



**MIAMI-DADE COUNTY
FINAL OFFICIAL MINUTES
Naranja Lakes Community Redevelopment
Agency (CRA)**

Board of County Commissioners

South Dade Government Center

Room 203

10710 S.W. 211 Street

Miami, Florida

April 23, 2007

As Advertised

Harvey Ruvín, Clerk
Board of County Commissioners

Kay Madry Sullivan, Director
Clerk of the Board Division

Jill Thornton, Commission Reporter
(305) 375-2505



**CLERK'S SUMMARY AND OFFICIAL MINUTES
NARANJA LAKES
COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY (CRA)
APRIL 23, 2007**

The Naranja Lakes Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA) Board met in the South Dade Government Center, Room 203, 10710 S.W. 211 Street, Miami, Florida, at 6:00 p.m., April 23, 2007; there being present upon roll call: Mr. Rene Infante, Mr. Moe Hakssa, Mr. Stuart Archer, Mr. Kenneth Forbes and Mr. Parsuram Ramkisson; (Chairperson Nina Betancourt, Ms. Marlene Volkert and Mr. Daniel Lipe were late); Mr. Mike Iturrey, CRA Coordinator, Office of Strategic Business Management; Mr. Alberto Gonzalez, CRA Analyst, Office of Strategic Business Management; and Deputy Clerk Jill Thornton.

I. Call to Order

Mr. Forbes called the CRA Board meeting to order at 6:05 p.m.

II. Roll Call

Upon roll call and a quorum being present, the Board proceeded to consider tonight's agenda.

III. Approval of the Minutes

It was moved by Ms. Archer that the March 26, 2007 NLCRA meeting minutes be approved. This motion was seconded by Mr. Hakssa, and upon being put to a vote, passed by a vote of 5-0.

IV. Approval of the Agenda

Mr. Ramkisson requested additional time be reserved under Agenda Item VII - New Business for the CRA Board to consider a request concerning his place of business. Additionally, Mr. Archer requested some time be allotted under New Business to address an issue with garbage along roadways in the NLCRA district.

It was moved by Mr. Archer that tonight's agenda be approved as amended. This motion was seconded by Mr. Hakssa, and upon being put to a vote, passed by a vote of 5-0.

V. Open Forum for Public Comments

Mr. Forbes opened the floor for public input:

Ms. Minnie Williams, 13920 SW 268th Street, Apt #105, appeared before the CRA and expressed concern with needed repairs at the Villages of Naranja. She also expressed concern with filth, garbage, maintenance issues and a serious mildew problem throughout the entire complex.

Mr. Ramkisson noted he recalled this complex was managed by a private company who was supposed to be on site and that someone from the management company made a presentation before the CAA years ago. He noted he was opposed to the construction of these apartment complexes in

the Naranja area; however, the developer received Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds to construct this complex.

Mr. Phillip Murray, 13428 SW 256th Terrace, appeared before the CRA and expressed concerns regarding the Villages of Naranja. He noted he attended a Community Action Agency (CAA) meeting where several tenants voiced their concerns regarding the building and maintenance staff, needed repairs, mildew and rodents. He said the management replied they lacked the resources for necessary maintenance. Mr. Murray requested the CRA render whatever services it could.

Mr. Dennis Whitaker, 28223 SW 134th Court, appeared before the CRA and noted the Sea Pines Community was cleaning up its area for the upcoming Neighborhood Resource Fair on May 12th, 2007. He requested the CRA's assistance to ensure that a damaged guardrail along the west side of a canal at SW 280th Street and 142nd Court was repaired for this event. For the record, Mr. Whitaker provided some pictures demonstrating the improvement and cleanup efforts of the Sea Pines Community.

Mr. Iturrey asked Mr. Whitaker to share the information regarding the damaged guardrail with Sergeant Ozzie Hernandez, Miami-Dade Police Department, who could report it as a safety issue to the appropriate departments.

Mr. Len Anthony, Property Owner, Naranja Lakes Condos No. 5, appeared before the CRA and presented a copy of his 2006 property tax statement reflecting a fee paid towards the lighting district. He noted that lighting standards within the Naranja Lakes community had been in poor condition since Hurricane Andrew and the County should fix them.

Ms. Serena Robinson, 13920 SW 268th Street, Apt #203, appeared before the CRA and expressed concern with water leaking in the Villages of Naranja complex. She noted she reported this condition over six months ago and nothing has been done. She also noted the Villages of Naranja were overrun with rodents, filth and a tremendous amount of garbage.

Hearing no further comments, Mr. Forbes closed the public hearing.

Mr. Forbes noted he had toured this complex and was aware of the situations. He stated the CRA members would make necessary recommendations concerning these matters later in the meeting.

Chairperson Betancourt assumed the chair upon her arrival, and the CRA proceeded to consider the balance of the agenda.

VI. Old Business

Community Policing

Sergeant Ozzie Hernandez, Miami-Dade Police Department, Cutler Ridge District, provided an overview of the monthly community policing report entitled "Naranja Lakes CRA Initiative Monthly Progress Report," dated April 17, 2007. He noted a Tactical Narcotics Team (TNT) arrested five people in the Hidden Grove Apartment complexes. He noted these arrest forms were forwarded to the Public Housing Agency, Section 8, to have them removed from the program.

Sergeant Hernandez noted the flyers were completed that advertised the “Neighborhood Resource Fair” at the Sea Pines Community Park on Saturday, May 12, 2007, from 10 am to 2 pm. He noted some highlights of this event, and who would attend, and noted the objective was for neighboring communities to become acquainted with their police department, other communities and available resources.

Update on General Old Business

2nd Home Development Inc. – Mr. John Gadway

Mr. Iturrey noted staff communicated with Mr. Gadway regarding needed information to support his request for assistance and requested he provide financial statements and proforma(s) that could show what benefit the CRA would receive in providing the requested funds. Regarding a refund of the impact fees paid, Mr. Iturrey advised that the CRA Board had no jurisdiction over impact fees but would need to consider whether the request for refund could be allocated by way of a grant.

Mr. Archer cautioned staff and the CRA board not to mislead Mr. Gadway concerning funding assistance, since the CRA had no formal structure in place to provide that assistance.

Mr. Iturrey pointed out the CRA members requested that staff inquire of Mr. Gadway on how the funds would be used.

Mr. Forbes asked staff to advise Mr. Gadway that the structure of the program should have fair criteria for everyone requesting assistance from the CRA.

Chairperson Betancourt suggested this discussion be tabled until the CRA had a formal program in place that Mr. Gadway could apply for.

Mr. Iturrey explained it was not uncommon for CRAs to receive unsolicited proposals, like Mr. Gadway’s. He noted this type of proposal should be reviewed to determine whether monies allocated would be put to good use, which was outside the scope of any grants program. Mr. Iturrey pointed out that based on discussions at the last CRA meeting regarding possible tax reforms in the near future; the CRA board tabled its discussions on all grants programs except the commercial redevelopment program using Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds. He stated if the Board so desired, staff would not engage in further discussions with Mr. Gadway.

Ms. Volkert stated she felt it would be fair if the CRA had a formal program in place for other individuals to participate in.

Mr. Hakssa noted he had a discussion with Mr. Gadway and he stated he would wait to see what formal program the CRA would offer.

Heritage Village

Mr. Iturrey noted he received an e-mail from the Housing Department regarding the status of the Heritage Village and the construction repairs would be complete by the last week in June.

Mr. Forbes advised that all CRA members received this same e-mail indicating a detailed progress of each unit, which was a sufficient report.

Current re-zoning applications in the CRA

Mr. Iturrey advised that as of April 3, 2007, no re-zoning applications had been submitted for properties located within the NLCRA district.

In response to Mr. Hakssa's comment that he received a public hearing notice informing of a request for a zoning change in the area, Mr. Alberto Gonzalez advised that the foregoing report reflected only new zoning applications, and the application relating to the subject public hearing notice had been filed months ago and was already in the process.

Construction Consultant

Mr. Iturrey noted at the last CRA meeting, the CRA Board asked staff to enter into negotiations with the first selected construction consultant and have a final contract signed by April 5th. He noted that staff was unable to enter into a contract with Mr. Flores, and proceeded to negotiate with the second ranked consulting firm, SRS Engineering, Inc. Mr. Iturrey further noted this firm provided a proposal and a negotiated contract, which was before the CRA tonight for approval. Mr. Iturrey recommended the CRA accept the proposed contract.

It was moved by Mr. Archer that the CRA accept the proposal submitted by SRS Engineering, Inc, for Construction Management Services and the contract, as presented. This motion was seconded by Mr. Infante for discussion.

Mr. Infante noted he believed the CRA would save money by giving clear directions to the new consultant on what the CRA expected in terms of scope of work. He stated he would not support any change orders.

Mr. Archer requested the opinion of the CRA's legal counsel regarding the CRA Board giving directions to the consultant in the contract agreement.

Mr. Zelkowitz stated that pursuant to statements made by the former construction consultant, Mr. Ritsema, he believed an analysis of the payment issues was needed. He noted that based on those statements, he believed a conflict existed regarding interpretations of the schedule of values, the bid contract, and the work performed in the field versus the Redevelopment Agreement. He noted after an analysis was conducted of the payments made, it came to light that staff needed an appropriate schedule of values as required by the Redevelopment Agreement. Mr. Zelkowitz noted the Developer should have submitted an appropriate schedule of values reflecting work constructed in the field, and not a single sheet of paper reflecting different projects and dollar amounts. He noted once this happens on an ongoing basis, the payment issues would be dealt with more efficiently.

Following Mr. Forbes' inquiry of the language on page 3, section 3.3, of the consultant agreement and whether additional language should be included in this agreement to avoid a future conflict should this CRA elect to hire an Executive Director, Mr. Zelkowitz advised the CRA could approve the contract tonight with language amended to transfer the powers of the County Coordinator to an Executive Director or amend the language when the CRA engaged an Executive Director. He

further advised that an amendment would require review by the County Attorney, which could delay the process to go forward with the analysis.

Mr. Iturrey noted since the CRA's funding was still based on a County loan, he suspected the County would want his office involved in the contract until such time the CRA bonds out with its own revenue resources. He noted the contract would have to be amended in a way to keep the County involved.

Chairwoman Betancourt pointed out that if the CRA hired an Executive Director, the County Coordinator would only serve the CRA as a County representative but the foregoing contract would give the County Coordinator the authority to direct services on the part of the consultant.

In response to Mr. Lipe's inquiry regarding whether the new consultant was comfortable with providing a preliminary report within 30 days, Mr. Ignacio Serralta, Construction Consultant, appeared before the CRA and noted that with the information made available to him, he believed 30 days was plenty of time to complete his report.

Mr. Iturrey noted for the record, this was possible since, pursuant to his request, Mr. DeGuardiola provided the same information within two weeks. He indicated the CRA would now have a professional construction consultant in place to represent the CRA's interests.

Following further discussion, the CRA Board proceeded to vote on the foregoing motion on the floor. Upon being put to a vote, the motion passed unanimously by those members present.

Chairwoman Betancourt asked staff to report on any developing issues going forward, and to notify the CRA members immediately via e-mail.

Mandarin Lakes

Mr. Carl Albertson, representing D.R. Horton Builders, provided an update on the sales of the Mandarin Lakes Homes. He noted a total of 480 units had been sold to date, of which included 241 town homes, 147 forty-foot single-family homes and 92 fifty-foot single-family homes; and that 155 town homes, 95 forty-foot single-family homes and 63 fifty-foot single family homes had closed. Mr. Albertson further noted 830 permits had been pulled to date and 13 additional homes were sold since the last CRA meeting. He informed the CRA Board that another extension would be requested in July for the completion schedule of Phase One of the project.

Infrastructure Construction

Mr. Scott Hedge, Vice-President, Architecture and Planning, DeGuardiola Properties, appeared before the CRA on behalf of Naranja Lakes Construction, LLC, and advised they were behind schedule on meeting their goal stated at the last CRA meeting to complete the placing of the last lift of asphalt. He explained subcontractors had not completed the necessary tasks prior to placing the asphalt but they assured him they would be finishing next week. He assured the CRA members that the developers were very cognizant of their commitments to complete this project.

Mr. Hedge noted the South Florida Water Management District approved two of the three Water Use Permit applications and the third application needed to be revised. He noted the District would not

permit water drawn from a canal with a larger-sized pump so they were in the process of revising the application to reflect water drawn from a deep well for irrigation purposes. He noted once the permits were obtained from the District, they could move forward with the process of securing irrigation permits at the County level. Mr. Hedge further noted some landscaping had been planted but would not be completed until the irrigation system was in place.

Mr. Hedge noted after reviewing protocol with Mr. Iturrey, many items in the original payment application submitted in September were reduced. He noted the reductions were largely due to the fact that he and Mr. Iturrey differed in opinion regarding the interpretation and administration of the Redevelopment Agreement, and what he felt was a reimbursement of a Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP) for work outlined in the contract. Mr. Hedge noted an agreement for some reimbursement was reached by following the process Mr. Iturrey wanted and that reimbursement for a unit price per quantity did not reflect the true cost of that work.

Mr. Hedge stated his interpretation of the Redevelopment Agreement amendment was a GMP for improved items in a particular phase of the project and that a schedule of values consistent with that value gets presented in order to be reimbursed on a monthly basis for the percentage of work completed. He noted a schedule of values was, in fact, submitted by the developer and was paid against since the beginning of the project, but that process ceased due to County staff's interpretation of the process. He requested this matter be resolved first before the new construction consultant performs his analysis and comes back before the CRA with his preliminary report.

Following discussion, it was moved by Mr. Forbes that Mr. Steven Zelkowitz, Legal Counsel for the CRA, meet with Mr. Hedge and the new construction consultant to re-evaluate the schedule of values and present an agreed upon or amended schedule of values for consideration by the CRA Board. This motion was seconded by Mr. Archer for discussion.

Mr. Zelkowitz explained it was the County's position that an approved schedule of values was never submitted, only a one-page document that directly tracks the total amounts of each component of the overall project, which was never approved. Mr. Zelkowitz clarified his recommendation was not to go back and create a schedule of values for the work already performed but to reconcile any discrepancies. He advised that a true, detailed schedule of values should be provided going forward.

Mr. Iturrey clarified the specific items staff requested to be removed from the payment applications were for unapproved changes of scope, and not for the interpretation of quantities versus lump-sum payments. He noted payments were made for items where clear, detailed and verifiable information was provided.

Following further discussion, the CRA Board proceeded to vote on the foregoing motion on the floor. Upon being put to a vote, the motion failed by a vote of 3-5 (Chairperson Betancourt, Mr. Lipe, Mr. Hakssa, Mr. Archer and Ms. Volkert voted No).

Chairperson Betancourt noted the CRA's attorney had been involved since the beginning of the Redevelopment Agreement and has stated on several occasions that he requested a schedule of values. She expressed concern with paying the CRA's attorney to prepare an amended schedule of values when the Redevelopment Agreement required the developer provide one. She noted she opposed the previous motion because she felt that approving the new construction contract would be the first step in resolving this issue.

Mr. Ramkissoon noted this Board has never seen an approved schedule of values, yet Mr. DeGuardiola was paid based on the approval of the CRA's and the County's representatives. He noted the CRA was now being put in a position to approve payments, which was why he supported hiring an Executive Director. He stated he felt that all concerned parties could have one understanding of the schedule of values and the CRA should not hold up the entire project to review past payments.

Mr. Hakssa noted the CRA's negotiation team worked hard to negotiate a Construction Consultant contract that specifically stated the information the CRA wanted in the analysis report.

Mr. Archer concurred that the new construction consultant should be given the opportunity to review and resolve this matter.

In response to Mr. Forbes' question regarding how much money DeGuardiola has been paid, Mr. Iturrey clarified that when staff discussed the payment application(s) issues with Mr. DeGuardiola, he understood completely and agreed that payment would not occur until these issues were resolved.

Chairperson Betancourt noted it was agreed that those payment requests would be dissected for clarity and modified to generate some payments to Mr. DeGuardiola.

Mr. Iturrey noted of the \$140,000 payment request submitted, staff was looking to approve approximately \$123,000 minus the retainage fee, however, \$100,00 of items had been extrapolated from the payment request that staff believes could be approved.

It was moved by Mr. Forbes that the amount of time allotted for this Agenda Item be extended to allow for further discussion. This motion was seconded by Mr. Hakssa and upon being put to a vote, passed unanimously by those members present.

Following further discussion, Chairperson Betancourt noted it was important this Board work towards a resolution. She stated she believed that hiring the new Construction Consultant would provide answers to the CRA in resolving the issues between the payment applications and the schedule of values versus the Redevelopment Agreement.

Grants Program – CDBG

Mr. Iturrey noted staff was in the process of finalizing a contract with the Office of Community Economic Development (OCED) using the \$70,000 Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) funds already allocated to the CRA for a Commercial Redevelopment Grants Program. He noted the basic thresholds would be a \$10,000 minimum to \$13,000 maximum grant, which would allow 10 to 13 applicants.

In response to Mr. Archer's expressed concern regarding the \$140,000 expense to manage \$70,000 in grants, Mr. Iturrey clarified that this expenditure included the administering of all three grants programs—Residential, Commercial Tenant and the CDBG-Commercial Redevelopment grants program.

In response to Mr. Lipe's question regarding the \$140,000 cost to administer \$225,000 worth of grants for all three programs, Mr. Iturrey noted staff calculated approximately 3,200 hours to

manage all three grants programs based on a Contract Specialist's annual salary that ranges from \$30,000 to 70,000, which meant a total of 68 potential contracts would be administered.

In response to Mr. Lipe's question regarding the duties of the Contract Specialist, Mr. Iturrey noted the duties involved developing and implementing the plan, disseminating and collecting application packages, reviewing required documentation, determining eligibility, evaluating applicants comprehensively, processing the approval and notification, marketing materials for the program, entering data and monitoring quarterly.

Following Mr. Archer's question regarding the cost to manage the \$70,000 CDBG-Commercial Redevelopment Program and the amount the CRA currently pays County staff, Mr. Iturrey noted OCED only allowed up to 20% (\$14,000) of the allocated funds be used to administer the grants and the CRA would have to cover the remaining portion, which would require more time of staff. He also noted the CRA pays approximately \$77,000 for a portion of County staff's salaries.

Chairperson Betancourt pointed out there would probably be an economy of scales when multiple programs were implemented.

Mr. Alberto Gonzalez reminded the CRA members they voted to proceed with the CDBG Commercial Redevelopment Program at the last CRA meeting and tabled discussion on the remaining grant programs to see the outcome on potential tax reforms.

Mr. Iturrey clarified that since the remaining programs were tabled, OCED would not include funding by the CRA and the maximum amount of contracts would be 5 to 7 as opposed to the 10 to 13 he previously mentioned. He also noted staff initially proposed the CRA assist in funding these programs.

Following discussion, it was moved by Mr. Infante that the CRA approve the proposed contract with the Office of Community Economic Development for a Commercial Redevelopment Grants Program using CDBG funds. This motion was seconded by Mr. Archer for discussion.

Following Chairperson Betancourt's inquiry as to whether the CRA members had any comments or discussion regarding changes or modifications to the terms of this program, Mr. Archer noted his primary concern was the cost to administer this program for 5 to 7 grants.

Mr. Iturrey noted some guidelines needed to be amended to remove the \$60,000 CRA funding but he could provide the CRA with an estimate.

Referring to page 8 of the grants proposal regarding recaptured funds, Chairperson Betancourt questioned whether the affidavit regarding recaptured funds could be recorded to run with the property in the event the property was sold. She noted this would prevent the CRA Board from having to pay back monies that someone else benefited from.

Mr. Iturrey noted if the government guidelines permit them to do so, staff could record these affidavits against the properties that were being assisted with grants.

In response to Mr. Forbes' suggestion that OCED's staff be invited to participate in the next CRA meeting to provide a better understanding on how this program works, Mr. Iturrey noted staff could continue working with OCED to modify the contract before the CRA actually signed it.

Following further discussion, the CRA proceeded to vote on the motion on the floor, and upon being put to a vote, the motion passed unanimously by those members present.

Mr. Zelkowitz advised that typically with a grants program, a memorandum of the grant agreement was recorded against the real property, which would not go to a successor owner unless they had notice of it through the chain of title.

Executive Director

Mr. Archer noted the CRA was awaiting Mr. Infante's report regarding the process used by the North Miami CRA for hiring an Executive Director (ED).

Mr. Infante noted this CRA needed a full time expert with ED qualifications to represent the CRA's interests. He proposed a letter of invitation to solicit an ED be advertised and referred to an example in the Florida Redevelopment Association that could be used as a guide. He noted all CRAs he was aware of, had an ED and he called a few CRAs but was unsuccessful at speaking with a representative from the North Miami Beach CRA.

It was moved by Mr. Infante that the CRA approve an advertisement of a letter of invitation to solicit parties interested in an Executive Director position with the NLCRA. This motion was seconded by Mr. Archer for discussion.

In response to Mr. Archer's inquiry of this person's duties, Mr. Infante noted the ED would be responsible for administering grants, along with other duties, which would eliminate the expense of approximately \$85,000 for County staff; and that the salary for an ED ranged from \$120,000 to \$150,000.

Ms. Volkert noted she could attest that hiring an ED would not meet all the CRA's needs and one person could not do the job. She stated she believed the work now performed by the County staff was equated to about five people. She further noted an ED would need additional staff and fringe benefits.

Following further discussion regarding the advantages and disadvantages of the CRA hiring an ED, the CRA proceeded to vote on the motion on the floor. Upon being put to a vote, the motion passed 4-3. (Chairperson Betancourt, Mr. Lipe and Ms. Volkert voted No), (Mr. Hakssa abstained from voting)

Mr. Infante suggested staff work with Mr. Zelkowitz to draft the letter of invitation, which he clarified would only be a letter of interest.

Mr. Zelkowitz clarified the direction of the CRA Board was that he advertise a letter of invitation in the Florida Redevelopment Association (FRA), soliciting parties who may be interested in an ED position with the CRA, which was different from an RFP and selection process that advertised for a

job opening with a specific salary. He noted when the CRA actually decided to hire an ED, it would include at least one other process for interviewing the candidates.

Following a discussion regarding whether to limit the distribution of the letter only in the FRA or to include it in the local newspapers, the CRA agreed to limit it only to the FRA.

In response to Mr. Hakssa's suggestion that the CRA meet every two weeks for an additional meeting per month to conduct a workshop that addresses community issues, Mr. Iturrey noted the CRA could effectuate sunshine meetings to hear public comments.

Following further discussion, it was moved by Mr. Hakssa that the CRA conduct a special workshop every month for the next six months, in addition to the regular CRA monthly meetings, to hear public input on community issues. This motion was seconded by Ms. Volkert for discussion.

Mr. Forbes suggested the foregoing motion be amended to include the first meeting be conducted at the Naranja Neighborhood Center to hear public concerns regarding the Villages of Naranja.

Discussion ensued regarding the purpose of the workshops.

Mr. Zelkowitz clarified the workshops would strictly be informational meetings, such as town hall meetings, to hear public input regarding community issues, with no action taken by the CRA Board.

Mr. Iturrey added the CRA Board could direct staff at each regular CRA meeting of locations and issues to be addressed at future workshops.

Following further discussion, the CRA Board proceeded to vote on the foregoing motion as amended to conduct a monthly community workshop in addition to regular monthly CRA meetings, for the next six months, to hear public input on community issues; and that the first workshop be conducted at the Naranja Neighborhood Center to address the concerns of the residents at the Villages of Naranja and the Hidden Grove Apartments. Upon being put to a vote, the motion passed 7-0. (Mr. Ramkissoon abstained from voting).

VII. New Business

a. Ritsema Consulting Summary

Mr. Iturrey noted this Board requested at the last CRA meeting, a discussion on the disputed amounts in the payment requests of the former construction consultant, Mr. John Ritsema. He noted a summary of Ritsema Consulting invoices was included in tonight's agenda package and that the two invoices (Nos. NL15 and NL16) totaled to \$11,850, of which \$5,910 was disputed. Mr. Iturrey also noted staff sent e-mails to Mr. Ritsema requesting more information regarding the disputed amounts and after greater detail was provided, the County approved another 14.6 hours in the invoices, which meant an additional payment of \$2,220. He noted the \$3,690 balance of the disputed amount was related to hours spent by Mr. Ritsema to develop a spreadsheet for his final report, which was to reconcile the developers' request for payment applications, but was not to staff's satisfaction. Mr. Iturrey noted in the course of negotiating, county staff offered to pay half of the remaining disputed amount but Mr. Ritsema refused the offer. Mr. Iturrey noted he did not recommend the balance be paid.

Mr. Archer pointed out that Mr. Ritsema was an engineer by trade, not an accountant and there was a misunderstanding regarding what staff wanted in terms of a final report. He noted the CRA has had to hire a consultant and cause a delay in payments to the developers in order to resolve this dilemma. He applauded staff for trying to settle the disputed amount.

It was moved by Mr. Archer that the CRA approve to pay half of the remaining disputed amount, \$1,845, as a settlement of Mr. Ritsema's contract. This motion was seconded by Mr. Infante for discussion.

Pursuant to Mr. Forbes' request, Mr. John Ritsema appeared before the CRA to discuss the final payments due him and provided background information. He noted he sent an addendum to his final report and addressed several issues and answered many of staff's questions. He stated he asked Mr. Iturrey to put in writing what he expected in a final report but he never received anything.

Mr. Ritsema noted when he came onboard, bidding was taking place for this project and Naranja Lakes, LLC, entered into a contract and submitted a schedule of values. He noted Amendment No. 1 did not exist at that time but preliminary breakdowns of the original agreement, which were solely engineering estimates. Mr. Ritsema further noted he followed the payment procedure put in place by the prior County staff and the Finance Department. In addition, he noted Solo Construction also submitted a schedule of values to the developer to get paid, which was just an estimate each month on how Solo Construction gets paid for a lump sum contract. He stated he did not agree with Mr. Iturrey's method and that his contract with the CRA did not require he provide any kind of a report or a final report, but he tried to comply with what he was asked of him. He noted he was paid on an hourly basis, worked to the best of his ability and never had his integrity questioned in the thirty years he had worked for the County.

In response to Mr. Forbes question regarding Mr. Ritsema's agreement with the CRA and whether the figures submitted in the requests for payments were based on that agreement, Mr. Ritsema noted Assistant County Attorney Heffernan drafted his agreement/contract.

Following further discussion regarding Mr. Ritsema's contract and work performed, Mr. Zelkowitz clarified he sent an e-mail to Mr. Ritsema requesting a final report be produced and what was expected in it. He noted the CRA would never be in this situation if Mr. Ritsema had not said that he approved changes in the scope. Mr. Zelkowitz also noted he provided an e-mail to the County stating he did not find the invoices to be sufficiently detailed regarding work performed. He also noted Mr. Iturrey made a determination that the work performed was not to staff's satisfaction as requested. Mr. Zelkowitz advised that he could not make a recommendation on whether or not to pay Mr. Ritsema for the disputed amount; however, the motion on the floor was meaningless unless it was acceptable by Mr. Ritsema.

Mr. Ritsema responded that he was not in agreement with everything stated, but agreed to accept the difference of the disputed amount as a settlement of his final payment.

Hearing no objection, the CRA proceeded to vote on the foregoing motion as amended to pay the additional \$2,220 already approved by staff plus \$1,845 of the remaining disputed amount as a settlement for final payment to Mr. John Ritsema. Upon being put to a vote, the motion passed unanimously by those members present.

Mr. Ramkissoon expressed appreciation to Mr. Ritsema for his services provided to the CRA.

Hearing no further comments, the CRA Board proceeded to consider the items added to the agenda under New Business, during the approval of tonight's agenda.

Mr. Archer expressed concern with illegal dumping occurring along SW 145th Avenue from the International House of Pancakes on S. Dixie Highway to SW 280th Street. Mr. Archer noted a tremendous amount of debris was scattered along the County right-of-way. He asked staff to contact Team Metro and have this mess cleaned up.

Mr. Iturrey invited all CRA members to contact staff anytime they witnessed illegal dumping and staff would respond accordingly.

Mr. Ramkissoon noted they could also contact Team Metro or Sergeant Ozzie Hernandez, who had been instrumental in resolving these matters.

Mr. Ramkissoon approached the CRA Board as owner of the International House of Pancakes located in the NLCRA district, to make a request. He said his restaurant was in need of improvements and he was approaching a deadline to have it completed. He noted he sought funding from financial institutions but requested any assistance the CRA could provide him in terms of a commercial grant.

Mr. Infante congratulated Major Ramirez, Miami-Dade Police Department, on his promotion as Chief.

Sergeant Hernandez advised that Officer Carlos Garcia was promoted from Captain to Major, and would be replacing Major Ramirez in the Cutler Ridge District. He noted Major Ramirez was promoted to Chief but would still preside over the South District.

VIII. Setting of Next Meeting Date

Chairperson Betancourt announced the next NLCRA meeting would be held on May 21, 2007 at 6:00 p.m. and a Special Workshop would be held on Monday, May 7th, 2007 at 6:00 p.m. at the Naranja Neighborhood Center to address concerns of residents at the Villages of Naranja and Hidden Grove Apartments.

IX. Adjournment

There being no further business to come before this Board, the Naranja Lakes Community Redevelopment Agency meeting was adjourned at 9:29 p.m.

Nina Betancourt, Chairperson
Naranja Lakes Community Redevelopment Agency