



MINUTES OF THE CITY OF MIRAMAR CITY COMMISSION WORKSHOP

SEPTEMBER 29, 2025

4:30 P.M.

A legislative workshop of the Miramar City Commission was called to order by Mayor Messam at 4:36 p.m. on Monday, September 29, 2025, in the City Commission Chambers, Town Center, 2300 Civic Center Place, Miramar, Florida.

ROLL CALL/ANNOUNCEMENTS

Upon call of the roll, the following members of the City Commission were present:

Mayor Wayne M. Messam
Vice Mayor Yvette Colbourne
Commissioner Avril Cherasard
Commissioner Maxwell B. Chambers
Commissioner Carson Edwards

Members of staff present in the Commission Chambers:

City Manager Dr. Roy Virgin
City Attorney Jordan Gary
City Clerk Denise A. Gibbs

PRESENTATION

A. LEGISLATIVE DISCUSSION

CITY MANGER VIRGIN: This is workshop is one that we have been requestion for a while, and we're happy that we have a lot of the parties here, so at this junction, I'm going to turn it over to our well esteemed Mr. Debon, who has organized with all the legislative folks to get them here. Mr. Debon.

Development and Intergovernmental Affairs Officer Debon Campbell acknowledged the presence of the City's lobbyist team, noting the City's State legislative delegation was

invited, but they, too, were holding their legislative workshop at the same time as the present meeting; they did send their regrets. He turned the presentation over to lobbyist, Sean Hennessey

Lobbyist Sean Hennessey began the PowerPoint presentation, as provided in the backup, stating the following:

- The workshop agenda would cover the issue and purpose of the workshop, some background, the 2025 State Legislative session updates, 2026 State proposed projects, 2025 federal updates, and the 2026 federal appropriations submitted projects
- Priority projects for the upcoming State Legislative session would be presented, for which Commission input was sought; they included projects that aligned with state funding requirements to ensure the team had the best possible case in Tallahassee; federal appropriations submitted project overview.

Mr. Campbell explained that the City contracted out to lobby firms, as indicated by current members of the lobbying team, and the firms to which they were associated; this put the City in a position to advocate firmly on all its priorities, and positions; it was a standard practice for a city of Miramar's size to have a robust lobbying team to be successful.

Lobbyist Jared Rosenstein, Capital City Consulting, remarked that the last legislative session was pretty unique; for municipal purposes, the session did not end with the budget, having gotten into a complete gridlock between the House, the Senate, and the Governor's Office. He opined that this benefited municipalities, as a lot of bad legislation that would negatively impact municipalities died because of this budget gridlock; these included sovereign immunities that could cost cities millions of dollars, changes to CRAs, etc. Heading into the next legislative session, municipalities needed to be very cognizant of the discussion on property taxes. There was a select committee on property taxes, and the Governor thought he could unilaterally say that property taxes were gone, but, realistically, it was a decision of the legislature, and the latter had to put something on the ballot in order for there to be a change on property taxes in the Florida Constitution. He believed there were realistic proposals that the Legislature would try to steer the conversation towards, such as relief from property taxes for persons 65 and older, or a millage rate reduction for persons on a fixed income. Removing property taxes would result in serious financial losses for municipalities, and there was insufficient general revenue (GR) at the state level to fill cities' revenue gaps. Mr. Rosenstein commented on there being conversations in the Florida Senate about whether to replace property tax with a consumption based tax, such as upping sales tax to 14 percent, but he thought this would disproportionately disadvantaged cities and counties without a large retail presence. He said the City's lobby team and staff would be tracking the property tax conversations, etc. very closely, giving the City Commission and management real time updates. It would likely culminate into something on the November 2026 ballot. He noted cities should expect to see the matter of sovereign immunity return, as well as changes to CRAs, as state government liked to keep an eye on local governments, and their

spending. The State's Chief Financial Officer (CFO) would be in Broward County on September 30, 2025, speaking about his findings with Broward County, and it was important to be mindful of such activities to ensure that when cities drafted their annual budget, they did not attract the radar in Tallahassee. He stressed that they could not change cities' budgets, but they were trying to influence city government's behavior on spending, resulting in some municipalities, such as Broward County, taking steps to keep their spending low, making a small millage reduction, which State legislators favored, thinking it was due to their influence.

Lobbyist Rana Brown, Ronald Book, PA, mentioned that Miami-Dade County had a property tax delegation meeting earlier in the present day, and they spoke through exactly how that county's dollars were spent, such as how much of the budget was spent on fire and police, and other requirements they had little spending wiggle room. It was very productive educating the delegation members, and the chairman of that meeting read out a list of items of note he received from his constituents that they felt should be on the next election ballot, though he concluded in the end that none of them would work. Items on that list included: changing the portability of the homestead exemption; raising the homestead exemption to \$500,000.00; fund fiscally constrained counties separately, though this would result in surrounding counties supplementing the budget of smaller, disenfranchised counties, such as rural ones; at present, no ad valorem taxes for those at 100 percent disability, but it was suggested that a sliding percentage disability scale be implemented to lower the taxes accordingly; changing agricultural exemptions, and what would qualify; Florida residents who owned and occupied their house for 20 years should receive a tax discount on the following ten years; raising the cap on Save Our Homes, and include renters; alleviate all homestead property taxes, which would lead to 27 percent of all ad valorem shifting to non-homesteaded properties, which was unworkable; and figuring out how to prevent an increase in property taxes due to increases in home values after improvements were made by the owner to lower their home insurance. All the suggestions would significantly impact local governments' budgets. Ms. Brown mentioned that Florida House Representative Mike Redondo, a future incoming speaker said that he foresaw that if property taxes were eliminated, it would be of no relief to local citizens, as it would only result in a cost shift, as cities would have to figure out how to fund their emergency services, first responders, etc., which were services that residents wanted. Without property tax revenue, the cost to provide those services would not be alleviated, just shifted to residents in another manner; these were matters the committee was hearing at present, and they had no solutions as yet.

Mr. Rosenstein mentioned one other matter the City should pay attention to in the next legislative session was congressional redistricting. Whether or not the latter turned out the way the Governor preferred remained to be seen, and it depended on the efforts of other states, such as Texas and California. He noted that right now the margin for a republican majority at the federal level was two votes, so there was movement afoot in some democratic states to redraw districts to pick up democratic seats, and then in republican states to offset that. Time would tell how Florida reacted, depending on some of the rulings, and what happened in other states, but the Florida Speaker of the House

impaneled a redistricting committee, so their discussions were being closely monitored. He said this was important to municipalities, as it affected which member of congress represented them, and advocated for them.

Ms. Brown added that the CRA legislation might come back, but not in its previous form, as in the last session it was used as leverage to secure votes, but it failed; they were very strategic in using that language to play around with different budget things, and other policies. Lobbyists sought input from the City, giving them some ideas by looking at the previous language; in the last year, there were areas of compromise that cities were willing to do, such as sticking to the sunset date, while facilitating opportunities for new projects, as many of the existing projects needed to be completed for bonding purposes. She believed that if the CRA bill came back in the same form, there would already be language on hand to use to negotiate some compromise solution.

MAYOR MESSAM: I guess, as it relates to whatever upcoming battle on the CRA front, we're kind of silent, because we don't have the benefit of a CRA; we wish we did, but, yes, it's definitely something of note. We know that many of our peer municipalities are very concerned about them. Before we go into the projects, because it's fresh in everyone's mind, at this time, if there are any questions for the Commission for our state lobbying team, the floor is open for that discussion. Commissioner Cherasard, you're recognized.

COMMISSIONER CHERASARD: Good afternoon. Thanks everyone. I had a question for Ronnie Book -- Ron was your name.

MAYOR MESSAM: Ron Brown.

COMMISSIONER CHERASARD: I had a question for you. Thank you, Ronnie, for presenting, and explaining the list of considerations that came up at the Miami-Dade meeting. I wrote down a few of them, and I wanted to get some clarity on why some of the solutions for them were all or nothing, versus kind of working to find middle grounds that do work. I did hear about the additional disabilities at 40 percent, but what about the additional disabilities at another sliding scale at ten percent that wouldn't cripple a budget, but would be an additional relief. I also heard about the home improvements not raising your valuation; that seems fairly reasonable. I mean on a bigger scale, it may hurt the input, but to a lesser degree. How about trying to find some smaller ways to achieve savings without being all or nothing on the attempted amount that was raised? Is it an option for that?

MS. BROWN: Well, that's a good question. I think all of the things that I ran through were some of the ideas that legislators are hearing from the community, and the point that they were making in reading out those was that none of them are necessarily going to make a big difference, or, really, technically work. I think the 40 percent for disability was a -- they were trying to talk about a sliding scale, but how do you truly gauge that. And so I think that they're still looking for solutions. We went to -- last Monday and Tuesday when they

had their meetings in Tallahassee, they're still in the educational stage, as far as making sure member understand the issue, not just eliminate property taxes. But what does that mean? And think that they're still at that stage; I think they don't have any solutions yet, so I wouldn't take any of those as a given. I think that they really still have to dig into it more.

COMMISSIONER CHERASARD: Thank you. I also had a very quick question for Gerald.

MR. WESTER: Hi, how are yah?

COMMISSIONER CHERASARD: Hey, Gerald, thank you, I'm very good. I wanted to ask you a little bit more information about when municipalities did their brief millage reduction, and there was a response from -- was it Tallahassee?

MR. WESTER: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER CHERASARD: About the change; whether it was a huge reduction or not, they were pleased to see that changes were being made in the direction of relief. Can you tell me a little bit more about how that presented, and how that information came down?

MR. WESTER: Sure, thank you. It's a great question. When the Governor and his team launched their DOGE effort, right, to look at municipal budgets, first it was a theory, then the Legislature put a little teeth to it by changing the law, giving them the statutory authority to do so. The first county they chose to DOGE was our home county, Broward County, right. Some of the things they look at is increase of budget adjusted for population, and inflation, right; that is one metric of, I think, a dozen that they really use. They look at government inefficiencies, they're looking at salaries, they're looking at nonprofit funding, arts funding; really -- and if you listen to the words -- don't take it from me. If you listen to the words of our new CFO, Blaise Ingoglia, you know, the CFO has said that government should be funding basic services: fire, water, roads. But, you know, he used as an example -- he did just the other day that there was a county in the State of Florida that is paying eight times the cost of a road that the State pays, right. These inefficiencies are some of the things that they're trying to highlight with specificity to Broward County who, in all honesty, a client of mine. You know, the County administration worked really hard with the County Commissioners on crafting a budget that kept spending flat, with a very small millage rate reduction. I think the last millage rate change, if I'm correct, I just became a homeowner here, so I should know this, right, is in 2017. But I'll say that I got calls from the Governor's Office about Broward County, "Look at them, they reduced their millage rate." Now, again, it's a dollar for each resident, but it's something, right, and it's showing that there is a psychological effect on the conversation changing of just being mindful of how you spend your money. Again, Tallahassee can't really do anything to change your budget, but they can say, "Hey, look, philosophically, we're just -- the State's going to go in a different direction." And that trickles all the way down to voters, and constituents, and when county commissioners are

starting to hear about property taxes, right, it's a strategy that is working. It was positive feedback -- it remains to be seen; we'll see tomorrow when they do their press conference on DOGE in Broward County, but it's the small things, I think, they see. They would never in a million years -- I think in a million years, and I think the lobbyists behind me would agree, that we would never see, you know, the Republican CFO in the State of Florida praising Broward County for something they did budgetarily, but he did. So, you know, that's the -- those are the small wins that a city can show: hey, we're saving taxpayer money.

COMMISSIONER CHERASARD: Appreciate you, thank you.

MAYOR MESSAM: Any other comments or questions? All right, thank you.

MR. WESTER: Thanks.

Mr. Campbell moved the presentation to a discussion of the proposed 2026 projects for the upcoming legislative session.; Miramar had a total of seven.

- Miramar sought funding for seven projects: Pembroke Road widening; sidewalk improvements; water distribution improvements; lift station improvements; cybersecurity improvement; special operations; and the Southcentral Southeast Focal Point; the City was very successful over the years with receiving the latter
- These were all projects the City identified as aligned with the Governor's Office to stand a better chance of success; it was likely the City would have to make the list smaller based on the lobby teams' recommendation, which was to reduce the number to submit a solid four or five projects
- Commission input was being sought on the seven projects.

MAYOR MESSAM: Any thoughts or comments? I think most of these projects have existed in some form or another, have been discussed. Are there any comments or questions regarding this schedule of projects for the 2026 State proposed projects? All right, hearing none, yeah, I mean outside of just determining those priority projects, I'm not sure what the Governor's, I guess, theme will be for this upcoming fiscal year. But I think it's well known, at least for the projects that come out of the City of Miramar what positive feedback we have received, or that they are dealing with, even the most vulnerable, our infrastructure, which is needed, and it's really hard to criticize the projects. The other positive note is that we're not asking for complete funding; we're bringing money to the table; it's just a supplement of the overall cost. So I think by maintaining that same position of bringing forth meaningful projects that deal with our infrastructure, and the most vulnerable, as well as showing that we have significant skin in the game with our request positions us to at least get to the Governor's desk. We all know once it gets to his desk it's a crap shoot, right. But we put together credible, you know, projects for consideration would be my comment. Commissioner Chambers.

COMMISSIONER CHAMBERS: Thank you Mayor. Can you put that chart back up, please? I'm just trying to see what we're asking versus what we really need, and what's the reasoning behind asking that small amount.

MS. BROWN: So these are not state grants, these are member project funding requests, which is a completely different thing; these requested amounts are within the range of what those are traditionally funded in the State budget over many years, and something along the lines of the road widening, or the road project on the other chart being such a large project, I would suggest that, maybe, applying for State dollars for that small a portion might not even be worth your while. There might be other ways, other grants that are a different category to try and fund something like that. I think that, you know, just logistically in the budget, there's a House rule that when you submit a funding request, if the House doesn't put the funding request in their first budget, at least half of what you've asked for, it doesn't get in the budget. So we try to be strategic, in that, we don't ask for a \$5 million request, whereas they would have to put half of that in the budget, rather than something smaller, and then we can continue to move that project along. I think that they have their own rules that they work with, and really that's why it's a combination of those type of things.

MAYOR MESSAM: And just a housekeeping note. When you do speak, for our records, if you could just state your name so that our minutes can reflect who's making what statement.

MS. BROWN: Oh, sorry. Yes, sir. Rana Brown with Ronald L. Book, P.A.

MAYOR MESSAM: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER CHAMBERS: So I guess I understand the rationale. I have a general question. In terms of our lobbyists, during the budget process, what kind of leverage do any lobbyist, whether it's the City of Miramar lobbyists, the County, or other cities, what kind of leverage do they have, or impact on the Governor, and also on the Legislature?

MS. BROWN: To promote the projects, you mean?

COMMISSIONER CHAMBERS: In the overall process, not just for what we need, but for decision making.

MS. BROWN: Well, I think issues, as well as funding projects are as much about the value of the projects, as the team you have working on your behalf. I think that you have top people that are on your team from top-tier firms. I think networking of ours, and yours as high priority, as far as how we utilize our contacts to advocate on behalf of the City, and I think that, you know, your staff has worked out fantastic projects, so I think all of those things combined really does work together on your behalf.

COMMISSIONER CHAMBERS: And there is a good working relationship, given the makeup of the elected officials in Tallahassee?

MS. BROWN: I think so. At least don't you think so? Yeah, we have great relationships throughout the Legislature, and in the Governor's Office.

COMMISSIONER CHAMBERS: Okay. I guess, from my perspective, I think there is a -- given everything that's in play for the upcoming legislative session, and the previous one, I think there's a disconnect between the residents of Florida, and what's happening in Tallahassee. And I know we're here, we're meeting with you, updating us, but then what about the general public, because, at the end of the day, they're the ones who vote for everyone that's in Tallahassee. And those are the two important parts of what's happening, and how we can change things, and without that, we're not going to really make a huge difference. So how do we encourage residents, the voting public to pay attention, because they usually don't; they just really pay attention to the City sometimes, and the people that affect them the most, they're not paying attention at all. And that's where decisions of what we are in now, where we are, and where we are heading, that's where the problem comes in. So maybe there's a magic answer somewhere, but I thank you for being here. Thank all of you for being here. Thank you so much.

MS. BROWN: Thank you.

MAYOR MESSAM: Commissioner Cherasard.

COMMISSIONER CHERASARD: Thank you very much. I had a general question that takes us to the beginning of the presentation where you mentioned that you recommend we kind of streamline the amount of items here, and I rely on your experience in the legislature about supplying a list that is eight items long; you have suggested we condense it into critical projects, or timely projects, so I rely on that recommendation. But my follow-up question to that would be -- if everything here is slated to be started and completed in 2026, and if there are things here that are many years ahead of that, where those are things that can wait for another legislative year, the true question is really: Is it better to submit a more condensed, needy list than seven or eight, and do we need to really work on getting this a little lower?

MAYOR MESSAM: Before she responds, I think the list is priority projects that the City could apply for, and I think staff is seeking direction from the Commission on what our priority list will be, so over the last, perhaps, at least six years, we've typically would submit three to five projects every year out of a longer list of options that we could submit. So, obviously, we would have to -- ideally, from this meeting, if we could, perhaps, give some guidance to staff as it relates to those projects that are on this list that would make up that priority list, so that our lobbying team could work on our behalf with our delegation in the Legislature. Good afternoon, you're recognized, ma'am.

MS. ST. FLEUR: Good afternoon. Good afternoon. My name is Katia St. Fleur with the Southern Group. I wanted to just speak briefly to how we get to the list, so that it can help you guys make the decision. The Legislature has a tendency to give priority to projects that we've already worked on. So, in the past, what we do is we look at where have we gotten money before, and where is there an appetite for more, and we typically give some suggestions, and that's kind of how the list comes about, right. The other thing that I wanted to talk about was really just to give you guys a little bit of kudos; everything you guys gave us last year got in the budget. One thing got vetoed, but everything got in the budget, so the team worked really, really hard to get that done. I work on a number of teams; this is one of the better teams, so kudos to Debon for coming up, making sure he stays on top of us; and, again, everything we submitted got into the budget, so you do have a stellar team. And when you're looking at the projects that you need to fund, what I would recommend, as we typically recommend, is what are the projects that we've already gotten funding, how much more money do we need to get there, and the ones that we don't have the ability to fund directly, we work with the Debon, and we'll will continue to work with Debon to see where we can get grant dollars, where we can work with departments to see if we can get into their budgets. And someone made the statement about communicating -- sorry, Commissioner Chambers, you made the statement about communicating with the residents. We send out weekly reports about what's happening in Tallahassee, and we also send out reports at the end of session; what we -- all of us would combine, we'd be more than happy to do for your newsletter is maybe put out a top ten things for people to look for. That's super simple; it's just extracting what we already send you, and you can share that with the residents. And -- kind of, those are some of the things that I wanted to kind of go over. So, again, as you're looking at this, not only what's closest to being done, and what you need for 2025/2026, but also what have we already funded, because that is typically where we know we have appetite. Thank you.

MAYOR MESSAM: Thank you.

Mr. Campbell indicated that for the next portion of the workshop, the Commission would hear from the City's Washington, D.C. lobbyist, Maurice Kurland for an update.

Lobbyist Maurice Kurland updated the Commission on what was happening in Washington, D.C., stating the following:

- They were still in the middle of their legislative session, just days away from the end of the federal fiscal year; there was a lot of discussion about whether or not the federal government would shut down; if there was a shut down, the question was whether it would be a short-term one, or longer
- The City's projects were well positioned based on where things stood at present, even if there was a government shut down, as in the end the federal government still had to be funded, though nothing was 100 percent until it was finalized

- In the past, the City's lobbyists worked on infrastructure pertaining to water, transportation, and public safety; the main members of Congress working on the City's behalf were Debbie Wasserman Schultz, and Frederica Wilson
- In recent history, there was funding close to \$1 million for water infrastructure; \$1 million for the Youth Enrichment Center (YEC); working with the City's grants team, they were able to secure over \$4 million for public safety; for hiring firefighters, one of the biggest grants of over \$6.5 million
- The City had done very well positioning itself with community project funding
- Pending in the upcoming year was over \$1 million for the Pembroke Road widening and expansion project advocated by Congresswoman Wasserman Schultz; the project funding was included in the House Transportation, and Housing Urban Development (HUD) Bill that was pending
- Also pending was an additional \$800,000.00 for the YEC; this was a priority for Congresswoman Wilson
- Congresswoman Wilson, of her own volition, submitted a second project called the Empowering of Miramar Youth Crime Prevention Through Community Engagement
- The rule that had to be contended with in Washington was that each member of Congress could only submit a total of 15 projects a year for funding; the projects encompassed their entire congressional district
- The One Big Beautiful Bill contained many controversial items, some of which were important for City of Miramar
- One was the reauthorization of opportunity zones that started in 2016, allowing cities to designate several of their low-income census tracts; this was a means by which to drive private investment into those areas; those investing in these areas would receive a tax deferral
- Another was the reauthorization of the New Market Tax Credit; these were items the City's Economic Development Department would look at
- There was increased spending on border security, immigration, national defense
- Reforms to Medicaid, and SNAP - food stamps; this affected constituents in the community, as they had to choose between purchasing supplemental food or affordable health insurance; the requirements were made stricter
- These changes would go into effect in the next fiscal year
- The primary item driving the potential for a federal government shutdown was that Democrats said they would not agree to fund the government until November 21st because they had not been brought to the table, and their priorities were to make sure that healthcare was affordable, and for healthcare tax credits that were removed to be reinstated
- There was also a rescissions package, which was unusual, whereby the GOP leadership said that even though everyone agreed on the funding last year, they wanted to cut out international aid, which they did; and cut funding for public broadcasting, which they did; these were things that upset the Democrats, as those matters were already agreed on by both parties last year, and now they were taken away

- With Miramar's diverse population, these were recessions that directly affected the U.S. foreign policy globally
- There was considerable discussion about eliminating FEMA, for which there had been some good pushback; Congressman Jared Moskowitz felt some improvements were needed, so he introduced a FEMA reform bill that pushed other members of Congress on both sides to introduce the FEMA Act of 2025 that would elevate the administration of FEMA to cabinet level; the act was introduced, and supported by both sides, passing the committee 57-3; this was good support and pushback from the administration
- With regard to housing, the issue of property tax, and the supply of affordable housing, Senator Tim Scott of South Carolina, and Elizabeth Warren of Massachusetts joined together on a bill called the Road to Housing Act for 2025; this was the first comprehensive housing bill to come out of the committee in about ten years; it came out with a vote of 24-0, so everyone agreed something needed to be done about housing; the main drivers of the bill were housing costs, supply, access, homelessness, etc.; the Act sought to increase the supply of affordable housing, and increase Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funding
- The City's agenda for 2026 would be the continuation of the Pembroke Road widening; and the YEC; there was still time for the City to add projects, as submissions were not until March.

MAYOR MESSAM: Any questions or comments for Mr. Kurland? Just one quick question. What has been the appetite in terms of continuing community funding projects, or earmark projects for congressional members? There's been some discussion about, you know, cutting that back.

MR. KURLAND: I think from the members of Congress, there is a continuing appetite. I think once a determination was made: Hey, this is a tool in our toolbox, and these are our constituents, and we should be able to direct funding to our communities, because we know them. Even on both sides, we're seeing -- in the State of Florida, there are only two members, currently, that do not do that; it's real interesting. One is Congressman Bean, who's a former mayor, doesn't support them, okay; and Kat Cammack who represents Gainesville. Why they don't, I don't know, but members on both sides, Republicans and Democrats throughout the whole State of Florida, they do. Your United States senators do not, currently. But in answer to your question, Mr. Mayor, there are members in other states on both sides that -- hey, we want these, we have them baked in the process so far; we want them. So I would just qualify that, because the administration, you know, has different perspectives, and priorities, and in the name of just cutting spending, could push back. But I do think in this case the Congress is saying we need these, and these work well, and they vet them. All this stuff that I'm talking about, they post them on their websites, as you know. I'm telling you this, but you can look at Wasserman Schultz or Wilson's website yourself, and you can see them listed, and so it's very public, so we're not hiding anything, and these are important projects. You road, your youth, your public safety. So, thank you.

MAYOR MESSAM: Thank you. I think now there's open discussion, or is there any other presentation? Are there any final comments or questions for our guests. Vice Mayor Colbourne, you're recognized.

VICE MAYOR COLBOURNE: Thank you. I just wanted to say thank you to both our state legislators -- I'm sorry, state lobbyists, as well as our federal lobbyist. We truly appreciate the update. You know, we hear a lot of stuff on the news, and we know there's a lot going on, but it's good to hear it from you, and your insight, and how you're dealing with it, how you're maneuvering with it. But I do appreciate all the support that you provide in terms of the grants, and the lobbying efforts. I know this year our state folks, we really had them on overtime, or overworked, so just want to say thank you to all of you.

MAYOR MESSAM: Commissioner Chambers.

COMMISSIONER CHAMBERS: Thank you for the presentation here tonight. I also want to thank you for meeting with me today, and just give me a little update. We appreciate you. We thank you for the work you do in Washington, and keep fighting for us. Thank you.

MAYOR MESSAM: Commissioner Cherasard. Okay. You're done? Commissioner Edwards.

COMMISSIONER EDWARDS: Okay. Just like to take the opportunity to say thank you to all the lobbyists. For me as a newbie, I am a little better in terms of understanding some of the intricacies of what you all do, and, also, it provides me with some more information to make a little more informed decision when it comes to one of the things that we're tasked to do here, so I thank you all very much. Appreciate it.

MAYOR MESSAM: All right. So as we conclude the workshop, thanks again to everyone; thanks to Mr. Manager and the team. Mr. Campbell, your team for bringing this workshop together. It's a lot of work to be done. I will say though that municipalities seem to be under attack every legislative session. I mean I'm not going to sugarcoat it. We're under attack. And I think the better we can communicate the importance of striking that balance between being affordable, as well as providing a quality of life. Running a city is totally different than running a state, you know. Our property taxes aren't governed by just incremental population growth, even though Miramar continues to grow. Obviously, everyone deals with inflation, but those aren't the only barometers that we factor in, as it relates to striking a balance between quality of life, and being affordable to our residents. So thank you all for being sensitive to that. We're very appreciative to the stable of lobby professionals that we have on board; some firms are -- have strategic relationships with certain aspects of our Legislature, including the Governor's Office, and we lean on that. We understand that, you know, when we need to lean on the democratic side, we have folks we can go to, and when we need to lean on the republican side, we have folks that we can -- that's called being strategic, and being smart about how we approach these

things to give some insights, so that we can make the best decisions, and give the best directive, as it relates to our residents. So thank you all so much.

ADJOURNMENT

MAYOR MESSAM: And at this time, this workshop is adjourned.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Denise A. Gibbs, MMC
City Clerk
DG/cp