CITY OF CORAL GABLES BUDGET/AUDIT ADVISORY BOARD

Meeting Minutes: Thursday, June 28, 2018

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

MEMBERS	J	Α	S	0	N	D	J	F	M	Α	М	J	APPOINTED BY:
	17	17	17	17	17	17	18	18	18	18	18	18	
Tony A. Rivas	Р	-	Α	-		Α	-	Α	Α	-	Α	Α	Mayor Valdes-Fauli
Erin Knight	-	-	-	-	-	Α	-	Α	Α	-	Α	Α	Commissioner Jeanette Slesnick
Alex Menendez	Р	-	Р	-	-	Р	-	Α	Α	-	Р	Р	Commissioner Vince Lago
John Holian	Р	-	Α	ı	-	Р	ı	Ρ	Α	ı	Ρ	Р	Commissioner Frank C. Quesada
Cheryl Goldstein	Α	-	Р	1		Р	1	Р	Р	1	Р	Р	Commissioner Pat Keon
Francisco Paredes	Р	-	Р	-	-	Р	ı	Ρ	Р	-	Α	Р	Commissioner Mena
Rosa Bravo [^]						Р	-	Р	Р	-	Р	Р	Mayor Valdes-Fauli

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

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

Staff:

Diana Gomez, Finance Director Keith Kleiman, Budget Director Sally Ola Ola, Assistant Director

Minutes Preparation and Recording Secretary: Nieves Sanchez, Bailey & Sanchez Court Reporting, Inc.

1	CITY OF CORAL GABLES
2	BUDGET/AUDIT ADVISORY BOARD TRANSCRIPT
3	CORAL GABLES CITY HALL 405 BILTMORE WAY, FIRST FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM
4	CORAL GABLES, FLORIDA THURSDAY, JUNE 28, 2018, COMMENCING AT 8:05 A.M.
5	
6	
7	
8	Board Members Present:
9	Alex Menendez, Chairman
10	Cheryl Goldstein Vice Chairperson Francisco Paredes
11	Rosa Bravo John Holian
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	City Staff and Consultants:
17	Diana Gomez, Finance Director Keith Kleiman, Assistant Finance Director for Management
18	and Budget. Leonard Roberts, Assistant Director of Economic
19	Development
20	Elsa de Bruzos Fuentes, Accountant III, Finance Department
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

```
1
    THEREUPON:
 2
             (The following proceedings were held.)
             CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Okay. So we'll call
 3
 4
         the meeting to order. We have a quorum here
5
         today.
             MS. GOMEZ: Roll call, please.
6
7
             CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Okay. Let's do a roll
8
         call.
9
             All right. Cheryl?
10
             MS. GOLDSTEIN: I'm here.
11
             CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Okay. John?
12
             MR. HOLIAN: Here.
13
             CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Frank?
14
             MR. PAREDES: Here.
             CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Rosa?
15
16
             MS. GOMEZ: I think she's going to be here,
17
         but she's not here yet.
18
             CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Okay. So she's not
19
         here yet.
20
             MS. GOMEZ: Yeah.
21
             CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Okay. And in the room,
2.2
         we have Diana, Keith, Leonard, and, I'm sorry,
23
         you are?
24
             MS. DE BRUZOS FUENTES: Elsie.
25
             CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Elsie, okay.
```

```
And the first order of business is to
1
 2
         approve the minutes from the May 15th meeting.
 3
             Oh, we've got Keith here, as well.
 4
             All right. So does anyone want to make a
 5
         motion to approve the May 15th meeting minutes?
                            I'll make it, but I wasn't
 6
             MR. PAREDES:
7
         here, so I don't know if that's acceptable or
8
         not.
9
             MS. GOMEZ: Yeah. I don't know that it is.
             MR. HOLIAN: I'll make a motion.
10
11
             CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: John will make the
12
         motion. I'll second the motion.
             All in favor?
13
14
             Aye.
15
             MR. PAREDES: Ayes.
16
             MR. HOLIAN:
                           Aye.
17
             MS. GOLDSTEIN: Aye.
18
             CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: All right. Great.
         today we have some members that need to be gone
19
20
         by 8:45, so let's do the time sensitive stuff.
21
             MS. GOMEZ: Yes. So, I guess, just a real
2.2
         quick discussion as to which item -- because I
23
         know, Cheryl, you need to leave. So which item
24
         gives you the most concern that you want to be
25
         here for?
```

```
1
             MS. GOLDSTEIN: I have one overall comment
 2
         on the budget.
 3
             MS. GOMEZ: Okay.
             MS. GOLDSTEIN: And then I think we should
 4
5
         do --
             MS. GOMEZ: Leonard's?
 6
7
             MS. GOLDSTEIN: -- we have to vote for the
8
         lease. We should do that. But let's do the
9
         lease first, and then we'll get into the
10
         budget.
11
             MS. GOMEZ: Okay. Perfect. Very good, if
12
         that's okay with The Chair.
13
             CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Oh, yeah. I'm very
14
         flexible.
             Leonard, do you want to go ahead?
15
16
             MR. ROBERTS: Great.
17
             So the City has been doing some research
18
         related to acquiring another fire station.
         goal is to have a fire station in between Fire
19
20
         Station 2 and Fire Station 3. To kind of give
21
         you an idea, on US-1, close to the Starbucks,
2.2
         there's a fire station, and then we also have
         one on Old Cutler, close to the Pinecrest area.
23
24
             And what happens is that we only have like
25
         two arteries that go into that area, and during
```

high congestion time of traffic, it limits the flexibility of getting in. So there's no real side streets you can take, because of all of the canals and such.

And to give you an example of a situation, in Cocoplum, right, Tahiti Beach, specifically, there was a lady, who was choking on a piece of steak, and they called 911, and we weren't able to respond fast enough. And so having a location of a fire station in this general area will help to increase the actual response time.

So the City has looked at several properties throughout the area, and if you look on Page 2, the third diagram shows several properties on a map with checkmarks. These are all properties in the general area where the City has been looking at for potentially acquiring a fire station.

Now, these are all residential lots, and this community overall is primarily residential. So the goal is to acquire a property, retain its exterior look of a residence, and retrofit the interior to meet a fire station, and then the truck would be on the outside. Obviously a truck is very hard

2.2

not to distinguish. So we wanted an area that is well vegetated to kind of provide a visual barrier.

So the site that was selected, that seemed to be very popular, was the 7000 Old Cutler Road, which meets all criterias and then some related to a potential fire station.

Now, this building is a little older. It is located on 7000 Old Cutler Road, which is directly on the actual Cocoplum Circle. So if you guys are familiar, if you're traveling south on Le Jeune, and once you hit the circle and you pass Sunset, the first house immediately on your right-hand side, that's the property, and you probably don't remember it, because it's so well vegetated. There's over 136 trees in the front of the property.

MR. HOLIAN: Is that the one with the gravel driveway?

MR. LEONARD: So there's --

MR. HOLIAN: There's one very small, it's like a little structure.

MR. LEONARD: So these are actually three driveways to this property, and then the one -- there are three driveways, and in the picture,

2.2

actually, at this point -- on the third page, there's a picture of the property, and as you can see, those three arrows denote the three entrances into the property.

So let's just say a fire station was there, and they needed to get onto Sunset, they can come out on Sunset. If they need to go on Old Cutler, which is the arrow furthest to the right, they can come out on Old Cutler. Or if they need to just get onto the circle, there's an entrance onto the circle.

MR. PAREDES: That's the property where the bus stops there and everybody is unloading and it just --

MR. LEONARD: And so the frontage of the property actually has about 16,000 square feet of City right-of-away. So if the City were to acquire this property and assemble that 16,000 as part of the site, they'd probably use a component of it for an open green space. And you guys know, there's an Old Cutler trail that's right here, also, and this would be a nice synergy for that Old Cutler trail, for people to gather, and, you know, maybe be a bike station or a bike pump station or

2.2

something to that effect, and allow people to go up and down this eleven-mile Old Cutler trail. So that's another benefit of this particular site.

The other benefit of this site, which is something I learned recently, I don't know if all you can see this, this is a very unique map, and this is a map that shows -- this white area is the highest elevation in the County, Miami-Dade County, and that circle, where you see right here, is the property. So that white line is 17 feet above sea level, and coincidentally that line runs parallel to Old Cutler. So you can't get higher than this in the entire County.

Actually, I'm curious where in the State you can get higher than that, but I'm still researching that.

MS. BRAVO: Those people don't have to have flood insurance.

MR. ROBERTS: So this is one of the highest elevations, if not the highest elevation, and so that was another unique component that I found out, which just happened to be, you know, gravy on top of everything else.

2.2

1 MS. GOLDSTEIN: Can you skip to the price? 2 MS. ROBERTS: Sure. 3 CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Good morning, Rosa. 4 Thank you for joining us. 5 MS. BRAVO: Sorry I'm late. 6 CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: No, no problem. 7 MR. ROBERTS: Because this was a property 8 of interest, we negotiated with the actual 9 property owner, and we ordered a couple of appraisals. Now, because the site was going to 10 11 be used as a fire station, we did an appraisal 12 just for an academic purpose, looking at it 13 from an institutional use. The use is going to 14 be converted to an institution, even though 15 that is not the current use, and so we did an 16 appraisal based on a residential and based on 17 an institutional use. 18 And one of the appraisers, Waronker and 19 Rosen, the value came in at 1.3 million, and 20 the value of 1.3 was based on the fact that the 21 property is so large, that the house is old and 2.2 it wasn't in the best of condition for that 23 area, that the appraiser recommended his 24 highest and best was its land use, that someone

would buy this property, knock down the

structure and build a mega mansion for this area.

And so the same component or thought process went through for the institutional use, just the commercial side of it is a little more. Blazejack, interestingly, they appraised it at 3.4, and they didn't appraise it based upon a land value, they based it upon with a structure intact, and they came out at 3.9 million for an institutional use.

Those appraisals were both completely off from each other, so we ordered a third appraisal just to kind of get a better feel.

CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Hold on, Leonard. I have a question. Did you direct them to assess one with a house value and one as a land value?

MR. ROBERTS: We wanted the house value, and the institutional use is more of an academic purpose, because we would be buying the site and changing the zoning on it for purposes of a fire station.

MR. HOLIAN: So that means the house is valued at 2.1 million dollars in Blazejack. It went from 1.3 to 3.4? That just seems a little weird.

2.2

```
MR. ROBERTS: No, 2.1 is the actual
1
 2
         difference between the two appraisals -- I'm
 3
         sorry, 3.4.
 4
             MS. GOLDSTEIN: No.
5
             MR. HOLIAN: No. The land is 1.3 --
             MS. GOMEZ: No. That's the value that the
6
7
         first company valued the whole thing, with the
8
         house and everything.
9
             MR. HOLIAN: Right. Then the second one,
10
         3.4?
             MS. GOMEZ: Yes.
11
12
             MR. HOLIAN: But I thought they said the
         first one was just the land.
13
14
             MR. GOMEZ: No.
15
             MS. GOLDSTEIN: It's a ridiculous
16
         appraisal.
17
             MS. BRAVO: It's a ridiculous appraisal.
18
         The 3.4 is ridiculous.
             MR. ROBERTS: I mean, pretty much.
19
             MS. GOLDSTEIN: The 1.3 I think is also --
20
21
             MR. HOLIAN: I think they both have to be
2.2
         whacky --
             MR. PAREDES: All three. All three.
23
24
             MR. HOLIAN: They're apples and oranges.
25
             MR. PAREDES: You go from 1.3 to 3.4 to 1.9
```

1 and you're trying to sell it for four million 2 dollars or you're trying to buy it for four 3 million dollars. 4 MR. ROBERTS: So we'll get there. Have 5 patience. 6 MS. GOLDSTEIN: So get there. 7 MR. ROBERTS: So you want to get there, okay. 8 Let's go straight to that. All right. 9 we spoke to the appraiser -- I'm sorry, the owner of the property. We offered a letter of 10 intent at 1.3 million dollars, which was based 11 12 on the residential value. 13 They pretty much told us, no. 14 MS. GOLDSTEIN: Of course. 15 MR. HOLIAN: I was going to say, I thought 16 that was cheap. MR. ROBERTS: So we went back and forth for 17 18 several months trying to get to a price that we 19 would do something at, and the last price that 20 he presented to us was so ridiculous that we walked away. 21 2.2 We walked away. Then we went back to the 23 drawing board and we went looking for other 24 sites, and the uniqueness of the site just kept

coming back up for our Fire Department. And so

after about four months of just dropping the whole discussion, we went back to them and we offered them the 3.4 million, which is Blazejack's value.

Now, he came back at a higher number, and the number that he was willing to go for, the lowest he said he would actually sell it for, because he said he had offers in the three million range, the lowest he would potentially sell if for was four million dollars, with a right to stay in the property for two years -- up to two years.

He is an older gentleman, and he is not in the best health condition, but he feels as though two years would be the time period he needs to outlive the property, and so that's the ask, with the two-year condition.

Now, the two years would be that he would be responsible, as though he owns the property, for everything related to the property. In other words, if the A/C breaks down, if a liability occurs, he is the one responsible.

Now, the other side of it is that if a major catastrophe were to occur, a hurricane or so, and the roof were to cave in, now the

2.2

1	property is owned by the City of Coral Gables.
2	We would actually take possession of the
3	property at that point, so that he would not be
4	responsible for making that major repair, since
5	he'll be kicked out of the property or vacate
6	the property because of its condition. So he
7	would voluntarily leave the property if a major
8	catastrophe or major
9	MS. GOLDSTEIN: Where are the comps of the
10	home sales in the area?
11	MR. LEONARD: Well, the appraised value is
12	based upon
13	MS. GOLDSTEIN: That's okay. But like are
14	there comps of the home sales in the area?
15	MR. ROBERTS: The properties that I have
16	MR. PAREDES: And I think we need comps of
17	vacant land, because that's basically what
18	we're buying. I mean, the structure that's
19	there is not
20	MS. GOMEZ: Well, we're going to keep the
21	structure. We're just going to we're not
22	going to knock it down and build it up again.
23	MR. ROBERTS: No, we're going to renovate
24	it.
25	MS. GOMEZ: So the structure is going to

stay there.

2.2

MS. GOLDSTEIN: I don't think vacant property is the right thing to go off of, because you're looking at a prime piece of real estate, in a great location in the Gables, and even -- I mean, I think it's good to look at, also, vacant lots, but you're not going to find vacant lots. You're going to find homes in the area that have sold, that you can look at whether they were knocked down or not, but you'll see it in the home sales pricing. It will show up in the older homes, that they weren't able to get, you know, the three million --

MR. HOLIAN: And then you can just extrapolate the price of the home, the square foot per "X" number of dollars and subtract it.

MR. ROBERTS: So when you ask for the comps, the purpose of the appraisal was to look at the actual compared sales and come up with a value. So we have a copy of the appraisal --

MS. GOLDSTEIN: But obviously we don't have confidence in the two appraisals, and so we got a third appraisal, and --

MR. HOLIAN: This is embarrassing.

1	MS. GOLDSTEIN: Yeah.
2	MR. PAREDES: And somewhere I read that the
3	neighbors have to approve it.
4	MR. ROBERTS: Yes.
5	MR. PAREDES: Are the neighbors going to
6	approve a fire station in that location?
7	You're talking about some high priced area.
8	And going back to even before we get into the
9	numbers, you mentioned an incident in Tahiti
10	Beach, and it says it's an underserved area.
11	Who determined that it was underserved? Is it
12	the neighbors or is it just a person in Tahiti
13	Beach?
14	MS. GOLDSTEIN: Let me ask you a question.
15	MR. ROBERTS: Yes, but let's take one
16	question at a time. So let me address his
17	question.
18	You guys wanted me to go into the price. I
19	went into the price. I didn't go through the
20	full analysis. On the third page of the
21	analysis, you'll see a map that shows the area
22	that has an underserved, which is determined by
23	the Fire Department.
24	MR. PAREDES: And then the following map
25	shows overlaps.

1	MS. BRAVO: A lot of overlaps.
2	MR. PAREDES: A lot of overlap. So I'm
3	just wondering, even before we get to the
4	numbers, which I have a lot of problems with
5	the numbers, the basis for this recommendation,
6	is it the Fire Department wants this fire
7	station or is it the neighbors that want a fire
8	station around there?
9	And I have a feeling, a very strong
10	feeling, that the neighbors around there are
11	not going to want the guy over here, by the
12	Gables Canal or whatever the water there, is
13	not going to want a fire station right in front
14	of his house. It seems that way.
15	MR. ROBERTS: So let me go back into the
16	presentation, then. So we were talking
17	about
18	MS. GOLDSTEIN: Can I ask one question?
19	MR. ROBERTS: Sure.
20	MS. GOLDSTEIN: Has Cocoplum been
21	approached to give some of their municipal
22	land, that they have around there, for use for
23	this purpose?
24	MR. ROBERTS: So the only property they
25	have it's the a Women's Club on site, but when

```
1
         you say, "Municipal land," there is no land
 2
         that's available, that the City owns, that
 3
         would suffice --
 4
             MS. GOLDSTEIN: No, that is Cocoplum -- so
 5
         they have a whole rec area. They have like the
         entrance in. You know, there's a guard gate
 6
 7
         and there's some, you know, land around there.
8
         There's some land down by the marina
9
         potentially. So I'm just saying, have we
         looked at --
10
11
             MR. ROBERTS: We have not gone into
12
         individual communities like Gables Estates and
13
         Cocoplum. We want to stay outside of
14
         communities, so it's not known as a Fire
         Department for that specific community, but
15
16
         it's known as a fire station for all of it.
17
             MS. GOLDSTEIN: But if they're willing to
18
         give some land and some space and it's cost
         effective --
19
20
             CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: But those are public
21
         roads.
2.2
             MR. ROBERTS:
                           They're public roads, yes.
23
             CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: They're not private.
24
             MR. ROBERTS: No, I know. It has a
25
         security guard that comes in and out, but it's
```

absolutely public.

2.2

So, no, the properties that we looked at were properties that are on this site on Page 3. Those are the different properties that we looked at in the general area, because this street itself, Sunset, is a general corridor, is where the Fire Department wants to be to meet that underserved area.

Now, this underserved area is not only the area we see on this map, but if you'll notice this little punch out right here, which is Unincorporated Dade County, that's the potential annexation for the High Pines/Davis area. So this fire station is not only to accommodate this underserved area, but the area that we're looking to annex.

So the area of the underserved includes not just the City of Coral Gables property today, but the City of Coral Gables potential annexation.

MR. HOLIAN: Okay. A couple of thoughts.

One, this property twenty years from now is going to be worth a lot more than it is today.

So even if you overpay for it -- I'm not saying ridiculously overpay for it -- but if you

overpay for it, five, ten, fifteen, twenty years down road it's going to be much more expensive.

Two, I have a problem with buying a piece of property, put a fire station that's not supposed to be a fire station, and pretend because -- the people, if it was my neighborhood, I wouldn't want it to look like a fire station, but if you needed a fire station, you have to get them to agree you could have a fire station.

MR. ROBERTS: And that's part of the requirement, the contingency.

MR. HOLIAN: Because it sounds like they can just tie the City up and arguing with that group of people over there, that are very sophisticated, that have wealth and resources, you know, to buy something that you can't say, "Hey, down the road, we think we really have to facilitate building a 6,000 square foot actual working fire station, not a house that's old" --

MR. ROBERTS: The goal is to keep the actual house structure. We understand that neighborhood itself. We don't want to take

2.2

1	away from the aesthetics of that. So it's a
2	requirement that it has to look like a house.
3	Now, the thing is, it has 136 trees. So
4	like when you're looking at that property and
5	you're driving by, you can't see the house
6	there.
7	MR. HOLIAN: Have you ever driven a fire
8	truck through 136 trees?
9	MR. ROBERTS: It's a substation.
10	CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: How about sound,
11	because I think it's what bothers most people
12	with fire stations, would we have sirens going
13	on?
14	MR. ROBERTS: The sirens will not go off.
15	CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: So that's not going to
16	be a problem?
17	MR. ROBERTS: Even today, in our current
18	location, at Fire Station 3, which is in a
19	residential neighborhood, we don't put the
20	sirens on.
21	CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: And it's contingent to
22	the neighbors agreeing on it. How does that
23	work? Are we going to put it in a purchase
24	agreement and then we'll wait for approval?
25	MR. ROBERTS: So the purchase agreement

would be based upon the four million dollars, two years, with a liability protection. We require a contingency on the neighborhood and Commission review, and the neighbors would have to approve it.

When you guys looked at the Neighborhood Renaissance Program, we looked at those five parks. We had one park on San Antonio that was contingent on neighborhood approval, and literally 80 percent of people there said, no, and we walked away from that deal.

CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: From the passive park.

In this case, if the neighbors say, no, is there a penalty to the City?

MR. ROBERTS: If the neighbors say, no, the likelihood is that we're not going to through with it.

CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: The likelihood, we're not going to go through with it?

MR. ROBERTS: Yeah, just like we did with the San Antonio park. If we have a majority of the neighbors that are not wanting this, it's not going to happen. Cathy is very firm on that. That San Antonio, which we thought was a great deal, and then the neighbors said, no --

2.2

1	CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Will we have to pay a
2	penalty to the home seller?
3	MR. ROBERTS: No. No, these are
4	contingencies
5	CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Contingencies and we
6	walk away.
7	MR. ROBERTS: Yes. There's no loss.
8	MS. BRAVO: Usually, and my lack of
9	experience, what area does a fire station
10	usually serve? What kind of mile radius is the
11	average that the City looks for?
12	MR. ROBERTS: It's based on a two-minute
13	response time.
14	MS. BRAVO: So that would be like two
15	miles, then?
16	MR. ROBERTS: I mean, it all depends on
17	traffic. So they base it on minutes. So they
18	want to be able to respond within two minutes.
19	MS. GOLDSTEIN: I think it's a great
20	location. I think you've done your research.
21	I think, if the purchase price was two million,
22	I'd feel a lot more comfortable with it, and
23	the guy obviously knows he has you, and it's
24	how badly we want how badly the City wants
25	the space, in my opinion.

MR. PAREDES: Wants or needs. Wants or needs. I'm not sure --

MS. GOLDSTEIN: Well, wants or needs. I would say that, let's assume that we need it.

Let's assume they've done the research, and we say we need it or we will need it when we get that annexation as a part of the City, let's just say, and if you just are looking at the numbers -- because when we've looked at leases before or purchases before, we've gone through a whole analysis, like with the Starbucks and whatever. We've come up with what this financial group feels is reasonable as a purchase price for the property.

So let's just assume that we all agree that it's needed, and just if we focus on the four million dollars, I think, for me, at least, that's the point that I'm not comfortable with.

MR. ROBERTS: So that actually brings us to our questions. So part of the Budget Advisory Board is that the Procurement Code requires you guys to look at three questions related to this the deal, and the first question is: Is the lease or, you know, acquisition consistent with the property appraisal as required under

2.2

Section 2-1092, where any property that is over \$250,000 or a lease that's greater than ten years has been appraised by an M.A.I. designated appraiser?

And so we ordered two appraisals, and here's -- you know, if the Chair wants to read this or just consider -- pretty much what I'm saying is that it's above market value. Based upon the appraisal requirement here, it's above market value, and the reason behind why the City would consider it even though it's above market value.

MS. GOLDSTEIN: So right now we're just coming up with the questions.

CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Well, that's what we're tasked to do as a Board. Our responsibility and I think where we stay is within these three questions and we look to see if they've been answered.

The purpose of the first one, I guess, is to make sure that our purchase price is within an appraised value. In this case, it's not.

MR. ROBERTS: Correct.

CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: So, yes, the two M.A.I. appraisers have done it, but we've had issues

2.2

1 with the appraisals, as noted by the members 2 here, and the purchase price is above market 3 price. So where do we go from there? 4 5 MR. ROBERTS: So what you do is, you look at the three questions, respond to the three 6 7 questions, and based upon that, make a 8 recommendation if you think the City should go forward with this deal, based upon your 9 10 criteria. 11 MS. GOLDSTEIN: I personally would like to 12 see the home sales in the area and the pricing 13 to know how much this owner -- how much 14 leverage the owner has or his heirs have as it 15 relates to us overpaying for the piece of 16 property. 17 So he says he has offers in the three 18 million. It's not even for sale, correct? 19 MR. ROBERTS: Yeah. 20 MS. GOLDSTEIN: And, I mean, all of us know 21 developers who go out and buy a lot to knock 2.2 them down and re-build. They're not paying in 23 the three million dollars for that lot, as you 24 said.

So I think we really need to assess --

1	MR. ROBERTS: That's a very good point.
2	The valuation one of the appraisers looked at,
3	and I always say Waronker and Rosen and
4	Magenheimer would be two people that I feel
5	very confident in their appraisals, after
6	reviewing it, those looked at the actual comps,
7	and both of them, actually, independent of each
8	other, without seeing the other appraisal, both
9	recommended this house, for this neighborhood,
10	should be knocked down and sold, because this
11	house (sic) is 35,000 square feet. You can
12	build a 14,000 square foot house.
13	MR. HOLIAN: The lot is 35,000 square feet.
14	MR. ROBERTS: Yeah, the lot. And then
15	there's 16,000 of the City right-of-way
16	attached to that.
17	MS. GOLDSTEIN: That's helpful.
18	MR. ROBERTS: Right. So if you bought this
19	lot for 3.5 million dollars or 3.9 million
20	dollars, knock it down and build, you're going
21	to make your money back on resale.
22	So for a land value, that 3.9 is out the
23	door. Related to the 1.9 million that
24	Magenheimer is presenting as a value, at that
25	value, he says that you can build a mega

mansion on this site, buying the land for 1.9, because that's what it's worth.

And so, you know, for institutional purpose, you know, again, this is strictly academic. You know, the gentleman who is the seller says, "If you're buying my site, it's unfair for you to analyze my deal as a residential lot, where you're not going to use it." I disagree with him, and for academic purposes, we added that institutional component to it.

MS. GOLDSTEIN: Right, because essentially most likely no one else is going to be able to get the change to use that property --

MS. BRAVO: No one else is going to get this as institutional, other than the City.

MR. ROBERTS: Exactly. Exactly.

So the values here were determined by other properties that sold in the area, that he determined that the land value -- and, again, he arrived to this number, the appraisers, the 1.3 to 1.9, based upon actual home sales and lot sales.

Now, if you want to see what's active in the market, what's currently on the market,

2.2

1 there is nothing at 3.9 million dollars or at 2 3.4 for this size type property. Now, this lot 3 size is very unique. We don't really find that many properties in this neighborhood. You find 5 16,000, 20,000, 25,000, but we never found anything in the 35,000 range. 6 CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: But like you said, we 7 8 don't need all of the land. We're going to 9 create green spaces and other areas, so it's 10 not that we have to have these 35,000 square feet. 11 12 MR. ROBERTS: It's not, but I will tell you 13 that the City applied for a grant to assist 14 with the acquisition of this property, a State 15 grant, and we won the State grant, and the 16 basis of that grant was that we would buy a 17 fire station and that we would use a component 18 of that fire station for open green space. 19 CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Green spaces. 20 And how much is that grant? 21 MR. ROBERTS: 1.5 million. 2.2 CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Our total out of pocket 23 is how much? 24 MR. ROBERTS: It will be 2.5 million. 25 That makes a lot of CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ:

1	sense.
2	MS. BRAVO: Without the retrofitting.
3	MR. ROBERTS: Well, 2.5 and then you have
4	1.5 million
5	MS. GOLDSTEIN: So there's three million.
6	So it's basically costing a million.
7	MR. ROBERTS: We have 1.5 of capital
8	reserves put aside
9	MS. GOMEZ: Impact fees.
10	MR. ROBERTS: and then we have 1.5 of a
11	grant, and so out of pocket will probably be a
12	million dollars.
13	MS. GOMEZ: And then we have to renovate
14	it.
15	MR. ROBERTS: Well, in two years.
16	CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Two years to renovate.
17	Okay. And that grant will be around for
18	the time that we need to get the approvals by
19	the
20	MR. ROBERTS: Yes, we have three years.
21	CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Okay. And that grant
22	will be whether we take this property or any
23	other property or is it tied specifically to
24	this property?
25	MR. ROBERTS: No, the grant is tasked

1	towards this property, but we did find recently
2	that really it's tied to the name. The grant
3	title, the way that the City Manager's Office
4	presented it, was Cartagena something park
5	MS. GOMEZ: Circle.
6	MR. ROBERTS: Circle, sorry, and so
7	wherever the property ends up, it has to be
8	called Cartagena Circle Park. So you're
9	paying, you know, 1.5 we're getting 1.5
10	million dollars for the name, and we have three
11	years to acquire it.
12	CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Okay.
13	MS. BRAVO: Three years from when?
14	MS. GOMEZ: From July 1st.
15	CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: This July 1st.
16	Okay. Do we have any other questions from
17	the members, as far as us going through the
18	actual questions?
19	MR. HOLIAN: Are there any other properties
20	that even come close to this criteria, meeting
21	anything like this?
22	MR. ROBERTS: No.
23	MR. HOLIAN: Okay.
24	MR. ROBERTS: Not with the criteria. With
25	the elevation component of it, with the

1 assemblage for a potential park and the size of 2 the lot, and the fourth thing was the three 3 entrance points that allow them to --4 MR. HOLIAN: That's pretty sweet. 5 CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: All right. So if there's no more questions, I'll run through the 6 actual questions that we need to read. 7 8 read them. 9 "Is the lease consistent with the property 10 appraisal as required under Section 2-1092? 11 Section 2-1092 provides: Whenever the City 12 purchases, sells or is involved in a lease of 13 real estate and the fee simple value of the 14 property being sold, or the annual value of the property leased is in excess of \$250,000, the 15 16 City shall, prior to consummating the purchase, 17 sale or lease, have the property appraised by 18 two real estate appraisers holding the M.A.I. designation in order to determine the estimated 19 market value"? 20 21 Okay. So that is the question. We've been 2.2 provided a response by the City. It says --23 you want to read the response? 24 MR. ROBERTS: Yes, for the record. 25 Again, this is just a suggestion. This is

1 to kind of create the dialog for you guys. Ιf 2 you don't want to use it, you can change the 3 full thing. It's just me providing some 4 context for you guys to consider. 5 CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: The response? 6 MR. ROBERTS: Yes. 7 MS. GOMEZ: I mean, this is, the City just 8 provided an example response. If you guys agree with it, then you can accept that 10 response. If you want to change it, you can 11 change it. 12 MS. BRAVO: I would suggest changing it, 13 because where it talks about, these terms are 14 above market but close to the 3.9 million appraisal, I don't feel comfortable presenting 15 16 that 3.9 million appraisal as the true number. 17 If you want to take an average of the three 18 appraisals or something like that, but I don't 19 like, in that response, referring to that 3.9

three or take the middle ground one, but -
MS. GOMEZ: Or do you want to just stop it

at, "These terms are above market value,"

period?

million appraisal, because I don't think it's

valid. If you want to take an average of the

20

21

2.2

23

24

1	MS. BRAVO: We can stop there, if you want,
2	but reference to that 3.9 million dollar
3	appraisal that is out of whack, I don't think
4	it's good to do.
5	CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Well, the estimated
6	market value, the market value on this property
7	should be residential, right?
8	MR. ROBERTS: Yes.
9	CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: So we shouldn't be
10	looking at the commercial aspect of it or the
11	change in zoning, based on the question that
12	we're being asked and tasked to do. I mean,
13	you guys provided it as informational and it
14	might be able to justify the purchase price,
15	but from our purposes, we should look at this
16	property based on residential appraisals.
17	MR. ROBERTS: Okay.
18	CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: And I believe that our
19	recommendation should be, you know, did the
20	City get two appraisals, residential
21	appraisals, to value this property? Which, in
22	this case, we got three.
23	MR. ROBERTS: Yes.
24	CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Okay.
25	MS. GOMEZ: So maybe we remove that part of

```
1
         the sentence, just put a period after, "value,"
 2
         right, on the response?
 3
             CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ:
                                  Yes.
 4
             MS. GOMEZ: Right there. And then just
5
         take that out, because --
 6
             MS. GOLDSTEIN: We can adjust the question,
7
         as well.
8
             MS. GOMEZ: Not the question.
9
             CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ:
                                  The response.
10
             MS. GOLDSTEIN: The response? Okay.
11
             CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Yeah, so that's what
12
         we're doing right now. I'm taking out the part
13
         about commercial, because I don't think that
14
         that's what the question asked us to look at.
             And if we look at it as only in the sense
15
16
         that the City got two appraisals, in this case,
17
         we got three appraisals, and the residential
18
         appraisals came in at, what, 1.3, 3.4 and 1.9?
             MS. GOLDSTEIN: I think we should state
19
20
         that the Committee feels we should be looking
21
         at the residential appraisals.
2.2
             MR. ROBERTS: Well, we can change the first
23
         sentence, where I have the 1.8 and the 3.9. We
24
         can change that to, the residential appraised
25
         value was between 1.3 and 3.4. We can change
```

1	that.
2	CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: And why would you not
3	include the 1.9, since we got that appraisal?
4	MR. ROBERTS: Well, it's between.
5	MS. GOMEZ: It's between. We're saying it
6	was between 1.3 and 3.4 as a residential use.
7	MR. PAREDES: Is the two-year lease free of
8	rent?
9	MR. ROBERTS: Yes.
10	MR. PAREDES: So it's a pre-sale type of
11	thing?
12	MR. ROBERTS: Yes.
13	MR. HOLIAN: There's two components to
14	this. One is to answer the question, and Two
15	is to explain, because theoretically, "Is the
16	lease consistent with the property appraisal as
17	required," the answer there is, yes, correct,
18	and then we're just adding more information
19	relative to the appraisal?
20	MR. ROBERTS: It's however you want to do
21	it. The Chair
22	MS. GOLDSTEIN: I mean, I think we should
23	add commentary to be helpful.
24	MR. HOLIAN: That's what I think. I mean,
25	but the answer to the question is very simple,

did we get two appraisals? The answer is, yes.

Then we want our disclaimer of why we made our decision or explain the 1.9 and so on and so forth. That's what we need to clarify, how we want to explain down the road, when someone says, "Oh, they got an appraised value of 1.3 and 3.4 and 1.9 and they bought it for four million dollars."

MS. GOLDSTEIN: That's not our job, to explain that.

 $\ensuremath{\mathsf{MR}}.$ HOLIAN: Then I think we just answer the question.

CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Yeah.

MS. GOLDSTEIN: Because I think that it's the job of the City Manager to explain to the Commission what the purposes of buying this property is, why we would pay more than the appraised value, and go from there. And then it's our job to inform our Commissioner on what our opinion is on it, and then they can act as they want, but we're assessing the financial -- whether they've properly researched the financial aspects of the deal as presented.

MR. HOLIAN: So then the answer, we just answer the question. We don't need to get into

2.2

anything else.

2.2

Put, yes, we got two appraisals, and that's it. So all of the rest of this, I don't think we need.

MR. ROBERTS: So at the end of the three questions, you're going to make a motion and you can structure that motion to include whatever additional information you'd like, and that motion will be read to the Commission.

MS. BRAVO: I'd prefer to have an explanation, a little bit of an explanation than just say, yes.

MR. HOLIAN: That was my point. Are we just answering the question or are we going to put --

CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: We can. We start with, yes, and then we can put the appraised value of the site was between the 1.3 and the 3.4, and if we want to add texture, we can say that the first two appraisals had a wide variance. A third appraisal was conducted, and all three are being taken into consideration.

MS. GOLDSTEIN: They can see that. I think we should add that the Committee -- we feel that although commercial -- although

institutional and residential appraisals were obtained, it is recommended we focus the market value of the property based upon the residential estimates.

CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: We can do that on the motion at the end. I think we make a motion at the end whether we recommend the purchase or we don't recommend the purchase. Then, at the end, we can actually put it all of our texture on it.

Because right now we'll answer the first three questions. Did we get the appraisal?

Yes. We actually got a third. It was between such and such.

When we go to the third, Cheryl, which is, "Does the Committee recommend purchase of this as seen here," we can put in, you know, we do, we don't, and we feel this way because we want it to be looked as a residential property value --

MS. GOLDSTEIN: It doesn't ask you if you recommend it.

MS. GOMEZ: No, it's in the motion. You have to make a motion whether you recommend it or you don't.

2.2

1 MS. GOLDSTEIN: Okay.

2.2

CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Yeah. And in that, we'll make it as clear as possible on that one.

MS. GOLDSTEIN: Okay.

MS. GOMEZ: So for Question Number 1, for clarity, we're just going to say, yes. So the answer is just simply, yes. So we'll do yes and no answers to the questions.

CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Yeah.

MS. GOMEZ: The second question, then?

CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Okay. The second

question, "What is the immediate impact on the

current fiscal budget and the long-term effect

future budgets, i.e., the long-term overall

effect on the City?"

Let me read the proposed answer, and then we can talk about it. "The City has 1.5 million in impact fees and has received a 1.5 million grant. The City will use another one million from the General Capital Improvement funds. The City will have to retrofit the building to meet the design of a fire station while preserving the residential facade which will require additional funding at the end of the two-year occupancy term; the future amount

is yet to be determined."

2.2

Okay. Hold on one second. The question, again, is, "What is the immediate impact on the current fiscal budget and the long-term effect on future budgets?"

I'll start, if that's okay with you guys, that last line where we have "future amount is yet to be determined," I would have appreciated an estimate there on what it's going to take to retrofit that building, and to answer this question, we would need that, to be able to determine what the long-term overall effect is on the City.

MR. ROBERTS: So the number that was given by the Fire Department, which they said they're not holding -- they said, "Don't quote me on it," is 500,000.

CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: But for our case, we're going to go on the record, and the Fire Department doesn't develop -- I mean, they specialize in this, so they have information on what it takes to build the fire station --

MR. ROBERTS: So, remember, we don't even have a signed LOI yet. This is going to your Board first as a consideration, before we even

1	get to LOIs. So all of these components have
2	to go into it. So we haven't ordered any
3	inspections or anything. This is, again, not
4	even an LOI.
5	CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: I understand, but we're
6	tasked with this
7	MR. HOLIAN: Agreed, but we can't answer
8	that question.
9	MS. GOLDSTEIN: But you're saying that the
10	future amount is yet to be determined.
11	MS. BRAVO: Right. So that's what we're
12	answering.
13	MS GOMEZ: So we're answering that it's yet
14	to be determined.
15	MR. HOLIAN: Okay.
16	MR. PAREDES: Based on what you explained
17	on the one and a half million dollar grant,
18	it's for this purpose, and I think it should be
19	clarified that that is for this purpose of this
20	Cartagena.
21	MS. BRAVO: And it most be used within
22	three years.
23	CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Earmarked. So the City
24	has a 1.5 million in Impact Fees and received a
25	1.5 million grant earmarked for purchase of a

1	property with a passive park, right?
2	MS. GOMEZ: No passive park, but, yeah.
3	CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Park and fire station.
4	MS. GOMEZ: Or earmarked for this purpose.
5	CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Yeah, earmarked for
6	this purpose.
7	MS. GOMEZ: It may be simpler.
8	CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Okay.
9	MR. HOLIAN: So if you're reading this, and
10	Joe Citizen in Coral Gables, the long-term
11	overall effect on the City, that future amount
12	is yet to be determined, we're buying a piece
13	of property that's valued two million dollars
14	over what we think it is, but
15	MS. GOLDSTEIN: It's going to be a lot less
16	than building a fire station.
17	MR. HOLIAN: Oh, no, I completely agree
18	with you.
19	MR. PAREDES: You can put, preliminarily
20	it's estimated at 500 a year.
21	MS. BRAVO: I'd rather not put a number,
22	because that is so
23	MS. GOLDSTEIN: I mean, people can know how
24	many square feet the house is, right, to
25	renovate a house, you know, which can be

1	from
2	MR. KLEIMAN: The estimate that the
3	firefighters gave us was 400,000 for
4	construction in 2021.
5	MR. HOLIAN: You know what you can build
6	for \$400,000? A garage.
7	MR. KLEIMAN: No. We're not building a
8	house. All we're doing is taking this house
9	and making it habitable for it's small.
10	It's a substation. There's only going to be a
11	few firemen there. It's a very small
12	substation. It's not for a large area.
13	MR. HOLIAN: Should the firemen be
14	determining how much it will cost to retrofit a
15	building?
16	MR. KLEIMAN: No, they worked with Public
17	Works to determine these numbers.
18	CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Okay.
19	MS. GOLDSTEIN: My comment was, in the end,
20	it might be cheaper to knock it down and build.
21	MR. HOLIAN: I completely agree.
22	MR. ROBERTS: And this is a substation.
23	This is not intended to be like
24	MS. GOLDSTEIN: No, but I'm saying
25	CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: A quick question on a

```
1
         substation. People will stay there 24/7?
 2
             MR. ROBERTS: Yes.
 3
             CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Okay. Great.
                                                 So there
 4
         will be a responsive --
 5
             MR. HOLIAN: They're going to eat, they're
         going to drink, they're going to be hanging out
 6
7
         in Cocoplum, waiting for someone to choke on a
8
         bone.
9
             MS. GOMEZ: In the budget book, we are
         showing the $400,000 in 2021. So should we
10
11
         just add that the future amount is estimated to
12
         be $400,000?
13
             MS. GOLDSTEIN: Yes.
14
             MR. HOLIAN: Per someone else.
15
             MS. BRAVO: If it's in the budget.
16
             MS. GOMEZ: It's in the budget book.
17
         that's the amount that they had given to us.
18
         And it's not just Fire coming up with a number.
19
         They've talked to Public Works.
20
             CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: And the operating cost
21
         of it yearly is also being budgeted, as well?
2.2
             MS. GOMEZ: It will be. It's not really
23
         for two or three years. We don't budget
24
         operating that far in advance.
25
             CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Okay. Perfect.
```

1	MS. GOMEZ: In the budget book, they gave
2	us \$400,000.
3	CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Okay. Does the
4	Committee feel comfortable, though, in saying
5	that the immediate impact on the current fiscal
6	budget and the long-term effects on the future
7	budget have been taken into account? Does the
8	group feel comfortable with that
9	MS. GOLDSTEIN: Yes.
10	CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: saying yes to this?
11	MS. GOMEZ: Yes, but this question actually
12	asks, what is.
13	CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: What is the immediate
14	impact?
15	MS. GOMEZ: So I think that we should leave
16	this exactly how it is, and then just the last
17	sentence, to say, estimated to be \$400,000.
18	CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: On the future amount?
19	MS. GOMEZ: Instead of saying that it's not
20	determined.
21	MR. PAREDES: But you've got to indicate
22	that the money
23	MS. GOMEZ: Money is earmarked for this
24	purpose, yes.
25	CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Do you want to read it

1 one more time? 2 MS. GOMEZ: Okay. So I said, "The City has 3 1.5 million in impact fees and has received a 4 1.5 million State grant earmarked for this 5 purpose. The City will use another one million dollars from General Capital Improvement funds. 6 7 The City will have to retrofit the building to 8 meet the design of a fire station while 9 preserving the residential facade which will require additional funding at the end of the 10 11 two-year occupancy term. That future amount is 12 estimated to be \$400,000." 13 MR. HOLIAN: Perfect. 14 MS. GOMEZ: Okay. Last one, because Cheryl 15 is leaving in two minutes. 16 CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: \$400,000, based on the 17 information provided by the Fire Department 18 along with Public Works. 19 Thank you. That would help me. We didn't 20 create that number. So we don't need to make a 21 motion. 2.2 So let's go to the third one. 23 MS. GOMEZ: So let's just say, as provided 24 by the City or you want to say Fire and Public 25 Works?

1 CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: No, by the City is okay 2 with me. 3 MS. GOMEZ: Okay. That's fine. 4 CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: "Considering the City's 5 Mission Statement, are there other alternatives to entering into the proposed transaction?" 6 7 Okay. Let me read the proposed response. 8 "This transaction is appropriate, as it is in 9 keeping with the City's vision of being a world 10 class city with world class services. By providing a fire station in this area enhances 11 12 the City's fire response time. There were alternative sites, but due to the uniqueness of 13 14 the site, such as the 17 foot elevation, three 15 road access, and adjacent green space uniquely 16 separates this site from the other 17 considerations." MS. GOLDSTEIN: I think, just to add one 18 19 more thing, would be the usage of the residence 20 that -- I don't know how to word it, but that 21 whole area is used as a major gathering place 2.2 for biking and running and water station, and 23 it would get nice use from that. 24 MS. GOMEZ: You mean, the park area? 25 MR. HOLIAN: Yeah.

MS. GOLDSTEIN: And would enhance the -
MS. GOMEZ: Availability of the park area

to residents.

MS. GOLDSTEIN: Walkers, runners and bikers.

CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Okay. In this one, personally I would like to start, clearly, yes, there are other alternatives. There's always alternatives. So we've all agreed here and talked at looking at other sites, the radius and whatever. I would start with that. And if you guys are okay with giving the explanation or the verbiage around the uniqueness of this site kind of justifying the premium that we're going to be paying, I'm okay with adding that language in, as well. How do you guys feel?

MS. GOLDSTEIN: That's fine.

MR. HOLIAN: Yes.

MR. PAREDES: I would strike out this, "By providing a fire station in this area enhances the City's" -- I just haven't seen that. I have trouble. But I think your suggestion is correct, yes, there are other alternatives, and we're paying high, because of the uniqueness of the site.

2.2

CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: And I don't think that it should go unsaid that the actual purchase of this property does help us with the annexation of -- with the annexation and response time, because I believe, I'm not a hundred percent sure at all about this, but I believe that we will have to make a justification to the County on whether or not we can annex that land and some of the things they look at are response time of Fire Department and police coverage.

So this is two-fold. It will help the existing area in the Gables and it will help us for our -- what is it, not a plea to the County, but what do we do to the County?

MS. GOMEZ: No, it's just really the residents have to decide if they --

CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: The residents. So it help us get the buy-in of the residents when we go to annex the area, but I'm open to discussion on this.

MS. GOMEZ: And as to Frank's point, the Fire Department, they believe it's going to increase response time, because they will get down there quicker. Right now it takes them longer to get there. Physically, they're not

2.2

1	close enough to that area. So it will get them
2	there quicker.
3	MS. GOLDSTEIN: I think it's more traffic.
4	If you just look at there's a fire what's
5	the station down by Red Road?
6	MR. ROBERTS: Fire Station 3.
7	MS. GOLDSTEIN: What's the mileage between
8	Fire Station 3 and this location?
9	MR. ROBERTS: The problem is that we only
10	have one artery coming into that area.
11	MS. GOLDSTEIN: I understand that, but
12	what's the mileage?
13	MR. HOLIAN: A mile or two miles, maybe.
14	It's not far.
15	MR. ROBERTS: So whenever they're analyzing
16	these deals, they have to look at the worst
17	case scenario, and so the worst case scenarios
18	are based upon congestion, when school is in
19	session in the morning.
20	MR. PAREDES: Have we even done an incident
21	rate in that underserved area?
22	MR. ROBERTS: Not yet.
23	MR. PAREDES: You just cited one case,
24	which is sad, and you're right, if you're the
25	family, you're tormented, but how many of those

1 are there a year? How many of those are there? 2 Has that been done to justify the pursuit of 3 this property and paying more? 4 MR. ROBERTS: So the response from Fire, I'll tell you, and that's a very delicate 5 question, I'll tell you, because there is no 6 7 value -- there is substantial value to one life. So if one life is lost as a result of 8 9 that, that's sufficient for the Fire Department 10 to want to have something there, but to answer 11 your question, the area itself -- this analysis 12 of the underserved area is based upon that 13 response. 14 MS. GOLDSTEIN: And the liability for the City is less than -- the one million dollar 15 16 that it is going to cost the City to purchase 17 it, the net one million, is probably justified. 18 MR. PAREDES: I am very skeptical that the 19 residents will allow this to happen. 20 MR. HOLIAN: That's not our problem. 21 MR. GOMEZ: Then that has to be determined. 2.2 MR. PAREDES: It's not our problem. 23 MR. HOLIAN: They're going to let it 24 happen, but they're going to tighten the screws 25 to whatever they want built.

```
1
             CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ:
                                  Okay.
                                         So the only
 2
         thing we added was a, yes; an affirmative, yes,
 3
         to there are alternatives.
             MS. GOMEZ: Okay. So it's a, yes.
 4
 5
         yes, there are always the alternatives, and
         then continue, "This transaction is
 6
 7
         appropriate, as it is in keeping with the
8
         City's vision of being a world class city with
         world class services." Whether we're keeping
         or not, I don't know, "By providing a fire
10
11
         station in this area enhances the fire response
12
                There were alternative sites, but due to
         time.
13
         the uniqueness of the site, such as the 17 foot
14
         elevation, three road access and adjacent green
         space uniquely separates this site from other
15
16
         considerations."
             Additionally, availability of park area to
17
         the residents in that area is --
18
19
             MR. PAREDES: Encouraged.
20
             MS. GOLDSTEIN: Desired or welcomed.
21
             MR. PAREDES: Welcomed, appreciated.
2.2
             MS. GOMEZ: Is welcomed or will receive
23
         lots of usage, I don't know.
24
             CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Supported.
25
             Okay. One thing, and this is a small
```

1	thing, the City's mission statement, a world
2	class city with world class service, aren't we
3	a world class city with a hometown feel?
4	MS. GOMEZ: Yeah, but that's the vision.
5	But the mission is to honor our history by
6	providing exceptional services that enhance the
7	quality of the life for the community. That's
8	mission. So we didn't restate the mission
9	here. We're just saying that we will provide
10	the service and the quality for our community.
11	MS. GOLDSTEIN: I make a motion on the
12	questions, that we accept our responses as
13	we've edited them.
14	CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Yeah. I don't think we
15	need to do that, because I think we're
16	correcting them here. So the answer that will
17	go in will be our edited answers.
18	MS. GOLDSTEIN: Are you asking for
19	agreement from the group that we're
20	MS. GOMEZ: You're okay with the edited?
21	MS. GOLDSTEIN: Yes.
22	MR. PAREDES: We're fine with that.
23	CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: With the edited ones.
24	MR. PAREDES: We're fine with the answers.
25	MS. GOMEZ: So now we need a motion as to

1	your recommendation.
2	CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Yes.
3	MR. ROBERTS: And that can have as many
4	components to it as you'd like.
5	MS. GOMEZ: So who is going to make the
6	motion?
7	MR. HOLIAN: What's the motion for? To
8	move forward?
9	MS. GOMEZ: To see whether or not, as a
10	Board, do you recommend moving forward with
11	this transaction?
12	MR. HOLIAN: Yes, we do. You want to make
13	a motion?
14	MS. GOLDSTEIN: You make the motion.
15	MR. HOLIAN: So my name is on it. I make a
16	motion that we move forward with the
17	recommendations that were presented today for
18	the project 7000 Old Cutler Road as Fire
19	Station 4.
20	MS. GOLDSTEIN: I'll second it.
21	MR. ROBERTS: Thank you.
22	CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Okay. All in favor?
23	Aye.
24	MS. GOLDSTEIN: Aye.
25	MR. HOLIAN: Aye.

```
MR. PAREDES:
1
                           Aye.
 2
             MS. GOMEZ: One no.
 3
             CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: One opposed?
 4
             MS. GOMEZ: Uh-huh.
             CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Okay. I've never had
5
         that, so I didn't put it there.
6
7
             MS. GOMEZ: No, I'll put it on here.
8
             MS. GOLDSTEIN: Okay. Sorry, is that it on
9
         this?
10
             MS. GOMEZ: Yes.
11
             CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: I have to leave, but
12
         can I just bring up my issue -- not issue, but
13
         my --
14
             CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Of course. Concern?
             MS. GOLDSTEIN: Concern.
15
16
             CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Perfect.
             MS. GOLDSTEIN: So, first of all, as
17
18
         always, Keith and your team, the work that you
19
         do --
20
             MR. HOLIAN: Spectacular.
21
             MS. GOLDSTEIN: Yes.
2.2
             Diana, you're in there, too.
23
             I think, from an overall vision for the
24
         City, there comes to mind the funding of the
25
         pension. Am I saying it correctly?
```

```
1
             MS. GOMEZ:
                          Uh-huh.
 2
             MR. KLEIMAN: Uh-huh.
             MS. GOLDSTEIN: And I feel that it should
 3
 4
         be more and more aggressively funded and that
 5
         we should have a discussion about that, and we
         should be -- I feel, as representing the
 6
 7
         citizens of Coral Gables, that it's the
8
         responsible thing to do, to fund it more,
         because we know these employees are retiring,
10
         and it's not funded to the level it should be
11
         at.
12
             MR. KLEIMAN: So we actually took a big
13
         step in this budget.
14
             MS. GOLDSTEIN: I know you did.
15
             MR. KLEIMAN: We increased it by 1.2
         million dollars.
16
17
             MS. GOLDSTEIN:
                              I do.
18
             MR. KLEIMAN: Which has three components.
19
         So, in the past, you know, we implemented a 401
20
         plan as an alternative, which is getting great
21
         acceptance, and so that reduces future risk,
2.2
         because the new employees, most of them are
23
         going -- not most of them, I think 45 or 50
24
         percent --
                          50 percent.
25
             MS. GOMEZ:
```

MR. KLEIMAN: 50 percent are going to the 401, which is a good reduction in risk. So up until FY18, the entire payment that we said we were going to make included the cost of the 401. For FY19, we pulled that out and we added that cost. So now, let's say, three or four hundred thousand dollars is going to the pension, as opposed to going to the 401 and we added money for that.

MS. GOLDSTEIN: And how much are we still under?

MS. GOMEZ: So we're at about -- the total unfunded liability is 227 million dollars. We are about 61 percent funded. In this coming budget, we're going to be sending about 2.1 million dollars above and beyond the amount that we have to fund. We are sending an additional 2.1 million dollars to keep moving with reducing the unfunded liability.

One of the things that kind of took us off our track this year is that we did have a lawsuit settlement for a prior year's cost of living increases, where the City settled with a class action suit that we had, and so it increased the required contribution by two

2.2

million dollars. So we would have sent 4.1 million dollars extra, but because that liability increased, we don't have another two million dollars to just put into the pension.

Now, although I agree we need to get to a point of a larger funding --

MR. KLEIMAN: We are adding the CPI.

MS. GOMEZ: Right. Right. So we are making strides in everything that we're doing to send additional funds to the pension and we are making our requirements.

MS. GOLDSTEIN: I'm not doubting that, but the way you get more money, right -- so you've done this -- the revenue comes from taxes -- with the amount that you're looking at.

MR. KLEIMAN: Right. And it's a good point you're bringing up, but just think about, again, we have kept the same tax rate, which technically is a tax increase, because the values have gone up. So the average household is going to pay maybe a hundred dollars more of the Coral Gables piece of the whole tax bite, but we only netted about 3.3 to 3.4 million dollars out of that.

So think about it, we're putting 1.2 of it

2.2

```
1
         toward the pension, and the rest, there are
 2
         other things that the City just has to do.
 3
             MS. GOLDSTEIN: I understand that, and I
         think it's a political thing, that that is just
 4
 5
         staying the same and we have our values
 6
         increasing and so we have -- we're going to
 7
         stay with the status quo, and I am of the
8
         opinion that at some point the Commission and
9
         whoever is Mayor is going to need to take the
10
         stand of, you know, huh, maybe half a percent
11
         increase, is that really -- you know, we can do
12
         a lot with that. What is a half a percent?
13
         How much money would that be?
14
             MR. KLEIMAN: We don't have that here, but
15
         we can get that for you.
16
             MS. GOLDSTEIN: I think that's just in
17
         general.
18
             MR. KLEIMAN: One hundredth of a mil, I
19
         think, brings in about $140,000.
20
             MS. GOMEZ: So it will be five times that,
21
         right?
2.2
             MR. HOLIAN: So four million --
23
             MS. GOLDSTEIN: I'm just saying, in an
24
         overall thing, you know --
25
             MR. KLEIMAN: Is it palatable for the
```

1 Commission to do that? Again, your 2 recommendation to your Commissioner really sets 3 things in motion. That's what you're here for. MS. GOLDSTEIN: That's why I'm bringing up 5 the point, because I think overall, from the City's standpoint, that that is -- that's 6 7 something that we need to do. 8 MS. GOMEZ: Right. 9 MR. KLEIMAN: Uh-huh. MS. GOMEZ: And so last week we had a 10 11 Pension Board Meeting, and the Commission came 12 to the Pension Board Meeting, four members of 13 the Commission, and there was this discussion 14 about how we're doing things going forward and all of that, and just so that you know, the 15 16 Commission did say that they are not planning 17 to raise taxes for this purpose. Just so that 18 you're aware, but you can discuss it -- that 19 was a comment that was made by one or two of 20 the Commissioners. 21 MS. GOLDSTEIN: What other ways would there 2.2 be to get more money to go there? 23 CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: The market improves. 24 MS. GOMEZ: How would you? So it has to 25 come from somewhere, so something else would

1 have to give in order to send additional, and I 2 think that the method -- so we've made a lot of 3 pension reform and we're holding strong to not 4 increasing pensionable benefits when we're 5 doing contracts. 6 MR. KLEIMAN: And we also covered the 7 assumption change. 8 MS. GOMEZ: Right. 9 MS. GOLDSTEIN: And how do we compare in 10 funding the pension to other cities? 11 MR. HOLIAN: That's surprising. That's 12 going to surprise you. 13 MS. GOMEZ: I mean, no. According to the 14 Pension Board actuary, he would say that his clients in Florida are at about 80 percent 15 16 funded. So we are not in a good funding 17 position compared to others. 18 MS. GOLDSTEIN: That's fine. 19 MS. GOMEZ: But the thing is that, I think 20 we've done everything from a structural

MS. GOMEZ: But the thing is that, I think we've done everything from a structural standpoint to reduce benefits, pension reform, we're not adding more. We are committing to send more and every availability of sending more, and the way we're paying it -- so we're doing a lot that we can do without actually

21

2.2

23

24

1	allocating even more funds toward it.
2	MR. PAREDES: So correct me if I'm wrong,
3	200 million is our pension liability and based
4	on everything give or take, 200 million.
5	Only sixty percent is funded, but the
6	MS. GOMEZ: No, 550 is the total liability.
7	MR. PAREDES: Oh, 550 is the total.
8	MS. GOMEZ: Or whatever, maybe 560, and
9	then 227 is what we have unfunded.
10	MR. KLEIMAN: Unfunded.
11	MR. PAREDES: Okay. But the 500 is staying
12	relatively stable, because of everything that
13	you're doing? We're not adding new people,
14	we're not giving
15	MS. GOMEZ: No, we are adding new people.
16	People have the option to come in.
17	MR. PAREDES: But they're going into the
18	401
19	MS. GOMEZ: Some people are going into the
20	401. Fifty percent of the people are going
21	into 401.
22	MR. PAREDES: So the question is, to make
23	sure that the rate of total liability
24	MS. GOMEZ: We want to get to 100 percent
25	in an ideal world, right? Right.

1 MR. PAREDES: There is no perfect world. 2 MR. HOLIAN: We just bought a piece of 3 property for four million bucks. 4 MR. PAREDES: The rate of that increase, of 5 that total liability, versus the rate of our unfunded, at least we're catching up to the --6 7 MS. GOMEZ: Well, right. So we were doing 8 real well with that, and then we had a lawsuit 9 settlement that increased that by 14.7 million dollars, and so --10 11 MR. PAREDES: The total liability? 12 MS. GOMEZ: The total liability, and so it 13 went truly to the unfunded. So our unfunded 14 otherwise would have been 15 million dollars less and we would have been higher funded. We 15 16 would have been like 64 percent funded. 17 MR. PAREDES: The critical components for a 18 Commissioner or for what Cheryl was talking 19 about is, making sure that the rate of total 20 liability is not greater than the unfunded part 21 of it, so that you're funding that, you're 2.2 catching up. 23 MS. GOMEZ: Yes. 24 MR. PAREDES: The question is, we've got to 25 catch up.

Correct. And so there's always 1 MS. GOMEZ: 2 different variables and that happens. 3 investments -- if the market does horribly as of September 30th, we're going to have a loss. 4 5 MS. BRAVO: Right. That is something that we 6 MS. GOMEZ: 7 cannot really -- we don't know, right. 8 the other factors, we're trying to be 9 conservative in the assumptions that are being 10 Now, the more conservative you become, used. 11 the more expensive it is on the onset. Like 12 they recommended to go -- the Pension Board 13 actuaries recommended to go to seven percent on 14 market rate assumption. We're at 7.65. reduced it from 7.75 to 7.65. 15 16 MR. HOLIAN: That's what caused the whole 17 problem.

MS. GOMEZ: But then that would add 35, 40 million to the unfunded. So the thing is, when we don't make our investment return, it's not like we don't make it by like .5 percent, we don't make it because it's like one percent. So we either make like ten or twelve percent or we make like next to nothing.

MR. PAREDES: But new employees, we're just

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

1 not -- I want to make sure that we don't try --2 we have to be competitive, but we don't try to 3 add to our total liability by using a 401. Private entity has gone to 401-Ks. There's no 5 retirement benefits for anybody. 6 MS. GOMEZ: Right. As a governmental 7 organization, in the public safety side, 8 pension is the way. It's just, it is, and we 9 will not retain or recruit anybody for public 10 safety if we don't have a pension plan. 11 On the general employee side, we do have 12 the 401 option, but it is just an option, and 13 only 50 percent of the people are taking it. The new people don't really cost us that much. 14 They don't add to the unfunded. The unfunded 15 16 is an old bill that we have to pay. 17 MR. KLEIMAN: The general cost is about the same as the 401-K. 18 19 MS. GOMEZ: Right. But, now, should the market tank tomorrow, then the new people are 20 21 causing me an unfunded, because there's a loss 2.2 based on those new people. 23 MR. KLEIMAN: Especially if we don't cover 24 those --25 MS. GOMEZ: That change, right.

1 MR. KLEIMAN: And we're doing our best to 2 cover those changes.

MS. GOMEZ: So the idea is that by getting people into the 401, the future uncertain liability is taken care of.

MS. BRAVO: It's diminished.

MS. GOMEZ: Maybe it's a little more expensive or no real savings right now, but in the future, if we have everybody in the 401, then the potential of something going wrong is less, because there's less people in it.

So it's a balancing. I think we are doing a good job of addressing it. We're not turning a blind eye to it. There was drastic pension reform made in the past few years.

MR. HOLIAN: It's a lot better than it was ten years ago.

MS. GOMEZ: Correct. Now, but,
technically, no. Twelve years ago, it was 105
percent funded or whatever it was, 102 percent
funded, right, but then we had all of these
market crashes and all of these things, and
benefits had not been reduced, and so they
multiplied and they made the funded just jump
and jump and jump every year.

2.2

1	MR. HOLIAN: You can say it's funded, but
2	have to change your assumptions. Instead of
3	going to seven percent, say 8.25 percent.
4	MS. GOMEZ: But then it's not realistic,
5	either.
6	MR. HOLIAN: No.
7	MS. GOMEZ: So we want to have a balance of
8	conservative
9	MR. PAREDES: It's in your benefits. Where
10	the City can control it is in the benefit side
11	of it. That's it.
12	MS. GOMEZ: Exactly. And so we're not
13	adding any in the last couple of years of
14	contract negotiations, we have not been adding
15	pension benefits that would adversely affect
16	the pension.
17	So there's always going to be, if you give
18	a raise, it affects the pension, but that's
19	normal.
20	MR. HOLIAN: And the overtime, the
21	reduction of the overtime and shifting people
22	with extra overtime
23	MS. GOMEZ: Right, and it's not pensionable
24	and all of this other stuff. We've done a lot
25	to stop the bleeding, for lack of a better way

1 of saying it, but now we have to catch up and 2 we're not going to pay it off in a year or two. 3 It's going to take us fifteen years. MS. BRAVO: Are we even going to get there 5 in fifteen years, is the question? 6 MR. HOLIAN: Some people are going to die. 7 MS. GOMEZ: If all of the assumptions are 8 relatively met, yes. I mean, the math works. 9 As long as we don't have a huge loss. But will 10 there be a market downturn at some point, of course there will be. 11 12 MR. HOLIAN: And what really happens wonderfully is that if you're making your 13 14 pension contribution and you have a great market year, you still make it. In years past, 15 16 sometimes what happened, not in the City, but 17 the market would be up fifteen percent, "Well, 18 we don't even need to fund it this year because 19 we made 15 percent." 20 MS. GOMEZ: We won't do that, right. 21 have a Resolution that we're going to fund at 2.2 least this much. 23 MR. HOLIAN: Other entities will do that. 24 They'll say, "We made 15 percent. We don't 25 need to put ten million in. We'll only put in

1	six million." That's part of the problem.
2	MR. PAREDES: Countering that is the life
3	expectancy of people. You retire at 50 and
4	you're living until 90 and you have your pay.
5	CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Guys, I'm really sorry.
6	I'm appointing John as Vice Chair. I'm
7	stepping out.
8	MR. HOLIAN: Okay. What do I have to do?
9	MS. GOMEZ: Just continue the meeting.
10	CHAIRMAN MENENDEZ: Just continue on.
11	MR. HOLIAN: Okay. Do we have anything
12	else we want to say about the pension?
13	Good. Let's move on.
14	MS. GOMEZ: The budget, just the overall
15	budget presentation, Keith, and the internal
16	audit update.
17	MR. ROBERTS: I'm going to excuse myself.
18	MR. KLEIMAN: Okay. So the budget for FY19
19	is 197 million dollars. It's very comparable
20	to what it was last year. However, just if you
21	take a look at your budget books, you will see
22	the FY18.
23	MS. GOMEZ: What page?
24	MR. KLEIMAN: It's my Page 46.
25	MR. PAREDES: 45 is the big pretty picture.

1 Right. It may be a couple of MR. KLEIMAN: 2 pages off because I have a new --3 MR. HOLIAN: What section would it be in? MR. KLEIMAN: In the Financial Data 4 5 section. Go to the parchment paper. 6 MR. HOLIAN: Got it. 7 MR. KLEIMAN: The first, you're going to 8 see a graphic that's just a fund structure. If 9 you go one, two and three pages past, Summary of Total Revenues and Transfers from Reserves. 10 11 MR. HOLIAN: Got it. 12 MR. KLEIMAN: Okay. So the bottom line, 13 again, your number may be slightly off from 14 mine, because that was a draft, but we have done some minor changes and we have a final 15 16 book, which you'll get, if not tomorrow, you'll 17 be getting a delivery on Monday. 18 The total budget is 197.2 million dollars, 19 bottom line. I think the operating revenues are 181.2 million dollars. 20 21 Now, the big difference, if you compare it 2.2 to the previous year's budget, is that budget 23 includes reappropriations from prior years, and 24 you can see that sort of a little below the

middle of the page. It says, "Prior year

reappropriations." They're about 50 million dollars. I don't know if you can see that.

So that is the difference, and I am sort of contemplating, though we haven't really discussed it, to pull out the reappropriations, because they're not a great measure. They sort of skew what the previous year is. We would leave it. It would still be the amended budget, but pull out the reappopriations, to make it more of an apples to apples comparison. I've been toying with that idea, but I have not really talked to Diana about it yet.

Now, if you turn a few pages further, it's my Page 56, it's probably going to be -- flip the pages a little bit. After that. Keep going. Keep going. One more after that.

Okay. And that is the Summary of Total Expenditures and Transfers to Reserves. Now, we always present a balanced budget. Again, it's 197.2 million dollars, and here's where you can see, the top section, Operating Expense. Now, here, you can see it's very comparable. So the FY19 estimate is 166.4, compared to FY18 of 165.9.

There's not a lot of reappropriation in the

2.2

operating side of FY18, so you can see the numbers are fairly consistent. If you did pull out some of the reappropriations, you would get the differences between the additional revenues that we got for FY19. It's a small amount of money. It's just several million dollars, as opposed to fifty.

Now, if you go to the next section, that's the Capital Improvement Budget, same page, and, again, you're going to see the reappropriations staring you in the face there. Total capital improvements for FY19 is almost 20 million dollars, and you'll see FY18 is showing 73 million dollars. That's most of it. That's 50 million dollars of reappropriations right there.

Now, you're going to see another change, if you look into the next section right below that, Debt Service. You can see the debt service rising from 8.3 million dollars to 10.5 million dollars and that difference there is strictly due to the new public safety building.

MR. PAREDES: That was funded by the Sunshine State debt --

MR. KLEIMAN: Well, that's how we acquired

2.2

```
1
                    We went through Sunshine State.
         the bond.
 2
             MR. PAREDES:
                            Okay.
 3
             MR. KLEIMAN: But the debt service is being
 4
         paid for by a rate increase in parking fees.
 5
             Any question so far?
             MR. PAREDES: Yeah, a couple of points.
 6
7
         The value has increased of the properties by
8
         what percentage?
9
             MS. KLEIMAN: Five percent.
10
             MR. PAREDES: Five percent.
11
             MR. HOLIAN: Which property are we talking
12
         about?
13
             MS. GOMEZ: Property values in general.
14
             MR. KLEIMAN: Yeah, taxable value.
15
             MR. PAREDES: And actual for this year,
16
         we're okay? This year, we're meeting budget or
17
         we're ahead of budget or --
18
             MS. GOMEZ: Current year.
19
             MR. KLEIMAN: Uh-huh.
20
             MR. PAREDES: Because we're almost there,
21
         at the end of the year. So we're fine?
2.2
             MR. KLEIMAN: Yes.
23
             MR. PAREDES: Because this only presents a
24
         budgeted budget and doesn't give you any
25
         indication of that.
```

1	MR. KLEIMAN: Right.
2	Any questions so far?
3	Okay. So we can go to the Capital section.
4	It's my Page 60, so it's a few pages on.
5	So now you can see what we're funding. The
6	middle column, you see "FY19 new funding,"
7	which is what we're doing for FY19.
8	MS. GOMEZ: So these are all of the capital
9	projects listed here, and anything that is
10	getting new funding. Some of them are
11	existing. They've had money in the previous
12	years, but it requires new funding in the
13	MR. KLEIMAN: Right. So some projects are
14	brand new for FY19, and then some projects have
15	prior year funding and we're adding additional
16	money to it.
17	MR. HOLIAN: Where are we with IT? It
18	seems like we're always spending a boatload of
19	money on IT.
20	MR. KLEIMAN: Yes. IT was one of our first
21	capital improvement matrices, where we looked
22	at every asset component of IT, and said, okay,
23	what would it take for you to replace all of
24	your items on time.
25	MR. HOLIAN: Right. And assets are

1	expiring and we'e on board with that.
2	MR. KLEIMAN: Actually, we're on board with
3	that. And everything we're doing with public
4	safety has a huge IT component. So that's why
5	the IT budget is growing, completely, all
6	public safety, especially police. It's not so
7	much on the fire side, but the police side,
8	they're all new systems and the City is right
9	on top of that.
10	MR. PAREDES: So that first line of 3.9
11	million dollars, we've got funds and we're
12	spending that, and that's IT?
13	MR. KLEIMAN: Yes. Right. That's some
14	prior year funding
15	MR. HOLIAN: Keith doesn't spend money he
16	doesn't have.
17	MR. KLEIMAN: No.
18	MR. PAREDES: No, but are we keeping
19	up-to-date with everything that's happening in
20	IT, both from a funding and spending aspect of
21	it?
22	MR. KLEIMAN: Yes.
23	MR. HOLIAN: I think that was a big
24	project. There's a time table for assets that
25	are expiring, right?

MR. KLEIMAN: Right.

2.2

MR. HOLIAN: And then they're budgeted so we're not going to walk into a \$500,000 unknown IT expense.

MR. KLEIMAN: No. No. Every IT asset is now looked at and budgeted for the future, and we have, truly, a great IT director, who is very progressive. He works well with us. He reviews every component of his budget and actually reduces his budget voluntarily for items that are no longer needed. So he's just a pleasure to work with.

Okay. Facility & Repairs. Now, as you know, the City has not taken care of its facilities in the past and we are playing catch-up. So, again, we have these other matrices. There's the roof, HVAC, elevator. Those are some of the major matrices to replace roofs, HVACs and elevators on time.

This year, we did a complete evaluation of all of the City's elevators and we increased the elevator matrix from originally, I think it was about 115,000 per year, and you can see now they're getting \$447,000.

Now, in FY19, we upped it a little bit,

because we're playing catch-up. It won't be that high on a regular basis, but we have to replace some elevators right away, because they have not been done in the past.

MR. HOLIAN: Some of them are spooky.

MR. PAREDES: But just a minor item, last year, you're carrying over 338 and you're funding 447.

MR. KLEIMAN: Right.

MR. PAREDES: Will you be able to spend the 786 all in one year to fix the elevators?

Those are the types of things -- you know, you keep appropriating, but you're not paying for them. You're not buying them. It's not happening.

So, in other words, you had a million seven sixty-six carried over from last year that you didn't spend, but it was appropriated. Now you're adding a million four and you're going to be able to spend 3.2 million in the next fiscal year?

MR. KLEIMAN: Yes. Like, for instance, on the elevators, the 338, it is completely available right now; however, it is already accounted for. We're going to be replacing two

2.2

1	of the elevators in the garages, and that 338
2	is going toward some of it. Some of the money
3	is going to come from the parking fund.
4	So, technically, this money, we have to
5	show it, because it's still in the system.
6	It's still showing it's available, but it's
7	already allocated.
8	MR. PAREDES: I mean, I'm just making sure
9	that you're spending as soon as the money is
10	available, so that you can
11	MR. KLEIMAN: Yes. The Commissioners are
12	very, very aware that capital
13	MR. PAREDES: Similar situation as the
14	pension. Let's make sure we don't dig a deeper
15	hole.
16	MR. KLEIMAN: Well, they were and that's
17	why we're playing catch-up on capital. That's
18	why the City is putting so much money in
19	capital every single year.
20	MR. HOLIAN: Which we never were playing
21	catch-up. We weren't even maintaining. We
22	weren't doing anything.
23	MR. KLEIMAN: There was no capital plan.
24	They didn't have one.
25	MR. HOLIAN: That's exactly right. "It

1	broke. Let's fix it."
2	MR. KLEIMAN: Right. It was putting out
3	fires, before.
4	MR. HOLIAN: Right.
5	MR. KLEIMAN: Now we're planning ahead.
6	So now you can go and you can see that
7	there are different categories, Historic
8	Facilities
9	MR. PAREDES: 800,000 to the Biltmore
10	Hotel. We're paying for that? Is that part of
11	our deal with them in the rental and all of
12	that stuff?
13	MR. KLEIMAN: Just recently. In the last
14	Commission Meeting, the Biltmore approached the
15	City and they are investing 25 million
16	dollars
17	MR. PAREDES: Yeah, it's in today's paper.
18	MR. KLEIMAN: Right. And so we are giving
19	them 800,000 a year until we give them in total
20	5.2 million dollars, and then that's going to
21	go away.
22	MS. GOMEZ: But the maximum that we give
23	them is 50 percent of what their revenues to
24	us, their rent payments to us, generate. Right
25	now it's estimated it's 1.6 each year that they

1	give us in rent payments.
2	MR. PAREDES: So we rebate them 50 percent
3	of the
4	MR. KLEIMAN: Until we've paid off 5.2
5	million dollars.
6	MS. GOMEZ: Right.
7	MR. KLEIMAN: So this 800,000 may go down.
8	MS. GOMEZ: Or up.
9	MR. KLEIMAN: Or up, right.
10	MR. HOLIAN: Just for clarity, they rent
11	the Biltmore facility for 1.6 million a year?
12	MR. KLEIMAN: No. No. That's our share of
13	their revenues. That's what we get.
14	MR. HOLIAN: So do they pay us otherwise or
15	that's all they pay us?
16	MR. KLEIMAN: No. They pay us that and
17	they pay for their own debt service. We have
18	some older debt, which they're paying the debt
19	service for that.
20	MR. HOLIAN: Okay. And what's that number?
21	MR. KLEIMAN: A quarter of a million
22	dollars. And once that debt is paid off, that
23	will stop.
24	MR. HOLIAN: So they pay the City,
25	arguably, just under two million dollars?

1	MS. GOMEZ: Yes.
2	MR. KLEIMAN: Well, it's 1.6, because,
3	again, the debt is a pass through. That just
4	goes right to pay off a debt.
5	MR. HOLIAN: It's a nice place to rent for
6	1.6 million dollars.
7	MR. PAREDES: Very nice.
8	MS. GOMEZ: Yeah. But it's revenue based.
9	So if they do well, then it goes up. If they
10	don't, then
11	MR. KLEIMAN: Right. And the goal is, with
12	the renovations
13	MR. PAREDES: And we rebate them 50
14	percent.
15	MS. GOMEZ: That's something that was just
16	approved by the City Commission in order for
17	them to do this capital renovations, but we
18	don't normally rebate them. For this program,
19	we're contributing up to 5.2 million dollars.
20	MR. KLEIMAN: Right.
21	Okay. So Motor Pool Capital Equipment,
22	similarly to the other capital classes, we're
23	replacing motor pool now on time, which we were
24	not doing before. When we first started, we
25	were only replacing 1.4 million per year, and

you can see the difference now of what we funded.

And this is now replacing. We're still playing catch-up. This could take another two to three years. When the matrices started, it was going to be three to five years to catch up. We have another two or three years to catch up, and then we should pretty much be on time.

Other categories, Parking Repairs, Parks and Recreation, now there you can see the second line down, Parks and Recreation Major Repairs, almost 1.4 million dollars going in. Every year, we're doing that. This is another capital matrix, which we looked at every single capital asset in our Park System, we costed it out, cost of replacement, its life cycle, and we came to the conclusion that around -- well, we started at 1.3 and we have a CPI on it every year.

So in FY19 we are giving them almost 1.4 million dollars, and all of that is planned in detail a few pages ahead. Actually, in your book, it wasn't there, but once you get your book, there is detail of the Parks Major Repair

2.2

```
1
         and where that 1.4 million is going. You can't
 2
         look in your book now. It wasn't in there.
 3
         was an oversight. But you will see it in the
 4
         book that you get either tomorrow or Monday.
 5
             Okay. Any questions so far?
             MS. BRAVO: Was the City of Coral Gables
 6
7
         taking on the whole high school track lighting
8
         or are we sharing that with the Public School
9
         System?
             MR. KLEIMAN: No, we're doing that. We're
10
11
         doing that.
12
             MS. BRAVO: But we don't own any of that.
13
         That's the --
14
             MR. KLEIMAN: No. We have a right to use
15
         the property for practices and things like
16
         that, and that area is weak in parks, so having
17
         that park lit up at night would allow it to be
18
         used for runners and walkers.
             MS. BRAVO: And that's all to be used by
19
20
         the citizens of the City?
21
             MR. KLEIMAN: Yes. It is a mutual
2.2
         agreement --
23
             MS. BRAVO: So it's open to them?
             MR. KLEIMAN: Yes.
24
25
             MR. HOLIAN: Do people rent space on that,
```

```
1
         because I see like workout groups and stuff?
 2
         Do they get a permit or anything to do that or
 3
         they just go and walk --
 4
             MR. KLEIMAN: On that school?
 5
             MR. HOLIAN: Yes.
 6
             MR. KLEIMAN: That I can't tell you.
         don't know.
7
8
             MR. HOLIAN: I'm just wondering, because
9
         they like run fitness programs over there and
         stuff.
10
             MR. KLEIMAN: If they do, they'll be
11
12
         renting it from the school, not from the City.
13
         Yeah, this is not a City property.
14
             MR. PAREDES: And the baseball field's got
15
         a lot of advertisement. I guess that's the
16
         fundraising --
17
             MR. HOLIAN: And Ransom Everglades, I
18
         think, replaced the track, because Ransom
19
         Everglades didn't have the facility, so I think
         they funded a bunch of -- that track being
20
21
         rebuilt.
2.2
             MR. KLEIMAN: Okay. So we'll be adding the
23
         lighting to it.
24
             MR. HOLIAN: LED, earth friend lighting, I
25
         assume?
```

1	MR. KLEIMAN: Yes.
2	MS. BRAVO: The Public Safety Improvements,
3	are we getting there now?
4	MR. KLEIMAN: Yeah. Go ahead.
5	MS. BRAVO: You've got Fire Station 4, half
6	a million
7	MR. KLEIMAN: That's the additional money.
8	MS. BRAVO: Well, it's going to cost us a
9	million extra.
10	MR. KLEIMAN: Right. It's going to cost us
11	a million, but that's next year. Let me take a
12	look.
13	If you flip the page and you get to the
14	Public Safety Section, you have the deal right
15	there. You look down, and you'll see, Fire
16	Station 4
17	MR. PAREDES: Purchase of the building.
18	MR. KLEIMAN: Purchase of Fire Station 4
19	building, there is the entire planned capital
20	project.
21	MR. PAREDES: Four million six.
22	MR. KLEIMAN: Right. Four million six
23	seventy and you'll see the entire thing that we
24	have. You see that seventeen zero nine of
25	prior year monies, 500,000 for FY19, next year

is the grant piece, in 2020, that two million sixty is grant piece and then the additional 500,000 to make the one million that we need. 60,000 is for possible design and then the 400,000 is the construction we discussed earlier.

What we try to do when we're planning capital projects is to smooth the costs. We try not to hit the ceiling in any one year. So we do our best. Sometimes it cannot be helped.

Like, for instance, in this year, if you look under Public Safety Building, we're adding two million dollars construction of new public safety building. The construction costs have gone up unexpectedly. So you'll see that we added this 2.365 million dollars in this fiscal year.

MR. HOLIAN: How is the project going over there?

MR. KLEIMAN: Well, they're expecting to break ground, I believe, in the winter of 2019. So this coming January or February.

MR. HOLIAN: There's always some scuttlebutt about that, that the Fire Department was complaining that they didn't

2.2

have showers for the Chief and that the car won't fit in the building, and you don't know what to believe.

MR. KLEIMAN: I think they've settled most of those issues. They kept coming back and forth to the Commission. And I believe, now they've gotten everybody on board. I don't want to speak for them, but that's my understanding.

So I don't know how much more detail you would like to go into. There's one more thing I'd like to show you that we're very, very proud of. I'll give you an example of it.

If you flip into the tab that is Community Recreation, right sort of in the middle of the back, and flip to the Tennis Center, okay, that's Division 6010, now you're going to see that is a change for FY19. The City has always had part-time employees.

Now every division has this. So the City has always had part-time employees and they've always been budgeted in one dollar amount.

Basically we sort of inherited that. It's been very frustrating for us not to know exactly what's going on. There were never positions

2.2

1 that we could budget. 2 So now we spent the last number of months 3 breaking out the part-time budget and now you 4 see it by position. 5 MS. BRAVO: That's great. 6 MR. KLEIMAN: Because we want complete 7 transparency. So now you're going to see the 8 title, you're going to see a column there that says "head count," HC, and then the FTEs. 9 10 are a percentage of what that is compared to a 11 full-time body. 12 So now it's much more realistic, and, 13 basically, now, when a position vacates, they 14 can put a form in, they sign it, they say that we want to replace this, and we know it's 15 16 It was very difficult to determine budgeted. what was budgeted and what was not before. 17 18 MR. PAREDES: So the big number there is the 120 Tennis Pro Commission. Is that worth 19 20 120? 21 MR. KLEIMAN: Right. Well --

MS. BRAVO: It's a percentage of what they generate. If they don't generate, they don't get it.

MR. HOLIAN: They're active. I drive by

2.2

23

24

there every day. That's how I go to work. And they've got a lot of activity over there.

MR. KLEIMAN: It's a very common thing for tennis pros in every City to have a small salary as an employee of the City, but then have a piece of the action.

MR. HOLIAN: And the whole little internal audit, where they were looking at the tennis facility and how they were doing refunds and things like that, that's all taken care of?

MR. KLEIMAN: Yes. And, actually, we have a status of that next, as soon as we're finished with the budget.

So this is the last thing I wanted to say.

We're very proud of adding this to the budget.

Cathy is thrilled now that this is in here. If
there's any questions, we can go into more
detail.

MR. HOLIAN: No.

MR. PAREDES: I would tell you, my congratulations to you guys. I think this is clearly well done. I want to highlight the Financial Excellence Goals. They're very nicely stated in the front, and your long range planning, very good.

2.2

So I just have a similar thought. You get lost in all this detail. You know, it's just amazing. You lose the forest for the trees in this concept. But the key is, the value of the taxes and you're paying for the services and people are happy.

MR. HOLIAN: You should bring in a budget from eight years ago and show what the budgets used to look like eight years ago. You could look at it, and we couldn't figure --

MS. GOMEZ: And so when we do the Budget
Workshop with the Commission, which is
scheduled for July 11th, we do try to summarize
those key points for the presentation to them.

MR. PAREDES: It's an elevator pitch.

MS. GOMEZ: Right. Well, I mean, it's about a thirty-minute, if they don't ask questions. The presentation itself is somewhere between twenty to thirty minutes from Keith, but it highlights everything in the budget.

Now, so the process right now is, we're printing the books. This is the budget, what we call the budget estimate. So it's just what we're estimating it to be. We had given you a

2.2

preview copy, which we're going to ask that we take back, and then we'll give you the real budget estimate book, and we'll deliver it either by the end of the day tomorrow or Monday.

MR. PAREDES: Can we get the executive summary, as opposed to the whole book, because I already got my guns as developed as I'm going to get them?

MS. GOMEZ: And so the idea, though, is that you have the full book should the Commissioners call you to ask you questions about, what do you think about this, what do you think about that, and the idea really is that if you have the opportunity, talk to your Commissioners, that's what they want of you, right. They want you to maybe look at this, and then, if you have any concerns or comments or questions or problems, that you reach out to them and you talk to them about it.

They're going to get the books by tomorrow evening. And then, again, we don't have a meeting on this until July 11th. We decided to do this earlier here just because of timing with the 4th of July holiday, which doesn't

2.2

allow another time before that Workshop for us to meet with you guys to see what your thoughts or concerns or questions may be.

So that's the goal of how we're doing it.

MR. KLEIMAN: But also, after you're finished with your books, if you don't want to keep them, please send them back to us.

MR. PAREDES: Yeah, because I don't have a way to shred them.

MR. KLEIMAN: If we don't give them out to somebody who actually is requestion one, we will shred it and we will reuse the binder. We pull out the pictures, so we save the City money, and we do recycle. We shred the document and recycle them. So we try to be as green as we possibly can.

MS. GOMEZ: Sure.

So after July 11th, there's nothing really in the budget until -- we work on the final budget after the Workshop, any feedback that we get, until September 13th, which is the first hearing where the Commission -- it's a public hearing regarding the budget, and then September 25th are the two hearings for the budget, where the public can speak as to budget

2.2

1 and all that. 2 So I would say that the Commissioners could 3 ask you questions at any time from July 1 that they get their book until September 25th. 4 5 MR. KLEIMAN: And feel sorry for me, 6 because I'll be spending my birthday at the 7 first hearing. (Discussion off the record.) 8 9 MS. GOMEZ: So the last item on the agenda 10 is a quick update on the Internal Audit side of 11 the house. 12 MR. KLEIMAN: And if you remember Elsie 13 Fuentes, she is our Internal Audit Coordinator 14 and Grant Coordinator. So she's going to run 15 through where we are. 16 MR. HOLIAN: My favorite is the oil and 17 gas, just for the record. 18 MS. DE BRUZOS FUENTES: Good morning, just 19 to give you a brief summary of all of the 20 internal audits performed by Pro that we have 21 completed to date and are currently in 2.2 progress. 23 So completed to date we have officially 24 four audits already done. The first one was

the network and data security testing back in

April 2017. That's not in the City's website, because of the sensitive information that has.

We have the next one, which is the user access control. The report was issued November 2017, and that is available in the City's website.

The cash management audit, that I think you were relating to, that was concluded on December 2017 and that is also on the City's website.

The last one has been the internal penetration testing, also from IT, and that was completed on January 2018, but less than two weeks ago we just finalized the report. That is not on the website either, because of how sensitive it is.

MR. PAREDES: Is there any problems in those, in the penetration, the phishing and all of the cyber security stuff that's going on?

MS. DE BRUZOS FUENTES: Right. In general, like Keith stated, the director there is very hands on and everyone there is very welcoming to all of the recommendations that are given. That's why, on the IT budget, they have some plans for later on some enhancements to the

2.2

1 system, but they're constantly being very 2 proactive on the controlling of the phishing 3 and all of these sensitive aspects of IT. MR. HOLIAN: It's very difficult. 4 5 MS. GOMEZ: I mean, just yesterday I forwarded an e-mail to IT to say, "This is a 6 7 phishing e-mail." They said, "Sure, it is." 8 We get them all of the time, but they --9 MR. HOLIAN: The problem is, someone clicks on it, and it's --10 11 MR. PAREDES: I sit on another board, on 12 the Commercial Audit Board, and we had the 13 external auditors in and did a phishing and 14 there was somebody that violated it seven times, and every time they send the false, it 15 16 gives you a training session, and they keep 17 doing it. 18 MR. HOLIAN: It's not going away. 19 MS. DE BRUZOS FUENTES: To continue, the 20 audits that we have now in progress would be 21 the Payroll and Human Resources -- we're almost 2.2 about to finish with that one -- which was to 23 review and document policies and procedures 24 related to the processing of payroll. 25 The fuel and fleet, also we're almost

1 finishing --2 MR. HOLIAN: My favorite. MS. DE BRUZOS FUENTES: -- review and 3 document policies and procedures related to 4 5 fleet management, fuel consumption and procurement of fleet services. 6 The fake service addresses -- we just 7 8 started with that one -- is to review the waste collection services billing addresses. The development services -- almost 10 11 completing that one, as well -- access the 12 development services area, including permitting 13 activities. 14 The procurement and disbursement audit, it's review and document policies and 15 16 procedures related to the procurement, disbursement and overall payment process. 17 18 The procurement card, P card and gas cards, 19 review and document policies and procedures 20 related to the procurement and the gas cards 21 all around the City. 2.2 And just, by the way, we also have an 23 Assistant Finance Director in that capacity, and she's wonderful. She's very reachable and 24 25 very quick in responding and giving us all of

1 the information we need. 2 And we're about to start the towing service 3 audit. It's to review the towing service contracts for compliance. 4 5 So here we also want to share with you the Updated Audit Plan that is as of May 31st. 6 7 there, I didn't identify that we had already 8 started the Public Works audit, and we're going 9 to put that into our third year. So we're 10 going to Page 5. You'll be able to see that. MR. PAREDES: So these hours are incurred 11 12 already or yet to be incurred? 13 MS. DE BRUZOS FUENTES: On the first tier, 14 for example --MR. PAREDES: Actual hours incurred. 15 I'm 16 sorry. I got it. I got it. This is already 17 done. 18 MS. DE BRUZOS FUENTES: The completed 19 audits, they were on target to the original 20 budget hours that we had, and I think it's been 21 progressively going to the next audits. 2.2 MR. HOLIAN: What was the budget for the 23 internal audit? 24 MR. KLEIMAN: It was 180 for the first 25 year, 135 for the second year, and the third

1 year is 105 or something like that. 2 MR. HOLIAN: Okay. The first year included the 3 MR. KLEIMAN: risk assessment, which is why it's so high. 4 5 MR. HOLTAN: Uh-huh. MS. DE BRUZOS FUENTES: And so we will 6 continue on with the Public Works audit. 7 8 mainly is to review, document and see the 9 procedures related to the facilities, utilities, sanitation, landscaping and 10 11 engineering. Due to Hurricane Irma and the 12 staff hours involved with all of the damages, 13 we decided to postpone it now to the third 14 year. And as to the Parks and Recreations, we 15 16 started with that audit in the second year. 17 Again, we wanted to postpone it now in this 18 third year, only because we wanted to give it 19 time for -- they're implementing a new in-house software system. 20 21 Then, for the third year, we're going to 2.2 continue on half settlements, how the City 23 processes and disburses the settlement. 24 will be another audit.

The Granada Pro Shop will be another audit,

financial review of revenues taken as part of
the contract, indicating about the Biltmore,
and then we'll have some hours for the
follow-up procedures, revisit all of the
statuses of all of the recommendations, which
on the four audits that we had completed, there
have been a very good positive outcome as to
try to quickly make the recommendations.

MR. KLEIMAN: Are you comfortable with the

MR. KLEIMAN: Are you comfortable with the personnel that are doing the audits, their professionalism and all of that stuff?

MS. DE BRUZOS FUENTES: Yes, very. Yes. We have the partner, the manager, that's very reachable, the senior staff and two other staff members, yes.

MR. HOLIAN: This is a night and day difference than when we had our own auditor on staff. I mean, it's -- we would get a spreadsheet and it would be ongoing, and there never was resolution -- I won't say, there was never resolution, but it was very difficult to track the resolution at the start of the project to the end of project.

MR. PAREDES: So their three-year plan has been relatively on budget? They haven't asked

2.2

1	for any extra fees or anything?
2	MR. KLEIMAN: No. We've been putting
3	additional requests of them. The third year
4	was never finalized.
5	So the towing and the fake addresses and
6	things like that, and the Biltmore, we've been
7	adding to that.
8	MR. HOLIAN: Can I make a suggestion, that
9	they use a Coral Gables photo instead of a
10	midwest photo on their thing? I don't know
11	about hot air balloons and all that deserty
12	stuff. I mean, this looks
13	MR. PAREDES: Do we have an audit
14	engagement letter for the external audit?
15	Isn't that coming up now in September?
16	MS. GOMEZ: No.
17	MR. PAREDES: Their year end is September,
18	right?
19	MS. GOMEZ: Our year end is September 30th,
20	yes. So we finished our audit for September
21	30th, 2017. So we won't get started on the
22	next audit until December or January, after
23	September 30th.
24	MR. PAREDES: But an engagement letter
25	doesn't come

1	MS. GOMEZ: Not until October. I mean, we
2	have the contract with them, but every year
3	they give us an individual engagement letter
4	and they give it to us around October, before
5	we get started.
6	MR. KLEIMAN: We can extend it up to six times.
7	MR. HOLIAN: But from their side, they're
8	comfortable, also, with us?
9	MR. KLEIMAN: Yes.
10	MS. GOMEZ: Yes.
11	MR. KLEIMAN: They just changed the name.
12	It's Crowe. It's no longer Crowe Horwath.
13	What we need from you, but I don't think we
14	need a vote, is to know if you guys are
15	comfortable with this now, this plan, and we'd
16	like to put this and replace the current plan
17	on the website and put this one there.
18	MR. HOLIAN: That's fine. Very nice.
19	Really nice.
20	MS. GOMEZ: And so I think that that is
21	everything that we have on the agenda.
22	Scheduling for the next meeting, we
23	typically skip July, so the next proposed
24	meeting is August 8th. Again, it depends on
25	what we may have on the agenda. If there's no

1 items -- typically we talk to the Chair, and if 2 there's no items, then a meeting is not had. 3 I don't know if there's anything --MS. BRAVO: I will probably be out of town 4 5 that week. MR. HOLIAN: I think you determine it. 6 Ιf 7 we don't need a meeting, we don't need a 8 meeting. MS. GOMEZ: Right. If we don't need a 10 meeting, we don't need a meeting. But going 11 forward, whether we have it in August or in 12 September, is there anything that the Board 13 would want us to bring forward? 14 MR. KLEIMAN: We're going to have the Capital Improvement Plan. Nothing is going to 15 16 be that drastically new in the budget to 17 discuss, but you may want to see, because we 18 always give the Board a copy of the Capital 19 Improvement Plan. If you guys want to review 20 it in more detail than the items that you saw 21 in here right now --2.2 MR. HOLIAN: I think that's the most 23 undermarketed document that we have in the 24 City, because I showed it to my wife and she 25 about fell on the floor looking at all of the

projects. I don't know if the Commissioners could get it, but if you go through that thing and you look at all of the projects, it's truly amazing what's going on. And my wife had no idea. I talked about it. I guarantee you, the citizens don't -- you know, you see it, but you don't see it.

MS. GOMEZ: So we may have the Capital Improvement Plan. I don't know if there's anything in particular that you would --

MR. PAREDES: On this fire station, we're done from our Committee perspective? It goes to the Commission and they'll decide whether to buy or not to buy?

MS. GOMEZ: That's correct. It's even put in a Letter of Interest, I think. That's what he was saying, that's the next step is to get the Commission to approve a Letter of Interest.

We will have our typical -- maybe our Quarterly Financial Reports, we may have the Quarterly Budget Overtime update, those kinds of things we will have, but unless there's something specific that this Board would like to bring in, you can always e-mail Yvette, if there is. If not, we'll just see what the

2.2

1	agenda
2	MR. PAREDES: And the interim financials,
3	for ramping up to the year, we might even wait
4	until you have year end numbers.
5	Financial quarterly, if we're almost at
6	year end, I don't know if we need to meet in
7	August
8	MS. GOMEZ: So we do quarterlies. So June
9	30th would be the next quarter. So it would
10	not be ready on August 8th, because that's too
11	close, but other than that
12	MR. PAREDES: So we don't have anything.
13	MS. GOMEZ: And the financials, they're not
14	usually done until February or March, because
15	of the time of the audit.
16	So if there's nothing else, then we can
17	adjourn the meeting.
18	MR. PAREDES: The Chairman adjourned it.
19	MS. GOMEZ: Well, he stepped out.
20	So motion to adjourn?
21	MR. PAREDES: Yeah, a motion. Do it.
22	MS. BRAVO: Second.
23	MS. GOMEZ: So the meeting is adjourned at
24	9:41 a.m.
25	(Thereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 9:41

1	a.m.)
2	<u>CERTIFICATE</u>
3	
4	STATE OF FLORIDA:
5	SS.
6	COUNTY OF MIAMI-DADE:
7	
8	
9	
10	I, NIEVES SANCHEZ, Court Reporter, and a Notary
11	Public for the State of Florida at Large, do hereby
12	certify that I was authorized to and did
13	stenographically report the foregoing proceedings and
14	that the transcript is a true and complete record of my
15	stenographic notes.
16	
17	DATED this 12th day of July, 2018.
18	
19	Min Days
20	
21	NIEVES SANCHEZ
22	
23	
24	
25	