

COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY BOARD

REGULAR MEETING

July 9, 2020

MINUTES

Present:

Arlene Schwartz
Antonio V. Arserio
Joanne Simone
Anthony Caggiano, Vice Chair
Tommy Ruzzano, Chair

Also Present:

Cale Curtis, Executive Director
David Tolces, Weiss Serota Helfman Cole & Bierman

The regular meeting of the Margate Community Redevelopment Agency having been properly noticed was called to order at 5:01 p.m., on Thursday, July 9, 2020, by Chair Tommy Ruzzano. Roll call was taken. There was a moment of silence followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

This was a virtual public meeting held via Zoom. Board Attorney David Tolces read the Findings and Procedure for a Virtual Public Meeting. Those physically present in the Commission Chambers were: Chair Tommy Ruzzano; Cale Curtis, Executive Director; Joseph Kavanagh, City Clerk; and Rita Rodi, CRA Coordinator.

1A. MINUTES FOR APPROVAL - (4/30/2020 Special)

After David Tolces, Board Attorney, read the item title, Ms. Simone made the following motion, seconded by Mr. Arserio:

MOTION: SO MOVE TO APPROVE

ROLL CALL: Ms. Simone, Yes; Mr. Arserio, Yes; Ms. Schwartz, Yes; Mr. Caggiano, Yes; Mr. Ruzzano, Yes. The motion passed 5-0.

2. PUBLIC DISCUSSION

No one from the public requested to speak.

3A. DISCUSSION & POSSIBLE ACTION: MCRA STAFFING PROPOSAL

Cale Curtis, Executive Director, introduced the item noting that at the Board had asked him to develop an organizational chart for the MCRA. The proposed chart was displayed for reference. It showed a part-time Executive Director as the City Manager, a part-time Assistant Executive Director, and a full time Project Specialist with notes on costs, and the current positions funded fully or in part by the MCRA. He explained that the chart showed proposed positions for discussion; the salaries could be negotiated at another time.

Discussion ensued. Mr. Curtis explained that the chart showed those positions that spent a considerable portion of their time on the MCRA, and there were other City departments that provided supplemental services to the MCRA. Costs for those services were accounted for in the annual cost allocation study that had been done in 2017.

David Tolces, Board Attorney, explained that there was a cost allocation agreement with the City that provided for the MCRA to pay for services provided to the MCRA by City employees.

Ms. Simone asked to see the chart that showed the employees, amount of time, and cost spent working on MCRA items. Mr. Curtis explained that the large report was broken down by department and it showed percentages of time rather than by employee, and he would review it with her. She expressed a concern that it was over \$1 million and it was not clear how it was being allocated. Mr. Curtis explained the process the outside consultant used to determine the amount of time spent on a department level.

Ms. Simone asked if recommendations were being taken for the Assistant Executive Director position and Mr. Curtis said he was open to the Board's recommendations and hoped they were open to his as well. She recommended

employee Andrew Pinney based on his experience in planning and zoning, AICP certification, familiarity with the MCRA, as well as being a Margate resident. Mr. Curtis concurred with her confidence in Mr. Pinney and said that the intent that evening was to discuss the organizational chart and not to select the Assistant Executive Director.

Discussion ensued about the Project Specialist and Project Manager positions. Mr. Curtis explained that the Project Manager position shown in the organization chart at 30 percent was that of Cotter Christian, noting that he likely spent more than that time on MCRA projects. He said the City was also looking to add project manager positions which would lighten Mr. Christian's workload. He said the Project Specialist would be a hybrid position working both in the office and out on the street monitoring projects. There was a short discussion about fringe benefits.

Vice Chair Caggiano asked if overtime payments to Parks and Recreation for help on MCRA events were included in City Offsets. Mr. Curtis said they were not, and he explained that City Offsets was a combination of the cost allocation study done in 2017 which increased by the Consumer Price Index (CPI) each year and was in addition to the percentages of salaries shown on the organizational chart which totaled \$1.258 million [2021]. He said he would provide all the Board members with a copy of the cost allocation and review it with them.

Mr. Curtis reiterated that the purpose of the item was to review the organizational chart that he was proposing for the staffing that he deemed necessary to run the MCRA successfully. He told the Board he was looking for their direction on either accepting his proposed chart and/or considering other staffing options.

Discussion ensued. Chair Ruzzano suggested the addition of an engineer to facilitate smaller projects that could be done in-house. He also asked about marketing and advertising support. Mr. Curtis explained how the City Manager's office handled marketing for the MCRA through the cost allocation. Several other Board members supported the idea of having an architect or engineer. Mr. Curtis spoke about how there were various disciplines amongst engineers and architects and if one were hired, the City/MCRA could miss out because they might not have the expertise needed for the wide variety of projects undertaken. The person would then be managing an outside consultant to get the needed expertise. He agreed about the need for engineering and architecture, however, he suggested the better approach would be to include money for Professional Services fees in the operating budget. He recommended hiring an appropriate consulting architecture firm to bring projects before the MCRA before they were started. Chair Ruzzano said it as important to keep in mind that hiring an engineer firm would inflate the cost of the project because they were paid either by a percentage of the job or by the hour.

Mr. Curtis asked for consensus from the Board on the proposed organizational chart and all Board members gave their consent.

3B. DISCUSSION & POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION ON THE FISCAL YEAR 2020-2021 MCRA BUDGET

Cale Curtis, Executive Director, referenced a rough draft of the fiscal year budget for 2020-2021 that was included in the meeting back-up and had been sent to the Board a week prior. Highlights of the discussion he led were as follows:

- A high level comparison of revenues and expenditures year over year showed the proposed budget was down almost 7 percent
- Operating budget showed expenses for July 4th, Winter Festival, and Sounds at Sundown had been removed the prior year. Mr. Curtis pointed out that these were positive events for the MCRA and he asked the Board for direction.

Events - Discussion ensued about the MCRA sponsorship of the events and budget amounts.

Ms. Simone expressed a concern about funding the events, a position she said she shared with the former Executive Director. She commented that having the MCRA Executive Director also being the City Manager was a problem because the MCRA had more money than the City to spend on events, noting that the City used to pay for the events. She said there was no proven benefit to the City or MCRA from people coming to attend the events.

Chair Ruzzano asked the Board Attorney his opinion. David Tolces, Board Attorney, said there had always been a concern among local governments about the use of CRA tax increment revenue for special events. He referenced the Attorney General's opinion in 2010 that indicated monies could be spent to support the bricks and mortar redevelopment activity. He agreed with Ms. Simone's analysis of whether there was a benefit to the MCRA or City, but he said that data could be gathered from the events. Attorney Tolces said he was comfortable with the use of MCRA funds to support the events from a legal perspective.

Ms. Schwartz commented that the MCRA would sunset in six years and the City would be taking over all the costs, and she suggested a 50/50 split. She also suggested creating a local benefit by getting local restaurants to participate in the Winter Festival. She said people from as far as Miramar attended the Winter Festival. She commented that the 10-minute fireworks display on July 4th was amazing.

Mr. Arserio agreed with Ms. Simone about the need for performance measures. He was in favor of the MCRA funding the special events as it had been done in the past. He agreed with a 10-minute fireworks display.

Vice Chair Caggiano agreed that the events attracted many people from out of the area and he hoped the events were creating a long term effect for the City. He said it was important for the MCRA to continue to fund the events because they showcased the City and the businesses would benefit as well.

Chair Ruzzano polled the Board members on budgeting \$50,000 for the July 4th event.

POLL TAKEN: Mr. Caggiano, Yes; Ms. Schwartz, Yes; Ms. Simone, No; Mr. Arserio, Yes; Mr. Ruzzano, Yes. Passed 4-1.

Chair Ruzzano polled the Board members on budgeting \$60,000 for the Winter Festival.

POLL TAKEN: Mr. Arserio: Yes, Yes; Ms. Simone, No; Ms. Schwartz, Yes; Mr. Caggiano, Yes; Mr. Ruzzano, Yes. Passed 4-1.

Mr. Curtis asked if the MCRA Board was interested in bringing back a reinvented version of an outdoor music event in place of the Sounds at Sundown. He commented about the uncertainty of when outdoor events might start, and he asked the Board whether they wanted to include an amount in the budget now or amend the budget later. Discussion ensued and Mr. Curtis suggested keeping the budget at \$25,000 and defining the specific events at a later time; a majority of the Board members gave their consent. Chair Ruzzano suggested changing the name of the budget line for Summer and Fall Events to MCRA Events.

Marketing and Promotions - There was a back and forth discussion about the need to increase the level of marketing and promotions and it was suggested that either additional staffing and/or investing in better equipment would be helpful, and it was suggested that the budget amount increase from \$25,000 to \$40,000. Ms. Schwartz pointed out the minimal amount of promotions that had been done in the current year, and she suggested considering the use of interns from the Art Institute. Mr. Arserio commented on the use of outside services as well. The majority of the Board members gave consent to increase the budget amount to \$40,000.

Property Maintenance - Discussion ensued about the line items for general maintenance and maintenance for the shopping plazas. Mr. Curtis noted that there had been enhanced landscaping and additional landscape maintenance taken on which increased the budget. He pointed out that the property maintenance line items were for unplanned, ongoing maintenance and repairs. Mr. Arserio asked when charges for Common Area Maintenance (CAM) would be implemented, and he suggested the addition of a small CAM fee to help offset the cost of maintenance on the plazas. Mr. Curtis suggested no change to the budget given the current economic environment but wanted to continue discussions in the months ahead. Mr. Arserio agreed and commented that the mechanism needed to be put in place to start CAM at the appropriate time. He clarified that the fee would not be effective immediately because existing leases would either need to expire or be renegotiated before CAM could be charged. Chair Ruzzano suggested waiting until the improvements to the Chevy Chase plazas were complete before implementing CAM.

Legal Fees - There was a short discussion about why the budget for legal fees was higher in current fiscal year and Mr. Curtis commented that it was possibly due to anticipated land acquisition related costs. He proposed reducing it to \$175,000.

Property Improvement Grants - Discussion ensued about the need to improve utilization of the grant funds for property improvements. Mr. Curtis explained that a moratorium had been placed on new grants earlier in the year until the new Architectural Design Guidelines were put in place at which time the new property improvement programs would be rolled out. He said the development of the guidelines was well underway and the grant programs would be heavily marketed to businesses in the next fiscal year.

Sinking Fund - Mr. Curtis explained the purpose of the fund was to pay annual debt service. He said the MCRA had two debt instruments that were scheduled to be paid off in fiscal year 2022. He said there was an outstanding principal balance of \$692,00 on the tax-exempt debt and \$1.7 million on the taxable debt. He commented that the MCRA had

money set aside in an Escrow Fund and the Board might want to consider paying off the debt now and remove it from the books. He said he would speak with them about it individually in the near future.

Marketing Staffing - Ms. Simone commented about the need to hire a person to market the MCRA and improve and maintain its website. She complimented Oakland Park's website. Chair Ruzzano agreed. Mr. Curtis said the position would be a City employee paid for by the MCRA, similar to the Business Development Coordinator arrangement with a percentage share between the City and MCRA. He was in favor of the position and he asked the Board if there was consensus. Mr. Arserio suggested a 50/50 split. Mr. Curtis commented that the MCRA would sunset in six years and the position would either be a temporary position for six years or a full time City employee. Chair Ruzzano polled the Board about the new position:

POLL TAKEN: Ms. Simone: Yes, Yes; Mr. Arserio, Yes; Ms. Schwartz, Yes; Mr. Caggiano, Yes; Mr. Ruzzano, Yes. Passed 5-0.

Mr. Curtis stated he wanted to speak with the City's Public Information Officer about her thoughts and recommendation on the appropriate split between the City and MCRA.

Code Enforcement - Mr. Curtis stated that the code enforcement officer position had been removed from the MCRA budget because it was being assigned as a separate code officer from regular Code in the City. However, he said it might be an opportunity to handle it similar to the marketing position where increased code enforcement could be shared between the City and the MCRA. Chair Ruzzano commented that the enhanced code enforcement position was going to compare site plans from when something was built to the current state and identify deficiencies. He said he was not in favor of an additional layer of policing in the MCRA and he thought the City should handle it. Vice Chair Caggiano agreed with having enhanced code enforcement in the MCRA district. Mr. Arserio said additional code enforcement was needed in the City, noting that there were only five code officers in the City and that was insufficient.

Board Attorney Tolces said any funding between the MCRA and the City needed to be properly documented through the cost allocation agreement with the City.

Ms. Schwartz spoke about the need to educate the businesses and that it made sense to do so at the present time. She suggested a workshop with the Code Compliance officers to hear what it was they needed. She commented about the need to re-evaluate the hours of Code Compliance.

Chair Ruzzano commented about the need to meet with the City and Code to discuss expectations. Mr. Arserio clarified that he supported a friendly, educational approach first.

Wayfinding Signage - Mr. Curtis said there was a wayfinding program that included conceptual designs of the signs but he believed that had been some disagreement about the type of materials to be used for the signs and the design of the signs as there had been comments that the design was similar to that of a neighboring city. He said there were two signs in process: Winfield Boulevard; and, David Park; and, if the Board was satisfied with the results, the program could move forward. He said \$200,000 had been budgeted in past years but nothing had been spent; however, he was re-budgeting \$200,000 in anticipation of the program moving ahead.

Atlantic Boulevard Median Beautification - Mr. Curtis explained that the funds previously budgeted had not been spent. The wall had recently been painted and installation of a hedge along the wall would take place shortly. He said in the past the plan called for the installation of stone and enhancements to the median. He said he would re-allocate funds from the current budget to allow for increased beautification to the Atlantic Boulevard median.

Chair Ruzzano commented that Broward County had a project years ago to beautify Atlantic Boulevard and after obtaining the permit number, he called the County who advised that the permit was still open to complete the project which included a sprinkler system and landscaping. He asked the County if the MCRA would have any input into the landscaping and was told it did absolutely. Mr. Arserio said he hoped Mr. Curtis would work with the County to get them to pay a portion of it.

City Center Projects - Mr. Curtis explained that the MCRA was committed to funding certain public amenities and infrastructure for the City Center as part of the Developer Agreement. He said the budget included a certain percentage for design costs to show the MCRA's commitment to the projects.

Land Acquisition - Chair Ruzzano commented that the \$4.65 million amount was too much and he would prefer to see the money put into the Chevy Chase Plaza improvements. Mr. Curtis said funds for repairs to the plaza were

already budgeted but they would not be completed in the current fiscal year so he was going to need to move some funds into next year's budget. He said it would need to be increased further if the Board wanted additional repairs.

Chevy Chase Plaza Improvements - Chair Ruzzano said that in addition to the repairs, he would like some improvements made to mimic Ace Plaza, such as painting the window frames in black, and accenting sections of the columns in stone. He asked the other Board members for their thoughts.

Mr. Arserio commented that he initially was opposed to redoing the plaza, but he wanted to do the repairs and would not be opposed to a minor spruce up, such as painting, adding some stone, and some landscaping in the parking lot.

Ms. Schwartz commented about flooding issues in the parking lot, particularly in front of the Gem Eatery. Chair Ruzzano said they would likely be addressed prior to doing the asphalt work. She agreed that the plaza lacked curb appeal and commented that some of the businesses did not attract the public by having their windows covered, and the MCRA needed to enforce the sign code.

Mr. Curtis said he heard consensus to add funds to include some additional improvements, and he would meet with Jim Nardi to create a scope of work and budget estimate.

Serino Park Renovations - Mr. Curtis said this was a new project that had been added. The neighborhood park located on the south end of the City off State Road 7 was considered slum and blight and in need of improvement. He summarized the improvements which included a new playground, new restrooms, replacement of sand with a safety surface, etc. Mr. Arserio asked that security cameras be added to the parks; he said the technology cost had decreased and cellular service was being used. Mr. Curtis said he would speak with the City Manager about utilizing that technology in all the parks. Mr. Arserio pointed out the need to make sure the costs for finishing touches were included in the budget.

Margate Boulevard Improvements - Mr. Curtis explained that improvements to Margate Boulevard from East River Drive east to State Road 7 were included in the budget to improve the landscaping in the roundabout, reseal the pavers in the crosswalks, restriping, etc. Ms. Schwartz suggested adding flashing lights to alert drivers to yield. Mr. Curtis said he would consider it with the improvements.

Land Acquisition - Mr. Curtis said the funds were not specific to any particular properties but discussions had taken place with a few properties previously. He said he had spoken with the Farm Bureau recently. Mr. Arserio commented that there might be some property value fluctuations due to COVID-19 and there might be some deals.

He thanked the Board for their feedback on the budget and said he would have a final version for them in September.

4. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Cale Curtis, Executive Director, provided the following capital project updates:

Atlantic Boulevard Wall - painting of the wall was 80 percent completed; anticipated completion was the following week.

David Park Construction - approximately 70 percent completed. Drawing of the decorative bollards had been sent to the Board and staff was moving ahead with the recommendation of four colored pencils, three erasers, and three book bollards.

Ace Plaza Improvements - project was substantially completed. Currently looking at replacing the off-site tenant sign which would require a variance from the Board of Adjustment due to its legal, non-conforming status.

Chevy Chase Improvements - The Request for Proposals (RFP) for roof repairs was being finalized for qualified contractors. Staff was moving ahead with the low bidder on the tenant signage in the amount of \$38,125.

Sports Covered Field - referenced comments from the previous meeting about issues with Broward County and the Cocomar Drainage District. He said City and County staff met last week and reached agreement to allow the project to tie into the existing drainage at the Sports Complex. He said it was not the ideal outcome because it shifted the problem all around and the regulatory agencies were complicating the issue.

Winfield Boulevard Entry Sign - sign was in permitting and the project should be starting soon. He said the sign would be made of concrete with a waterfall.

Mr. Arserio said he would like there be a ground breaking ceremony for the Sports Covered Field that would be done in line with the Center for Disease Control's (CDC) guidelines.

4A. TENANT UPDATES

James Nardi, Advanced Asset Management, reported that two tenants in the Ace Plaza owed rent; he said they submitted payment but it was not in the form required and the payments were returned. He reported there were two tenants in the Chevy Chase plaza that did not submit rent payments. He said all tenants were caught up from last year.

Mr. Arserio asked Mr. Nardi if he had received any feedback regarding the abatement and whether another was needed. Mr. Nardi said two requests had been submitted for abatement consideration. The first, Sharkey's Boulevard Lounge, paid their July rent but had submitted a written request to the Executive Director because they had been prohibited from opening by the State. Mr. Arserio said he would be willing to help those businesses affected by government mandates but he would want more information to discuss at the next meeting because there were other businesses that were allowed to remain open and were doing well.

Chair Ruzzano recommended a motion be made to waive their July rent because they were one of the only businesses that could not operate. David Tolces, Board Attorney, said he preferred consideration for rent abatement be put on an agenda so tenants had an opportunity to speak on it. Chair Ruzzano said he was only considering rent abatement specifically for one business that was not able to operate.

Vice Chair Caggiano asked Attorney Tolces if the Board could pick and choose tenants to give rent abatement to without it including all of them. Attorney Tolces responded yes, noting that each tenant had its own story and, as such, the Board could make a business and policy decision about who was entitled to rent abatement.

Attorney Tolces said it could be put on next month's meeting agenda and if there was a concern about the burden it put on them, the tenant could be advised to hold on paying August's rent until the Board made a decision. Chair Ruzzano expressed a concern about it opening up for all tenants to request rent abatement. He reiterated that he was looking to only abate Sharkey's rent because they were not allowed to operate. Attorney Tolces said he preferred items be on an agenda, but in this instance, a motion could be made to return the rent check to Sharkey's.

Vice Chair Caggiano made the following motion, seconded by Mr. Arserio:

MOTION: TO DIRECT THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO RETURN THE JULY PAYMENT FROM SHARKEY'S BACK TO THEM BASED ON A HARDSHIP

Ms. Simone commented that Sharkey's had not been closed the whole time, and a reliable source had witnessed people drinking inside and at outside tables. She did not think additional rent abatement was warranted. Mr. Arserio said he had heard similar allegations but he had not seen any documentation of it. He suggested that for future abatements, businesses should be made aware that if they were violated by 311 and shutdown, their abatement would be rejected. Mr. Curtis said the police were made aware of the matter and had gone by Sharkey's but he did not know whether any contact had been made. Mr. Nardi said he had been in his office most days but he was not aware of any issues with them being open for business. He said early on they had several workers there making improvements. He said the owner came in every morning, but he had not seen anybody visiting the place while he had been in his office.

Mr. Arserio suggested adding a caveat that if the business got shut down by the County, then they would owe rent.

Board Attorney Tolces said a written document signed by Sharkey's would be required documenting that the MCRA would return July rent but in the event it was found in violation during the State of Emergency, they would be obligated to pay the MCRA the rent amount within ten day's notice; if they failed to do so, the MCRA had the right to pursue further action.

Ms. Schwartz made the following amendment, seconded by Vice Chair Caggiano:

AMENDMENT: RENT ABATEMENT WOULD BE SUBJECT TO SIGNING AN AGREEMENT FOR PAYMENT OF JULY RENT TO MCRA WITHIN TEN DAYS IF FOUND IN VIOLATION DURING THE STATE OF EMERGENCY; FAILURE TO DO SO WOULD RESULT IN FURTHER ACTION

ROLL CALL ON

THE AMENDMENT: Ms. Simone, Yes; Mr. Arserio, Yes; Ms. Schwartz, Yes; Mr. Caggiano, Yes; Mr. Ruzzano, Yes. The amendment passed 5-0.

**ROLL CALL ON
ORIGINAL MOTION
AS AMENDED:**

Ms. Simone, No; Mr. Arserio, Yes; Ms. Schwartz, Yes; Mr. Caggiano, Yes; Mr. Ruzzano, Yes. The motion passed 4-1.

Mr. Nardi explained that three months ago, the owner of Ace Hardware had planned to expand his current space by taking an additional 3,200 square foot adjacent to his leased space and giving up 3,200 square foot on the east end of the plaza. He said his plan was to build out his space and move out of the existing 3,200 square foot space and into the new 3,200 square foot space, and the lease that was written granted him the use of both spaces for 90 days to complete the work. He said an email was sent to the MCRA which claimed that he had difficulty hiring an engineer and staff due to COVID. His 90-day period ended at the end of June and he had not had the opportunity to finish the new space and move. He indicated that he would be able to move before the end of July but was asking for an additional 30 days of free rent to make the move. He said he paid the rent due but he was asking for consideration. He explained that the lease was written where rent would be due on the old space after the 90-day period ended.

Mr. Arserio commented that he understood the delay but it was hard to justify because it was not due to a government shutdown. He said he would like more information and to hear from the owner. Ms. Schwartz noted that their business had remained open and their hardship was not based on the COVID crisis; she agreed with Mr. Arserio.

Chair Ruzzano asked Mr. Nardi the square footage amount of both plazas; Mr. Nardi responded that there was about 100,000 square foot at an average of \$12 per square foot.

Mr. Arserio asked Mr. Nardi whether a \$3.00 CAM fee would still be below the industry standard. Mr. Nardi said a survey had been done about six months ago of surrounding plazas and the previous Executive Director had planned to hold a workshop with the Board about the plaza improvements, lease terms, CAM, etc., to explain everything. Chair Ruzzano asked what larger anchor stores paid. Mr. Nardi said it depended on several factors, noting that in a Publix shopping center it could be more than \$30 per square foot. He said part of the MCRA's issue was its 12-month termination clause which was part of a larger conversation. He agreed that CAM could be phased in and that the tenants were aware of it.

6. BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

David Tolces, Board Attorney, advised that Judge Robinson denied the City's and MCRA's Motions to Dismiss in the litigation with New Urban Communities, and the signed order would be forthcoming. He requested that a shade session be held with the Board members, Executive Director, Michael Burke, Esq., and himself. He said the purpose of the shade session would be to discuss current status and next steps. He said the shade session would be held virtually using Zoom and participants needed to make sure no one else was present as shade sessions were confidential. He explained the process that would be followed. Mr. Arserio volunteered to help facilitate the Zoom meeting. Rita Rodi, CRA Coordinator, announced that the shade session was scheduled for Wednesday, July 15, 2020 from 11:00am-1:00pm.

Ms. Simone: She reminded businesses to follow the Broward County COVID guidelines.

Mr. Arserio: He encouraged everyone to follow the CDC guidelines and be respectful of others. He spoke about a mask giveaway that was being sponsored by State Representative Omphrey on MCRA property. He said the July 4th event was incredible, and he acknowledged the efforts of Police, Fire, and Parks and Recreation.

Ms. Schwartz: She agreed with comments made by Board members Simone and Arserio about wearing masks and the July 4th parade. She encouraged everyone to stay safe.

Mr. Caggiano: He agreed with the other Board members' comments. He asked everyone to be kind and considerate and practice social distancing.

Mr. Ruzzano: He commented on the good progress of the David Park project. He said large dummy checks were presented to three businesses for the Small Business Emergency Grant program: Eyes on Atlantic, Happy Nails and Spa, and Penny and Company Hair Salon. He spoke about a picture he received that had been taken in the median of another city of a small, attractive aluminum fence that might be something to consider in Margate as a deterrent to keep people from crossing areas of State Road 7. He commented that the painting of Atlantic wall looked good.

Mr. Arserio commented that there was a property in MCRA that had seven election signs. He commented that strict guidelines existed and needed to be followed and that everyone should be held to the same standard.

There being no additional business, the meeting adjourned at 8:12 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Transcribed by Rita Rodi, CRA Coordinator



Tommy Ruzzano, Chair

