		Page 1
1	Closed-Session Government Meeting	
2		
3		
4		
5	Thursday, October 19, 2023	
6	9:46 a.m.	
7		
8		
9	Remote Proceeding	
10	Miami, FL 33169	
11		
12		
13		
14		
15	Reported by: Kevin Klingenschmid	
16	JOB NO.: 6129266	
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

	-
1	PROCEEDINGS
2	THE REPORTER: All right. We are on
3	the record at 9:46 a.m.
4	Go ahead, Mr. Turner.
5	MR. TURNER: David Turner, city
6	administrator, Key Colony Beach.
7	MS. RAMSAY VICKERY: Hi. Beth Ramsay
8	Vickery, mayor pro tem, Key Colony Beach. I'm the
9	only female in the room today, so this should be easy
10	for you on me.
11	MR. FOSTER: Freddie Foster,
12	commissioner.
13	MR. HARDING: Tom Harding, city
14	commission.
15	MR. RASPE: Joey Raspe, city
16	commission.
17	MR. SMITS: Dirk Smits, city attorney.
18	Okay. So we're here on the Swanson
19	case. I had occasion to talk to all of you
20	individually. Just want to go over what I'm proposing
21	because we had a settlement. Well, we're here to talk
22	about settlement options and litigation expenditures.
23	I've been seeking the recent total for the amount, and
24	I don't have it yet. But we're probably about 15 to
25	20,000 dollars into the Swanson case as of this point,

based upon what I can remember. Might be a little less; might be a little more.

Based upon the pleadings that we are now looking at, they are seeking declaratory relief, which is going to result in us having to answer and respond to the complaint and then litigate. That litigation will of course cost more money and definitely last past November.

November is the day that the contractor — the month that the contractor gave Dave and I as the outside rim for being able to still stick with the agreement — or still do the contract. He's in the window to quit that contract right now, so obviously, if we end up litigating till the summer, we are going to lose the contractor.

Thus, it is my advice -- or the advice that I'm seeking is I feel like the more -- the business decision here is to resolve, save that money, and end up rebidding the city hall. That's what they're asking for, so I would anticipate that that would not be met with yet another lawsuit; however, I intend to spend some time with opposing counsel and make sure that that's the case.

So I'm open to comment on resolving this. I know it's been a divided issue, and now, we

have no more mayor. So I'll ask Dave, what do you have to contribute? Is there a financial advantage to settling or ...

MR. TURNER: With the expenses coming with the upgrade or cost in fire coverage, police negotiations will be coming up, it might be a financial benefit to put it out. But then, on the downside is, are we going to get it cheaper? Or is it going to be more? And what position would that put us in to have a building that's compliant with floods so we don't have an issue with CRS?

MR. SMITS: So those are all things that are going to have to be decided, but right now, it looks like we're going to lose our contractor no matter what. And all we're doing is throwing good money after bad, and that's kind of where I'm at with where -- and listen, we can litigate till kingdom come, but I don't see the point, and I don't see the reason for the expense when the reality is, as business people, we just need to move on in the right direction for the city -- in my opinion. But I'm --

Mayor Pro Tem, your comments?

MS. RAMSAY VICKERY: Okay. The Swanson lawsuit asked for an injunction preventing us from taking action to move forward with rewarding the bid

2.0

to HOB. That bid expired on October 3rd, and we're now finding that the contractor is going to walk next month, making it financially imprudent for us to now spend months and countless costs to pursue a bid that has or will be elapsing.

Therefore, in an effort to move forward and with my concern about the expiration of our \$2,282,859.28 State Harding Grant and my concern for the future of our post office, I think it's in the best interest of the city that we conclude this litigation by rebidding the rebuild project.

MR. SMITS: Foster, do you have anything you want to add?

MR. FOSTER: So the only thing I'd add is the only thing -- my understanding that the litigation is discussing -- is awarding the contractor HOB. That is it. So the only thing that we're talking about here -- it has nothing to do with rebidding or anything else -- it only has to do with stopping the issuance of a contract to HOB, and then we're back to ground zero.

MR. SMITS: So yes. That is what the petitioners asked for, is to not to take away the award to HOB, and that is indeed what the resolution will be. So in terms of the lawsuit, yes. But the

2.1

2.2

2.3

only reason I bring up the other is, if there's going to be any movement on the city hall, we'll make that decision at a later time, which direction.

But it is something that's affecting us right now because of the expiration of time and the expense that's going to result in just expense with no evidence. You know, there's no -- we can litigate through the summer, but we're not going to have anything to show for it.

MR. FOSTER: So again, my comment has to do with the litigation itself only has to do with awarding the contract HOB, and then --

MR. SMITS: That is the lawsuit, just one caveat. There's the action for declaratory relief to declare and to compel certain people to do certain things, to declare that the election needs to be held, and so forth. That's the things that are adding to and will elongate the litigation, if that makes sense.

MR. FOSTER: Right.

MR. SMITS: But the solution is -- what the petitioner wants -- is to not award to HOB.

MR. FOSTER: Okay. So --

MR. SMITS: So that's where I'm going to target if I'm hearing -- well, I haven't heard from everybody, but that's where I'm going to target, is

- resolution like that with an aim towards no more legal stuff, and we'll take it back, and we'll decide on other building options at a separate time and public meeting.

 MR. FOSTER: Okay. So I agree.
 - MR. SMITS: So this is not a vote, by the way, for the record. This is just you're giving your advice to me, and -- so okay. Tom --
 - MR. HARDING: So a few questions. So the judge from Monroe County dismissed this on the same day of the hearing.
 - MR. SMITS: He dismissed it at the hearing. Yes, he did. He gave the petitioners the additional time to seek additional relief. The additional relief that's being solved is going to result in longer mitigation.
 - MR. HARDING: A second question. So going to the next summer for litigation, what's your estimates for that?
- MR. SMITS: If we're close to 29 or -21 more than 1,500.
- MR. HARDING: So it's more than 50 more?
- MR. SMITS: No. At least 40 more.
- MR. HARDING: Okay. So as far as a
- 25 settlement option. Obviously, you can try to put in

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

- verbiage that no more additional litigation
 lawsuits -- what's your confidence that that would be
 held up, not switched around?
 - MR. SMITS: Sure. This would be settling with the petition. It would not be settling with anyone else who wanted to bring similar suit. But this particular situation, the way it is, the way it's framed, the way it's been brought, yes, there is the ability for someone else to bring same lawsuit. This particular situation, unfortunately, we have been -- because of nature of the delay and the nature of the case -- we have been put in a corner because of the contractor's needs to be starting --
 - MR. HARDING: So the risk that we have is, we settle with this petitioner, and then another petitioner comes out and files a lawsuit --
 - MR. SMITS: And that all comes down to how we handle the building down the road. Right? So this decision is really about what Commissioner Foster said.
 - This is, you know, rolling a rock up a hill. It's too steep. Right now, with the cost, it's going to exceed the budget. And because of that, we don't really want to continue on this path. The next path that's chosen certainly needs to consider the

- option of, "Hey. This could happen again." Right? 1 I mean I don't know that -- what's being sought is not to reward to HOB. I can only 3 speculate as to why. Maybe they have a problem with 4 5 HOB, maybe they have a problem with what's being built, but again, that's something to address down the 6 7 road because this is really just about my opinions. It's going to cost money, and we're going to get to a 8 9 point way into the summer where the contractor is going to have to walk. 10 11 MR. HARDING: If we agree to settlement, and we rebid and we get three quotes, when 12 the city decides on a certain quote, you know, just to 13 make sure we're all aware of what the risk is, that 14 somebody else could litigate in three months that they 15 don't like that contractor. 16 17 MR. SMITS: Right. MR. HARDING: How would that be 18 19 perceived to a judge? MR. SMITS: Well, it certainly isn't --20 21
 - well, let's put it this way: It's not what I think is proper. Right? I think we're in a strong position, unfortunately, just because of the time it would take to do this. There's a lot of different ways we can approach this proactively. You know?

23

2.4

1	And again, what I'm trying to get to
2	is, this is kind of futile, but down the road, what we
3	do is we figure out how do we get ahead of it, if it's
4	going to happen. And there are other decisions.
5	Like, what is going to be the thing? Right? What are
6	we ultimately going to do over there? Then, in that
7	event, we'll focus on how it's going to be put
8	forward. In other words, if we have to do the legal
9	stuff on our side, there's many, many options. We can
10	do bond. We can do validations. We can do deck
11	actions. We can do all kinds of stuff in advance
12	MR. HARDING: But, I guess, two
13	questions I have is, one is, so if another lawsuit
14	comes in January and we go in front of a judge in
15	March, so to the judge, in your professional opinion,
16	we would have two quotes that went out and appears the
17	city can't move forward. How would that be perceived
18	by a judge?
19	MR. SMITS: How would it be perceived
20	by a judge? Meaning the
21	MR. HARDING: Trying to execute
22	business. Trying to execute business.
23	MR. SMITS: Right. I mean it comes
24	down to the core problem that we're having. So, I
25	mean the other option is to continue to litigate on

that particular principle, but the fact of the matter is, that isn't -- I don't believe that is the more prudent way to operate. In other words, going forward I think it's best to -- this is, in my opinion, going to not be a good thing. Right? We're fighting an uphill battle, money wise and time wise.

MR. HARDING: Yes. I guess, Dirk, the point of my question -- so in March, we go in front of a judge again. Would you think a judge would deny it with prejudice or -- I'm not sure of the word, but -- so we couldn't appeal?

MR. SMITS: He'll probably litigate it, and then there's an appeal period.

MR. HARDING: He'll allow another appeal process if we go through this? Okay.

MR. SMITS: Yeah. I mean it's not an enviable position to be in, but this particular situation that we're currently in is not the way that's the most prudent force for the city.

MR. HARDING: I guess what I'm just -the risk for all of us is that we could be working for
another year or two from now. So to be honest, we
could all be in court for another year or two then?

MR. SMITS: Deposition is the whole nine yards, and if you're in court for that long, you

1 know, that's a huge expense, and we're still going to have to rebid.

MS. RAMSAY VICKERY: We would probably lose our State Harding Grant through that time period, which is almost, what, two and a half million dollars? That's a lot of money. If we lose it, we are never seeing that money again. It's gone.

MR. HARDING: So the other question I have -- HOB, can they sue us?

MR. SMITS: No.

MR. HARDING: I mean, can they?

Anybody can sue anybody. It's in our contract or our bid that they can reject our bid. It's not -- they don't get any rights to the contract.

MR. SMITS: And this is advice. This is advice. Right? So what I'm going to do is get -- if I'm getting the right advice that I think I need to do this, I'll nail down all those details.

MR. HARDING: Yeah. I guess the one thing I'm asking is that, okay, we sat in city commission and -- HOB. We didn't award them a contract, so are we in good legal standing that why -- if we have to go in front of a judge and say why we didn't award them the contract, what would be our reasoning?

2.0

2.4

MR. SMITS: If HOB asks why we didn't award the contract? Because under the bid specs we have the right to not. So it doesn't -- we don't need a reason.

MR. HARDING: Okay. So the answer is "We don't need a reason"?

MR. SMITS: We don't need a reason not. Does that mean they could sue us? They could try, but I don't get the indication that that will ever be the case. Contractors generally don't like to sue governments, but this particular situation, it says very much so in the bid that we can reject all bids and until there's a contract, there's no rights.

MR. HARDING: That's all I had. Thank you.

MR. RASPE: I agree that we should stop the bleeding in this particular case, but I want to make sure that going forward, as you say, all our options become available for us with the rebid process. But I think for now, this is the stepping stone to stop the bleeding. We need to do it.

MS. RAMSAY VICKERY: Well, Tom does have a certain point, though, that if this lawsuit is going to come back again later and then we have to fight it twice and we know we're going to win it

2.4

now -- We know we will. It's just a matter of how long and how much money. So that's something that --

MR. SMITS: And there's no guarantees.

There's no guarantees we'll win.

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

MS. RAMSAY VICKERY: I feel good about the position we're in and the discussions we've had. So that's just the other thing to discuss right now, is Tom did bring up a valid point.

MR. SMITS: Sure.

MS. RAMSAY VICKERY: We go through this again. What's to stop anyone from saying, "We don't like what you're doing. We're going to shut down government, again"?

MR. SMITS: And again, we will likely -- that's why I am bringing it up. There's other ways to skin this cat, but this particular way, the bid that we did and they way we did it and the way our code reads, we could end up here again. So obviously, the way we just did isn't the way we're going to try to do it again. It needs to be done a different way. If that involves doing something crazier than what we've already done -- but, you know, it could end up we take it to referendum. It could end up that way.

language. We have the prerogatives of not ordering the bid without any worries. We just -- for whatever reason, as commission, we're not happy with it --

MR. SMITS: I mean the contractor is aware of what we've done. So can it happen again? Yes. Can I say that our code is good enough to withstand it? I don't know. It's not the easiest issue to deal with. It shouldn't be that government can be hobbled by a situation like this.

MR. HARDING: Well, I guess I want to make sure I'm clear on my point through all of this conversation. But I'm not confident that this is the last litigation in this lawsuit. I'm not confident, and so I think we need to be proactive and have a judge -- get in front of a judge at some future time and say, "We're stopping business for the city. Someone is continuing to stop us to the point we're not protecting employees, we're not protecting government property." So I think we need to be proactive of our rights as a government to execute work.

MR. SMITS: So I get you there, that the issue comes back to our code. So one of the solutions that we could do -- and I didn't talk to anyone about this -- is we could run a vote. Vote.

- 1 Let them vote. Done.
- 2 MR. HARDING: So I think --
- 3 MR. SMITS: I mean that takes away the
- 4 lawsuit. It takes away whether we continue with HOB
- 5 or not. I mean let them vote. I brought this up in
- 6 the first closed session.
- 7 | MR. HARDING: But the . still --
- 8 MR. SMITS: Right. You can let them
- 9 vote. And if you let them vote, the chips fall where
- 10 | they may. There's no more litigation. We solve
- 11 | litigation. We let them vote. And that way you won't
- 12 be back here.
- 13 MS. RAMSAY VICKERY: A vote is
- 14 nonbinding.
- MR. SMITS: We can make it.
- MR. RASPE: But the vote would only be
- 17 to award --
- MR. SMITS: Right. But to not award
- 19 the HOB.
- 20 MR. RASPE: Right. So the vote
- 21 | wouldn't cover the issues that Tom was talking about.
- 22 So --
- MR. SMITS: Not necessarily, no. Well,
- 24 | let me tell you this: It depends on who's back.
- 25 We're voting to --

MR. RASPE: Well, what's back unfair. They can go out and bid again, and then we order somebody else.

MR. SMITS: Right. So there's -- like I said, there's two options. We can just nip it in the bud now and try and read through everything, or we can let the vote go forward on whatever basis, and maybe that makes a determination HOB can go forward. I mean, you know, this is -- the points that Tom and Beth are raising are valid. In other words, we could end up right back.

MR. RASPE: That's with anything. Nothing can stop that.

MR. HARDING: My concern is we go through this again in January, and we have three votes, and we decide on contractor B or whatever it is, and we get another lawsuit. And so, I guess, irregardless of any kind of vote, where I'm at is that the city has responsibilities to execute business to protect city property and to protect city employees.

So when do we get proactive to do in front of a judge and say, "Circuit Judge -- whatever -- and say you have that right to protect your property and your employees"? And I think we need to be thinking in that state because from my

background this is not the last lawsuit. We could be going through this for multiple years.

MR. SMITS: Right. And, Tom, what I was trying to get to is this right here and this right now, which is the four corners of this particular lawsuit and where it's going to head with this particular contractor is not where we -- it's not how we should be proactive, not in this particular situation.

MR. HARDING: And I guess the reason for putting this on the record, I just want us to all not be naive -- is that we agree on a settlement and we think it's all done.

MR. SMITS: No. It's not. It's got to be done differently, and it has to be done -- and we will have to have a lot of discussion on how that is. And referendums should not be off the table. If you want to do the financing, you can actually put a referendum when you do the financing. I mean, there's a million options that don't involve going through this lawsuit again. We can actually seek declaratory relief and our own code. We can actually go ahead and try to validate a bond. I mean there's -- but these are not the good questions for this particular session.

MR. HARDING: Right. And I guess the
reason I want to put on record is that we should be
thinking in the future about how to be proactive,
rather than wait in January and be reactive to another
lawsuit.

MR. SMITS: You could do a --

MR. RASPE: Isn't this all outside of what we're asking?

MR. SMITS: Yeah. I guess we're just batting around because it is a valid question whether as to whether we will be right back where we are.

MS. RAMSAY VICKERY: Right.

MR. SMITS: The issue is, yes, we could be, but this lawsuit is not the one to test it.

MR. RASPE: Right. Understood.

MR. SMITS: And again, this -- and please remember, this is -- no final decision is being made here. I just want to know if there's a mood to try and resolve it, given the parameters that I'm hearing. And I understand your concerns and your concerns and your concerns and Dave's financial concerns.

So I've got some advice. Right? No decisions are being made in here. They can't be. So I've got some advice to try and cobble something

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

together, based upon what I've heard from all of you.

And I'm going to call another closed session, and if I

think it's close to what we need, then we'll have

4 something to act on in November or December.

I would try to also slow down litigation. I have my response to file, and we've already done it, so it's being filed. I want to see the temperature of the water in trying to resolve this. If there's anything but a complete -- you know, everything goes away, we stop spending money, or some stipulation of some type that says, "We agree with you that this particular method is not bad for a --" I mean I'm going to work on settling if there's a mood for it. If there's no mood for it, then that's why I didn't want to have to spend time on it.

So the advice that I think I'm getting is that there is a mood to settle as long as it's making sense and in this particular -- I think everyone has a general understanding that this particular suit isn't the one to do any particular testing on because of nature of the contractor. The contractor and the expense -- this particular suit doesn't make sense. Whatever we have to do down the road, this is not the time to test it, monetarily wise and litigation wise and contractor wise. I mean the

ultimate thing is the contractor is going to walk. It said November. Right, Dave?

MR. TURNER: It was 120 days from -
MR. SMITS: No. No. No. When we were
on the phone --

MR. TURNER: Oh. Yes. Yes. He was willing to extend it.

MR. SMITS: -- outside envelope and he said, "November," which I can't tell you we'll be even close to done by --

MR. FOSTER: We're talking two weeks away.

MR. SMITS: So I mean, that's one of the key pieces to resolving this is the fact that the contractor — the only contractor is in the bid, and that's unfortunate, but that's why I think this box we're in right here, in this particular lawsuit, it's better to step back, stop spending money, make a plan to do this proactively the next go around, and hopefully, we get a bunch of bids in the next go around, whatever that is, or maybe we do something different. But this is not the place to test it, in my opinion.

But I think I've heard all of your input, for the record, and your concerns about this

happening again, so I'll put my mind to that too. But again, like I said, you are not wrong. We could be here again, so our approach needs to be found to doing without the litigation points.

MR. RASPE: What aim, if we're going through litigation to be there again?

MR. SMITS: That's what I'm saying. So we have to think about -- so we have to think of a better approach to this. Not now, next go around. This one is not the one to test because of the expense and the contractor walking. Here's not the place to do it. The place to do it is a well-thought-out strategy and a well-crafted strategy on what we're going to do about the vote. But also, legally, what we have to do to avoid this situation, just not -- this is not the place to do that. This litigation is futile, in my opinion.

MR. HARDING: Did we open ourselves up to this option?

MR. SMITS: What do you mean?

MR. HARDING: So if you look at the history, the process we went through, the bidding and then responding to the lawsuit, did we open ourselves up to this till July of next year? Is there something we should learn from it?

1	MR. SMITS: Oh. Yeah. We should learn
2	that our code is what it is, and we need to deal with
3	it, and we need to deal with the litigation in a
4	manner that
5	MR. HARDING: What's wrong with
6	modifying the code
7	MR. SMITS: It's not right now. It's
8	not doable right now. We're in litigation.
9	MR. HARDING: Yeah. So just for
10	example, if you settle Monday morning
11	MR. SMITS: You can undertake
12	MR. HARDING: On Tuesday morning, we
13	put in an update to our code
14	MR. SMITS: There's lots of options.
15	Yes. I'm trying not to get too far field because the
16	strategy going forward we all need to spend a lot
17	more time in just a closed session.
18	MR. HARDING: I guess
19	MR. SMITS: And I'm not bringing
20	anything final in front of you.
21	MR. HARDING: Yeah. I like your
22	recommendation of if we settle on this
23	MR. SMITS: How we change to go
24	forward.
25	MR HARDING: Maybe we're best to go

through a code change for three months before we 1 rebid. 2 MR. SMITS: I will have those 3 recommendations --4 MR. FOSTER: Either way, we need to 5 decide on this right now. 6 MR. SMITS: Well, I think 7 I have the consensus about this particular situation. 8 I just think going forward, there's a lot of stuff to 9 think about, and maybe code change is one of those 10 things, maybe some other ways of strategizing. I get 11 it. We're going to do that, and I don't -- I won't 12 advise another path just like what we just went down. 13 This situation with one bid and a recommendation that 14 we rebid and all this other sort of compounded, so 15 this is not the hill to die on. 16 MR. HARDING: Understood. 17 MR. FOSTER: Mr. Court Reporter, did 18 19 you get all that? THE REPORTER: Yes, sir. I did. I got 20 21 everything. Okay. That would conclude 22 MR. FOSTER: the closed session unless anyone has anything else to 23 24 add.

MS. RAMSAY VICKERY: Lots to say

2

CERTIFICATE OF DEPOSITION OFFICER

I, KEVIN KLINGENSCHMID, the officer before

3 5 6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

whom the foregoing proceedings were taken, do hereby certify that any witness(es) in the foregoing proceedings, prior to testifying, were duly sworn; that the proceedings were recorded by me and thereafter reduced to typewriting by a qualified transcriptionist; that said digital audio recording of said proceedings are a true and accurate record to the best of my knowledge, skills, and ability; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which this was taken; and, further, that I am not a relative or employee of any counsel or attorney employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of this action.

KEVIN KLINGENSCHMID

Notary Public in and for the State of Florida

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIBER

I, ANGEL DAVIS, do hereby certify that this transcript was prepared from the digital audio recording of the foregoing proceeding, that said transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings to the best of my knowledge, skills, and ability; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which this was taken; and, further, that I am not a relative or employee of any counsel or attorney employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of this action.

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Angel J Da ANGEL DAVIS

Veritext Legal Solutions

305-376-8800

	4 01 4		had 5,16 01,10
1	act 21:4	anybody 13:12	bad 5:16 21:12
1,500 8:21	action 5:25 7:14	13:12	based 4:1,3 21:1
10:12 26:3,6	27:12,16 28:8	appeal 12:11,13	basis 18:7
120 22:3	28:12	12:15	batting 20:10
15 3:24	actions 11:11	appears 11:16	battle 12:6
19 1:5	actually 19:18	approach 10:25	beach 3:6,8
2	19:21,22	23:3,9	believe 12:2
	add 6:13,14	asked 5:24 6:23	benefit 5:7
2,282,859.28 6:8	25:24	asking 4:20	best 6:10 12:4
20,000 3:25	adding 7:17	13:20 20:8	24:25 27:10
2023 1:5	additional 8:14	asks 14:1	28:6
22914 27:18	8:14,15 9:1	attendees 2:2	beth 2:5 3:7
29 8:20	address 10:6	attorney 2:3	18:10
3	administrator	3:17 27:14	better 22:18
30755 28:16	2:4 3:6	28:10	23:9
33169 1:10	advance 11:11	audio 27:8 28:3	bid 5:25 6:1,4
3rd 6:1	advantage 5:2	available 14:19	13:13,13 14:2
4	advice 4:16,16	avoid 23:15	14:12 15:17
-	8:8 13:15,16,17	award 6:24 7:21	16:2 18:2 22:15
40 8:23	20:23,25 21:16	13:21,24 14:2	25:14
5	advise 25:13	17:17,18	bidding 23:22
50 8:22	affecting 7:4	awarding 6:16	bids 14:12 22:20
6	agree 8:5 10:11	7:12	bleeding 14:17
6129266 1:16	14:16 19:12	aware 10:14	14:21
9	21:11	16:5	bond 11:10
	agreement 4:12	b	19:23
9:46 1:6 3:3	ahead 3:4 11:3	b 18:16	box 22:16
a	19:22	back 6:21 8:2	bring 7:1 9:6,9
a.m. 1:6 3:3	aim 8:1 23:5	14:24 16:23	15:8
26:3,6	allow 12:14	17:12,24 18:1	bringing 15:15
ability 9:9 27:10	amount 3:23	18:11 20:11	24:19
28:7	angel 28:2,17	22:18	brought 9:8
able 4:11	answer 4:5 14:5	background	17:5
accurate 27:9	anticipate 4:20	19:1	bud 18:6
28:5			

[budget - decision]

1 1 4 0.22	10.00	22.25	cost 4:7 5:5 9:22
budget 9:23	18:20	22:25	
building 5:10	clear 16:11	conclude 6:10	10:8
8:3 9:18	close 8:20 21:3	25:22	costs 6:4
built 10:6	22:10	concluded 26:5	counsel 4:22
bunch 22:20	closed 1:1 17:6	confidence 9:2	27:11,14 28:7
business 4:18	21:2 24:17	confident 16:12	28:10
5:20 11:22,22	25:23	16:13	countless 6:4
16:16 18:19	cobble 20:25	consensus 25:8	county 8:10
c	code 15:18 16:6	consider 9:25	course 4:7
c 2:1 3:1	16:23 19:22	continue 9:24	court 12:23,25
call 21:2	24:2,6,13 25:1	11:25 17:4	25:18
	25:10	continuing	cover 17:21
case 3:19,25 4:23 9:12 14:10	colony 3:6,8	16:17	coverage 5:5
14:17	come 5:18 14:24	contract 4:12,13	crafted 23:13
	comes 9:16,17	6:20 7:12 13:12	crazier 15:22
cat 15:16	11:14,23 16:23	13:14,22,24	crs 5:11
caveat 7:14	coming 5:4,6	14.2,13	currently 12:18
certain 7:15,15	comment 4:24	contractor 4:10	d
10:13 14:23	7:10	4:10,15 5:14 6:2	d 3:1
certainly 9:25	comments 5:22	6:16 10:9,16	
10:20	commission 2:6	16:4 18:16 19:7	dave 4:10 5:1
certificate 27:1	2:8 3:14,16	21:21,22,25	22:2
28:1	13:21 16:3	22:1,15,15	dave's 20:22
certify 27:4 28:2	commissioner	23:11	david 2:4 3:5
change 24:23	2:7 3:12 9:19	contractor's	davis 28:2,17
25:1,10	compel 7:15	9:13	day 4:9 8:11
cheaper 5:8	complaint 4:6	contractors	26:1,4
chips 17:9	complete 21:9	14:10	days 22:3
chosen 9:25	complete 21:3	contribute 5:2	deal 16:8 24:2,3
circuit 18:22	compounded	conversation	december 21:4
city 2:3,4,6,8	25:15	16:12	decide 8:2 18:16
3:5,13,15,17	concern 6:7,8	core 11:24	25:6
4:19 5:21 6:10	18:14	corner 9:12	decided 5:13
7:2 10:13 11:17	concerns 20:20	corners 19:5	decides 10:13
12:19 13:20		COINCIS 17.3	decision 4:18
16:16 18:19,20	20:21,21,21,22		7:3 9:19 20:17

Veritext Legal Solutions

800-726-7007 305-376-8800

decisions 11:4	doing 5:15	expense 5:19	florida 27:21
20:24	15:12,21 23:3	7:6,6 13:1 21:22	focus 11:7
deck 11:10	dollars 3:25	23:10	force 12:19
declaratory 4:4	13:5	expenses 5:4	foregoing 27:3,4
7:14 19:21	downside 5:8	expiration 6:7	28:4
declare 7:15,16	duly 27:5	7:5	forth 7:17
definitely 4:8	e	expired 6:1	forward 5:25
delay 9:11	e 2:1,1 3:1,1	extend 22:7	6:6 11:8,17 12:3
deny 12:9	easiest 16:7	f	14:18 18:7,8
depends 17:24	easy 3:9	fact 12:1 22:14	24:16,24 25:9
deposition	effort 6:6	fall 17:9	foster 2:7 3:11
12:24 27:1	either 25:5	far 8:24 24:15	3:11 6:12,14
details 13:18		feel 4:17 15:5	7:10,19,22 8:5
determination	elapsing 6:5 election 7:16	female 3:9	9:19 15:25
18:8		field 24:15	22:11 25:5,18
die 25:16	elongate 7:18		25:22
different 10:24	employed 27:11	fight 14:25	found 23:3
15:21 22:22	27:14 28:8,11	fighting 12:5	four 19:5
differently	employee 27:13	figure 11:3	framed 9:8
19:15	28:10	file 21:6	freddie 2:7 3:11
digital 27:8 28:3	employees	filed 21:7	front 11:14 12:8
direction 5:21	16:18 18:20,24	files 9:16	13:23 16:15
7:3	envelope 22:8	final 20:17	18:22 24:20
dirk 2:3 3:17	enviable 12:17	24:20	further 27:13
12:7	es 27:4	financial 5:2,7	28:9
discuss 15:7	estimates 8:19	20:22	futile 11:2 23:17
discussing 6:16	event 11:7	financially 6:3	future 6:9 16:15
discussion	everybody 7:25	27:15 28:11	20:3
19:16	evidence 7:7	financing 19:18	
discussions 15:6	example 24:10	19:19	g
dismissed 8:10	exceed 9:23	finding 6:2	g 3:1
8:12	execute 11:21	fire 5:5	general 21:19
divided 4:25	11:22 16:20	first 17:6	generally 14:10
doable 24:8	18:19	fl 1:10	getting 13:17
GUADIC 27.0	expenditures	floods 5:10	21:16
	3:22		

Veritext Legal Solutions

given 20:19	16:10 18:17	hill 9:22 25:16	job 1:16
giving 8:7	19:10 20:1,9	history 23:22	joey 2:8 3:15
0 0	24:18		judge 8:10
go 3:4,20 11:14		hob 6:1,17,20	10:19 11:14,15
12:8,15 13:23	h	6:24 7:12,21	
15:10 18:2,7,8	half 13:5	10:3,5 13:9,21	11:18,20 12:9,9
18:14 19:22	hall 4:19 7:2	14:1 17:4,19	13:23 16:15,15
22:19,20 23:9	handle 9:18	18:8	18:22,22
24:23,25	happen 10:1	hobbled 16:9	july 23:24
goes 21:10	11:4 16:5	honest 12:22	k
going 4:5,15 5:8	happening 23:1	hopefully 22:20	kevin 1:15 27:2
5:9,13,14 6:2	happy 16:3	huge 13:1	27:19
7:1,6,8,23,25	harding 2:6	i	key 3:6,8 22:14
8:15,18 9:23	3:13,13 6:8 8:9	imprudent 6:3	kind 5:16 11:2
10:8,8,10 11:4,5	8:17,22,24 9:14	indication 14:9	18:18
11:6,7 12:3,4	10:11,18 11:12	individually	kinds 11:11
13:1,16 14:18	11:21 12:7,14	3:20	kingdom 5:17
14:24,25 15:12	12:20 13:4,8,11	injunction 5:24	klingenschmid
15:20 19:2,6,20	13:19 14:5,14	input 22:25	1:15 27:2,19
21:2,13 22:1	16:10 17:2,7	intend 4:22	know 4:25 7:7
23:5,14 24:16	18:14 19:10	interest 6:10	9:21 10:2,13,25
25:9,12 26:2	20:1 23:18,21	interested 27:15	13:1 14:25 15:1
good 5:15 12:5	24:5,9,12,18,21	28:12	15:22 16:7 18:9
13:22 15:5 16:6	24:25 25:17	involve 19:20	20:18 21:9
19:24 26:4	he'll 12:12,14	involves 15:21	knowledge
government 1:1	head 19:6	irregardless	27:10 28:6
15:13 16:8,19	heard 7:24 21:1	18:18	1
16:20	22:24	issuance 6:20	1 1 1 1
governments	hearing 7:24	issue 4:25 5:11	language 16:1
14:11	8:11,13 20:20	16:8,23 20:13	lawsuit 4:21
grant 6:8 13:4	held 7:16 9:3	issues 17:21	5:24 6:25 7:13
ground 6:21	hereto 27:15	_	9:9,16 11:13
guarantees 15:3	28:11	j	14:23 16:13
15:4	hey 10:1	january 11:14	17:4 18:17 19:1
guess 11:12 12:7	hi 3:7	18:15 20:4	19:6,21 20:5,14
12:20 13:19	ARE S.I		22:17 23:23

[lawsuits - ordering]

lawsuits 9:2	16:11 17:15	13:6,7 15:2	nip 18:5
learn 23:25 24:1	21:23 22:18	21:10 22:18	nonbinding
	makes 7:18 18:8	monroe 8:10	17:14
legal 8:1 11:8		month 4:10 6:3	notary 27:20
13:22	making 6:3		november 4:8,9
legally 23:14	21:18	months 6:4	21:4 22:2,9
likely 15:15	manner 24:4	10:15 25:1	
list 2:2	march 11:15	mood 20:18	0
listen 5:17	12:8	21:13,14,17	o 3:1
litigate 4:6 5:17	matter 5:15	morning 24:10	obviously 4:14
7:7 10:15 11:25	12:1 15:1	24:12	8:25 15:19
12:12	mayor 2:5 3:8	move 5:20,25	occasion 3:19
litigating 4:14	5:1,22	6:6 11:17	october 1:5 6:1
litigation 3:22	mean 10:2	movement 7:2	office 6:9
4:7 6:11,16 7:11	11:23,25 12:16	multiple 19:2	officer 27:1,2
7:18 8:18 9:1	13:11 14:8 16:4	n	oh 22:6 24:1
16:13 17:10,11	17:3,5 18:9	n 2:1 3:1	okay 3:18 5:23
21:6,25 23:4,6	19:19,23 21:13	nail 13:18	7:22 8:5,8,24
23:16 24:3,8	21:25 22:13	naive 19:12	12:15 13:20
little 4:1,2	23:20	nature 9:11,11	14:5 25:22
long 12:25 15:2	meaning 11:20	21:21	open 4:24 23:18
21:17	meeting 1:1 8:4	necessarily	23:23
longer 8:16	26:5	17:23	operate 12:3
look 23:21	met 4:21	need 5:20 13:17	opinion 5:21
looking 4:4	method 21:12	14:3,6,7,21	11:15 12:4
looks 5:14	miami 1:10	16:14,19 18:25	22:23 23:17
lose 4:15 5:14	million 13:5	21:3 24:2,3,16	opinions 10:7
13:4,6	19:20	25:5	opposing 4:22
lot 10:24 13:6	mind 23:1	needs 7:16 9:13	option 8:25 10:1
19:16 24:16	mitigation 8:16	9:25 15:20 23:3	11:25 23:19
25:9	modifying 24:6	negotiations 5:6	options 3:22 8:3
lots 24:14 25:25	monday 24:10	neither 27:11	11:9 14:19 18:5
m	monetarily	28:7	19:20 24:14
made 20:18,24	21:24	never 13:6	order 18:2
make 4:23 7:2	money 4:7,18	nine 12:25	ordering 16:1
10:14 14:18	5:16 10:8 12:6		9

Veritext Legal Solutions

	1		
outcome 27:16	plan 22:18	professional	14:22 15:5,10
28:12	pleadings 4:3	11:15	17:13 20:12
outside 4:11	please 20:17	project 6:11	25:25
20:7 22:8	point 3:25 5:18	proper 10:22	raspe 2:8 3:15
own 19:22	10:9 12:8 14:23	property 16:19	3:15 14:16
р	15:8 16:11,17	18:20,24	17:16,20 18:1
p 2:1,1 3:1	points 18:9 23:4	proposing 3:20	18:12 20:7,15
parameters	police 5:5	protect 18:20,20	23:5
20:19	position 5:9	18:23	rather 20:4
	10:22 12:17	protecting	reactive 20:4
particular 9:7	15:6	16:18,18	read 18:6
9:10 12:1,17	post 6:9	prudent 12:3,19	reads 15:18
14:11,17 15:16	prejudice 12:10	public 8:3 27:20	reality 5:19
19:5,7,8,24	prepared 28:3	pursue 6:4	really 9:19,24
21:12,18,20,20	prerogatives	put 5:7,9 8:25	10:7 15:25
21:22 22:17	16:1	9:12 10:21 11:7	reason 5:19 7:1
25:8	preventing 5:24	19:18 20:2 23:1	14:4,6,7 16:3
parties 27:12,14	principle 12:1	24:13	19:10 20:2
28:8,11	prior 27:5	putting 19:11	reasoning 13:25
past 4:8	pro 2:5 3:8 5:22		rebid 10:12 13:2
path 9:24,25	proactive 16:14	q	14:19 25:2,15
25:13	16:20 18:21	qualified 27:7	rebidding 4:19
people 5:20 7:15	19:8 20:3	question 8:17	6:11,19
perceived 10:19	proactively	12:8 13:8 20:10	rebuild 6:11
11:17,19	10:25 22:19	questions 8:9	recent 3:23
period 12:13	probably 3:24	11:13 19:24	recommendati
13:4	12:12 13:3	quit 4:13	24:22 25:14
petition 9:5	problem 10:4,5	quote 10:13	recommendati
petitioner 7:21	11:24	quotes 10:12	25:4
9:15,16		11:16	record 3:3 8:7
petitioners 6:23	proceeding 1:9 28:4	r	19:11 20:2
8:13		r 2:1 3:1	22:25 26:3 27:9
phone 22:5	proceedings	raising 18:10	28:5
pieces 22:14	27:3,5,6,9 28:6	ramsay 2:5 3:7	recorded 27:6
place 22:22	process 12:15 14:20 23:22	3:7 5:23 13:3	recorded 27.0
23:11,12,16	14.20 25.22	3.7 5.23 13.3	

Veritext Legal Solutions

800-726-7007 305-376-8800

recording 27:8	reward 10:3	seeing 13:7	9:17 10:17,20
28:4	rewarding 5:25	seek 8:14 19:21	11:19,23 12:12
reduced 27:7	right 3:2 4:13	seeking 3:23 4:4	12:16,24 13:10
referendum	5:13,20 7:5,19	4:17	13:15 14:1,7
15:23 19:19	9:18,22 10:1,17	sense 7:18 21:18	15:3,9,14 16:4
referendums	10:22 11:5,23	21:23	16:22 17:3,8,15
19:17	12:5 13:16,17	separate 8:3	17:18,23 18:4
reject 13:13	14:3 15:7 17:8	session 1:1 17:6	19:3,14 20:6,9
14:12	17:18,20 18:4	19:25 21:2	20:13,16 22:4,8
related 27:11	18:11,23 19:3,4	24:17 25:23	22:13 23:7,20
28:7	19:4 20:1,11,12	settle 9:15 21:17	24:1,7,11,14,19
relative 27:13	20:15,23 22:2	24:10,22	24:23 25:3,7
28:10	22:17 24:7,8	settlement 3:21	solution 7:20
relief 4:4 7:14	25:6 26:2	3:22 8:25 10:12	solutions 16:24
8:14,15 19:22	rights 13:14	19:12	solve 17:10
remember 4:1	14:13 16:20	settling 5:3 9:5	solved 8:15
20:17	rim 4:11	9:5 21:13	somebody 10:15
remote 1:9	risk 9:14 10:14	show 7:9	18:3
reported 1:15	12:21	shut 15:12	sort 25:15
reporter 3:2	road 9:18 10:7	side 11:9	sought 10:3
25:18,20 26:2	11:2 21:24	signature 27:18	specs 14:2
resolution 6:24	rock 9:21	28:16	speculate 10:4
8:1	rolling 9:21	similar 9:6	spend 4:22 6:4
resolve 4:18	room 3:9	sir 25:20	21:15 24:16
20:19 21:8	run 16:25	situation 9:7,10	spending 21:10
resolving 4:24	S	12:18 14:11	22:18
22:14	s 2:1 3:1	16:9 19:9 23:15	standing 13:22
respond 4:6	sat 13:20	25:8,14	starting 9:13
responding	save 4:18	skills 27:10 28:6	state 6:8 13:4
23:23	saying 15:11	skin 15:16	18:25 27:21
response 21:6	23:7	slow 21:5	steep 9:22
responsibilities	says 14:11 21:11	smits 2:3 3:17	step 22:18
18:19	second 8:17	3:17 5:12 6:12	stepping 14:20 stick 4:11
result 4:5 7:6	see 5:18,18 21:7	6:22 7:13,20,23	SUCK 4.11
8:16		8:6,12,20,23 9:4	
			<u> </u>

stipulation	taken 27:3,12	thought 23:12	twice 14:25
21:11	28:9	three 10:12,15	two 11:12,16
stone 14:21	takes 17:3,4	18:15 25:1	12:22,23 13:5
stop 14:16,21	talk 3:19,21	throwing 5:15	18:5 22:11
15:11 16:17	16:24	thursday 1:5	type 21:11
18:13 21:10	talking 6:18	till 4:14 5:17	typewriting
22:18	17:21 22:11	23:24	27:7
stopping 6:20	target 7:24,25	time 4:22 7:3,5	u
16:16	tell 17:24 22:9	8:3,14 10:23	ultimate 22:1
strategizing	tem 2:5 3:8 5:22	12:6 13:4 16:15	ultimately 11:6
25:11	temperature	21:15,24 24:17	under 14:2
strategy 23:13	21:8	today 3:9	understand
23:13 24:16	terms 6:25	together 21:1	20:20
strong 10:22	test 20:14 21:24	tom 2:6 3:13 8:8	understanding
stuff 8:2 11:9,11	22:22 23:10	14:22 15:8	6:15 21:19
25:9	testifying 27:5	17:21 18:9 19:3	understood
sue 13:9,12 14:8	testing 21:21	total 3:23	20:15 25:17
14:10	thank 14:14	towards 8:1	undertake
suit 9:6 21:20	thanks 26:3	transcriber 28:1	24:11
21:22	thing 6:14,15,17	transcript 28:3	unfair 18:1
summer 4:14	11:5 12:5 13:20	28:5	unfortunate
7:8 8:18 10:9	15:7 22:1	transcriptionist	22:16
sure 4:23 9:4	things 5:12 7:16	27:8	unfortunately
10:14 12:10	7:17 25:11	true 27:9 28:5	9:10 10:23
14:18 15:9	think 6:9 10:21	try 8:25 14:8	update 24:13
16:11	10:22 12:4,9	15:20 18:6	upgrade 5:5
swanson 3:18	13:17 14:20	19:23 20:19,25	uphill 12:6
3:25 5:23	16:14,19 17:2	21:5	v
switched 9:3	18:24 19:13	trying 11:1,21	
sworn 27:5	21:3,16,18	11:22 19:4 21:8	valid 15:8 18:10
t	22:16,24 23:8,8	24:15	20:10 validate 19:23
table 19:17	25:7,9,10	tuesday 24:12	validations
take 6:23 8:2	thinking 18:25	turner 2:4 3:4,5	11:10
10:23 15:23	20:3	3:5 5:4 22:3,6	11.10

Veritext Legal Solutions

verbiage 9:1	went 11:16
vickery 2:5 3:7	23:22 25:13
3:8 5:23 13:3	willing 22:7
14:22 15:5,10	win 14:25 15:4
17:13 20:12	window 4:13
25:25	wise 12:6,6
vote 8:6 16:25	21:24,25,25
16:25 17:1,5,9,9	withstand 16:7
17:11,13,16,20	witness 27:4
18:7,18 23:14	word 12:10
votes 18:16	words 11:8 12:3
voting 17:25	18:10
W	work 16:21
wait 20:4	21:13
walk 6:2 10:10	working 12:21
22:1	worries 16:2
walking 23:11	wrong 23:2 24:5
want 3:20 6:13	y
9:24 14:17	yards 12:25
16:10 19:11,18	yeah 12:16
20:2,18 21:7,15	13:19 20:9 24:1
wanted 9:6	24:9,21
wants 7:21	year 12:22,23
water 21:8	23:24
way 8:7 9:7,7,8	years 19:2
10:9,21 12:3,18	Z
15:16,17,17,19	zero 6:21
15:19,21,24	
17:11 25:5	
ways 10:24	
15:16 25:11	
we've 15:6,22	
16:5 21:6	
weeks 22:11	