

Call to Order

Chairperson Flores called the meeting to order at 6:04 pm.

Roll Call

The Quincy Community Redevelopment Agency Advisory Board met on Tuesday, July 29, 2025, for a special meeting with the following other members present: Member Gainous, Member Ware, Member Smith and Member Elmore.

Also in attendance:

Manager Forehand, Attorney Laing, Transcriptionist Pamela Tribue

Approval of Agenda

Motion by Member Smith to approve the agenda, seconded by Member Elmore, motion carried 5-0.

Old Business

Finalize the Selection Process for the Housing Program

Manager Forehand provided a simplified list of the process for selection of homes.

Member Gainous was expecting something different based on comments from the attorney regarding the use of a scoring sheet. He recalled Attorney Brown indicated, at the last meeting, that if the board was going to use the scoring chart, they would have to change and notify the applicants of the new process.

Ms. Tribue stated based on the draft minutes from that meeting, the motion was: Motion by Member Gainous to have a special meeting to finalize the selection process, seconded by Member Rahman, passed 5-0. Member Elmore referred to the sheet provided by the manager as the process. Chairperson Flores recalled that Attorney Brown stated that if the old applications were put out to the public in a certain way, then when the new applications were sent out the public had to be updated in regard to what the new process would be. The public would have to be advised if the application process has changed. Attorney Laing confirmed that is correct if the process has changed. Member Gainous reiterated that the motion was indeed to finalize the process but by reviewing the plan and updating it as appropriate. He also stated he is not in favor of the score sheet because it is not fair. All the areas need to be covered and if we change the process this is not fair. Member Ware asked if all the old applications would be included. The manager stated that the old and new applications are included. Member Elmore asked if there was something wrong with the process provided by the manager, as the items discussed at the last meeting appear to be covered. Member Gainous pointed out that not all members of the board were made aware of the scoring sheet until last meeting, which was not fair. The manager stated that all forms were created by herself and staff and that the regular board reviewed and approved it. The advisory board was delayed in receiving and approving the process due to two missed board meetings. During the regular board meeting they requested that the criteria be put out to the community so they would know that this process has changed. Member Ware asked if we have to have criteria or scoring sheet, if the houses need work done to them, let's do the work. Perhaps the inspector or contractor can go out and inspect the houses and let's fix them. Feels the proposed process is too much. Manager Forehand explained that the board has more applications than they have money, so a selection process has to be established. The idea is to have this as a continuous program and that all homes will be done at some point.

Attorney Laing recapped:

- The process required verification.
- The process includes a scoring sheet which is new.

She then asked if the new process has been voted on and approved. Manager indicated yes it was approved by the full board. Staff was directed to present all of this to the public so they would know, including the criteria for the program.

Chairperson Flores asked Ms. Tribue to check the draft minutes to see what the recommendations by Attorney Brown regarding the current applications. Recalling the attorney stated that the public would need to be made aware. The manager indicated that this would be done.

Chairperson Flores recapped what he understands is the process:

- Applications are received by the manager/staff.
- The review team will identify target areas in each district of the CRA district.
- The team will score each application.
- The Manager will review/evaluate the scored applications and compile a list.
- List submitted to advisory board for recommendation to regular board.
- Recommended list submitted to regular board for final approval.

Member Gainous expressed that this process is unfair as the review team has not visited all areas. According to their report they went to district 1 and portions of 2 & 3.

Voices rose as several members spoke simultaneously. Chairperson Flores reminded all to be professional and respectful as the desired goal is to serve the citizens and improve the entire CRA district.

Member Gainous apologized but reiterated his concern that not all districts had been visited. The manager explained that they were not finished and that each area within the district would be reviewed. She also stated that Districts 4 & 5 have very little homes in them and because of the timing may not be included in the first round of renovations.

Member Gainous is again not pleased that there is a plan to do additional reviews tomorrow and this has not been brought before the board. He suggested that the Florida Sunshine Laws have been violated as decisions are being made without the full consent of the dais.

Attorney Laing asked:

- Has the process already been approved by the board? Manager indicates yes
- After approval of the process by the regular board, the review team went out right? Manager referred to the "Selection and Approval" previously distributed as it allows for the creation of Review Committee to be selected by the CRA Manager. It will include a staff person, housing specialist and community member.

Member Smith asked if the scoring will be done after all areas have been done to give everyone an equal chance. The manager explained about the target area(s) within each district and how they will be placed in categories A, B or C. There is a chance all districts will have houses in each category.

Member Gainous mentioned hearing timing again and again, and asked if this is why it appears we are rushing to get something done by just throwing it together. We need to be fair. What is this scoring process, what's the criteria? Manager Forehand responded that the referral to timing is related to the next regular board meeting, which is tomorrow. As stated before, this is working

in reverse because of the missed advisory board meetings. This board's approval is to acknowledge your awareness of the project. The only rush is to get things moving forward, to get on track, there is no fear of losing the funds or rushing through the process.

Attorney Laing hesitated to speak on this in detail as she is not familiar with the entire process and previous meetings. It appears that this process has been approved but there remain some questions that give her pause. So, there is a scoring key and what appears to be a rubric.

Motion by Member Elmore to accept the housing program selection process as it is presented, Discussion:

Member Smith stated based on her experience it may be better to review all the target areas and then evaluate them.

Member Gainous stated that Member Elmore could not make a motion as the board has not come to an agreement. Member Ware stated she would like to add to the motion that all applications (old & new) be included.

died for lack of second.

Motion by Member Elmore to accept the housing process selection process presented with the addition of including the old and new applications to the process, motion died for lack of second.

Audience Comments

Regina Davis

- Confused because it has been stated that the regular board has approved this process. Agrees that the criteria is subjective. Recommends a joint workshop. Feels that some members of the regular board are confused as well. In response to questions from Ms. Davis, Attorney Laing stated that she feels it is wrought with subjectivity, it is not objective enough to withstand legal challenge, understanding that she has not seen the minutes from the previous regular board meeting that would include their comments.
- Evaluation of the applications – this as well is confusing
- Attorney Laing commented that although this is an approved process, it appears that the advisory board may have recommendations and questions that need to be taken back to the regular board.

Manager Forehand stated she has no problem taking it back to the regular board, but this program will not get off the ground if people don't come to her with questions before the meetings, if questions are asked of the attorney who is not familiar with the complexities of the program, not sure how the board is going to understand when it appears they are not reading the materials being provided.

Member Comments

Member Smith made a recommendation to have a more comprehensive selection committee and asked when the review is done.

Member Ware – None and asked to be excused to attend another meeting.

Member Gainous stated

- He doesn't like the manager's comments made to the public and her statement that she gets a check every two weeks.
- Wants some accountability. Feels the process is very important and warrants discussion even if we don't all agree.
- Requested a joint meeting with the regular board.
- Suggests that we target houses not areas, not neighborhoods.

- Recalled his desire to assist the elderly like his 98-yr old aunt that needs a ramp. He understands he would have to abstain from voting but doesn't want her to be overlooked because of the focus on areas and criteria.
- Recommends that the advisory board come back on Monday and meet with the regular board to come to a better conclusion regarding the process.

Member Elmore

- Explained that she is new to the area and feels she can give an unbiased opinion on what she sees. She is not related to or familiar with many residents, her goal is to help as many people as possible.
- Feels the need to review the criteria again as there are many differing opinions on what that should look like.
- As the advisory board we should be taking our suggestions to the regular board. Additionally, we need to become more familiar with our role and the ins and outs of the CRA.
- Perhaps a workshop should be considered to get a step-by-step list of the process so that everyone is on the same page.

Chairperson Flores

- Shared that prior to her departure, Member Ware told him she wanted a joint meeting.
- Agrees we need to come back and review some stuff.
- Stressed again the importance of listening to the attorney's advice.
- Encouraged board members to remain professional and respectful. The board members serve in an advisory capacity whose goal is to serve our community.

Attorney Comments

None

Other

Transcriptionist Pam Tribue stated that typically she does not make any comments but wanted to first of all apologize to Ms. Forehand. She was asked for her interpretation of what the board expected today and after reviewing the draft minutes advised Ms. Forehand that she needed to explain the process in simple terms. This would be a simpler version of the extensive document already given to the members. Mrs. Tribue has served on the board and as the transcriptionist for several years and noted that the process is changing. This does not have to be seen as a bad thing. People have different visions of how we can get the job done. She has been in the same boat, when she questioned how the previous and current CRA Manager was going to get things done. It is important that we listen carefully, read the documents being provided, and please ask questions. When I don't understand I call her and ask what did you mean when you said this, how are you going to do that and how you considered this. She has always welcomed my questions and comments. There is no need to wait for a meeting and bombard her with questions that could have been addressed earlier. The idea of target areas is new and the regular board has approved her way of approaching this. I think it is also a misunderstanding that not all areas within the district will be served. All areas will be served. There is a list of 80+ houses, not all of them can be served in round one but the goal is to serve all of them. In order to do that you have to ask who goes first? Someone has got to evaluate that. She doesn't know if the criteria and rubric are detailed enough to come up with an answer but no matter what someone is going to be first, second, third and number 80. Maybe there needs to be more discussion on how that is determined but you have to be open minded. All districts will be served but by addressing a targeted area within a district it should have a bigger impact. That's not to say how it was done previously was right or wrong but this is another approach to get the same job done. Ms. Forehand's vision, that has been accepted by the board, is to view each district and determine the worse

neighborhoods/areas within that district and address those. That approach is different but that doesn't make it wrong. Meeting once a month is a disadvantage for board members and staff. Only so much can be accomplished during that short period of time, add to that the regular board meets one a month also. Ms. Forehand is getting direction from both boards and any time a meeting is cancelled or there is a change in direction that leads to a delay. She has heard that things are being rushed but that is not in her opinion because of a deadline. The money is not going away. She doesn't feel it is fair to complain that there is a six or seven month delay but then say we don't need to start moving forward. The delays have been because of cancelled meetings, changes in direction, requests for additional information, FDLE investigations, staffing shortage, etc. She is not supporting Ms. Forehand or the board, she wants everyone to understand they are on the same team. Within a team not everyone is going to agree on everything. If it is not illegal or immoral let's move forward. If it needs clarification or tweaking, Ms. Forehand is willing to listen and adapt as needed.

Member Gainous stated he disagrees with Ms. Tribue wholeheartedly. He doesn't believe that Ms. Forehand has a vision, nor that all 80 applications will be taken care of. Feels that if we are going to do one area, that applications should be taken from that one area only. He doesn't agree with the creation of a process that is not being properly looked at. It has been said that the regular board has voted on this but he is sure everyone did not agree. He referred to the same 3-2 vote since the arrival of two new commissioners. He also feels that Ms. Forehand is part of the three, so those who oppose her are at a disadvantage. Doesn't feel the City is going to grow regardless of the vision.

Member Elmore leaves the meeting.

Manager Forehand

- Reminded the board there needs a meeting to approve the list of applicants.
- The flyer to be sent out to the citizens also needs to be reviewed by this board.
- The revised applications and criteria requested by the regular board needs to be approved by this board.

Ms. Tribue will poll the advisory board members for attendance at a meeting on Monday, August 4th at 6:00 pm.

Adjournment

Motion to adjourn by Member Gainous, seconded by Member Smith, motion carried 3-0.

Meeting adjourned 8:05 pm