And then with the disinclusion of some that are being taxed and the inclusion of some that are not going to be taxed, it really skews the results.

Commissioner Fors: I think...

Commissioner Anderson: One vote...

Commissioner Fors: Oh, sorry.

Commissioner Menendez: And if I may...

Commissioner Anderson: Yeah, one vote.

Commissioner Fors: I think the kicker, as I'm analyzing this out loud, is that although the tax may be based on your common elements, it ends up on your folio ID tax. And therefore, if you don't pay it, your unit can be foreclosed on whereas the one next to you may not be.

Ms. Sibila: That is correct. And I'm pretty certain -- and that's why the City's been hesitant to create the tax assessment on the condo parcel rather than the individual owners as they've been taxing us.

Mayor Lago: Commissioner Menendez.

Commissioner Menendez: So, I just want to add, based on other items and other issues we've dealt with, when state law is -- doesn't -- is gray -- a gray area with regards to a topic, even when state law addresses an issue, we can go above and beyond. And where there's a gap in information/guidance in state law, then we can step in as a city to lay down -- lay the ground rules for petitions and votes and everything else. Also, with regards to condo associations, my concern is not every condo association is made the same or run the same way. So, it could be a hit and miss for whoever's in that unit. And going back to what the Mayor said, all residents are entitled to vote. So, we have folks that are residents that live in condos, and when it's time to vote for our local elected officials, the condo association doesn't vote for them. The individual residents in those units vote for them.

Mayor Lago: That's well said.

Commissioner Menendez: So, what makes this any different?

Mayor Lago: Yep.

Commissioner Menendez: So, I feel very -- and I'm not putting the blame on anyone, because quite honestly, this is probably something -- if it wasn't brought to the awareness of the City and the City Commission before, it should have so that it could have been dealt with now. So, I'm not pointing fingers. I think we're in a situation that the state law is silent, and the responsibility is on us to set the ground rules to make it fair, as fair as we can.

Commissioner Fors: I don't even think it's -- I don't even think the state law's inconsistent. It all ties to the property that you're taxing, and I think that a notice to the association only would be appropriate if the tax was being levied against the common elements only and not each individual unit. In this case, because each individual unit is being assessed and subject to foreclosure for non-payment, then I think you have to notice every single parcel.

Mayor Lago: So, listen...

Commissioner Anderson: I agree with you.

Mayor Lago: So, to move on to this -- move the issue forward, if the Commission doesn't have anything else in regards to this matter, what is the will of the Commission? What would you like to do? Me, personally, I've been very clear. I'll scrap the whole thing and start again.

Commissioner Anderson: I think we need to start again. It's fundamentally flawed.

Commissioner Menendez: And I think...

Commissioner Anderson: Youi can't rely upon it.

Commissioner Menendez: I think it's a reset, and I think we need to have someone -- you know, with the help of the Administration and the BID, to come back with a proposal on the best way forward that's fair, covering all the issues that's been discussed here...

Mayor Lago: Is that...?

Commissioner Menendez: Instead of having us come -- yeah, and I'll make a motion on that.

Mayor Lago: That's what I'm saying. I was going to say, Commissioner, is that a motion?

Commissioner Menendez: That's a motion.

Mayor Lago: Would you like to say something? Yes.

(COMMENTS MADE OFF THE RECORD)

Ms. Reinhardt: The last time we had a tax consultant, that was in 2006-2007 when condominiums -- in fact, yours -- were just coming into existence. So, we had hired someone through a taskforce that we had here in the City that worked very closely with the City and with the State. And when the tax consultant came back with recommendations of how to address each one of those folios, that's what happened. He managed to talk to all of the -- he included all of the condominiums, and we had all of their individual units, and they were given folios, and it was done that way. Clearly, at no point did we did we read tax -- communicate the tax to the condominium directly.

Mayor Lago: Okay, okay.

Commissioner Menendez: So, motion.

Ms. Reinhardt: So having...

Commissioner Anderson: Second.

Ms. Reinhardt: A consultant again is not a bad idea.

Commissioner Menendez: We have a second.

Deputy City Attorney Suárez: Would you like them to come back at a certain meeting or...?

Commissioner Menendez: Well, we need to identify who in the City -- my preference, the City Attorney's Office -- to work on finding the proper wording, the proper process, and then bringing it to us. And I don't -- I'm perfectly fine with, you know, you all seeing the draft form, but let them work on it, and then you can comment, and then it comes to us for our decision or our guidance one way or the other. So, we have a first and a second, Mayor.

Mayor Lago: Right. So, we have a first and a second. Let's get a vote please.

City Clerk Urquia: I'm sorry. Who seconded?

Commissioner Menendez: Anderson.

Mayor Lago: Commissioner Anderson.

Commissioner Fors: Yes.

Vice Mayor Mena: Yes.

Commissioner Menendez: Yes.

Commissioner Anderson: Yes.

Mayor Lago: Yes.

(Vote: 5-0)

Mayor Lago: Thank you very much.

Deputy City Attorney Suárez: Commissioners, would you like that to come back next meeting, or do you not have a preference when it comes back? I know there's timing issues with the...

Mayor Lago: I would like -- let's move it to the August meeting. Okay, is that fine?

Deputy City Attorney Suárez: I think she has something to say about that.

City Clerk Urquia: Can you please speak into the microphone?

Ms. Reinhardt: Sorry. I do have a question. We have an election in process, and we can go ahead and do all of this work, and do we do this -- as we move forward, all these things will take time. They could take weeks. They could take months. They could take two semesters until we have a new process. What would --? What is your recommendation about the election that's being done as we speak? And we already have -- as I said, we already have the majority in for the extension of the BID.

Ms. Sibila: I believe they said that they would toss that one.

Deputy City Attorney Suárez: Yeah.

Mayor Lago: We said we're canceling it.

Commissioner Anderson: It's tossed.

Ms. Reinhardt: So, we we're cancel...

Commissioner Menendez: Reset.

Mayor Lago: And my recommendation...

Ms. Sibila: They're canceling it.

Mayor Lago: And my recommendation is that -- is tomorrow morning, you schedule a meeting with the City Attorney, and you commence work in regards to the guidance provided by this Commission.

Ms. Reinhardt: Got it.

Mayor Lago: Okay?

Ms. Reinhardt: Thank you.

Mayor Lago: Thank you.

Commissioner Fors: I don't think it's going to be that complicated.

Mayor Lago: I don't see it as complicated at all. It's pretty straight forward.

Commissioner Menendez: So, by August, we should have clear direction.

Mayor Lago: Yes. Thank you very much.

Commissioner Anderson: Clear language, clear information so everybody knows what they're going to pay.

Mayor Lago: Yes.

Ms. Sibila: Thank you all. And I really appreciate you listening to this issue. It's really important for all of us to get this right. Thank you.

Mayor Lago: Thank you very much. Take care.