CITY OF WINTER PARK
REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY COMMISSION
August 8, 2005

The meeting of the Winter Park City Commission was called to order by Mayor Kenneth A. Marchman at 3:30 p.m. in the Commission Chambers, 401 Park Avenue South, Winter Park, Florida.

The invocation was offered by Building Official George Wiggins, followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

Members present:  
Commissioner John Eckbert  
Commissioner Douglas Metcalf  
Commissioner Barbara DeVane  
Commissioner Douglas Storer (left at 6:50 p.m.)  
Mayor Kenneth Marchman

Also present:  
City Attorney Trippe Cheek  
City Manager James Williams  
City Clerk Cynthia Bonham

MAYOR’S REPORT:

a) August 2005 Outstanding Employee of the Month

Mayor Marchman recognized Delsia Margraf, Utilities Services Manager as the Outstanding August 2005 Employee of the Month.

b) Nomination of George Herbst for “Citizen of the Year” for the annual Florida League of Cities’ award.


Attorney Cheek read the resolution by title. No public comments were made.

Motion made by Commissioner DeVane to adopt the resolution, seconded by Commissioner Metcalf. Upon a roll call vote, Mayor Marchman and Commissioners Storer, Eckbert, Metcalf and DeVane voted yes. The motion carried unanimously with a 5-0 vote.

c) Nomination of the Railroad Avenue Residences and Water Treatment Plant for the Florida League of Cities “City Spirit” award.


Attorney Cheek read the resolution by title. No public comments were made.
Motion made by Commissioner Eckbert to adopt the resolution, seconded by Commissioner DeVane. Upon a roll call vote, Mayor Marchman and Commissioners Storer, Eckbert, Metcalf and DeVane voted yes. The motion carried unanimously with a 5-0 vote.

d) Board appointment – Police Officers’ Retirement Board of Trustees – Zelle Washburn.

Mayor Marchman nominated Zelle Washburn as a member of the Police Officers’ Retirement Board of Trustees; seconded by Commissioner Storer and carried unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS:

1. Lurline Fletcher, 790 Lyman Avenue, asked that the streets be cleaned in her neighborhood and about the current garbage company because of problems with them picking up trash. Mayor Marchman informed Ms. Fletcher that she can notify the City staff when these issues arise so they can be resolved by staff.

2. Sherri Hodgson, 640 N. Park Avenue, representing the Park Area residents, addressed the restricted use of Swoope Avenue during school hours of St. Margaret Mary that was previously approved by the City Commission. She spoke about the lack of notification to their residents of the meeting where this issue was approved. She asked that this issue be revisited by the Commission. Mayor Marchman informed Ms. Hodgson that they should come back to the next meeting and be put on the agenda so the Commission is fully informed of the facts associated with this request.

Katie Walsh, Principal, St. Margaret Mary School stated they want to be good neighbors. She asked since they followed the procedures and attended the meetings, that in the interim until this is revisited, if they can close the street as approved at the previous meeting. There was consensus to allow the closure until this is revisited.

CITY ATTORNEY’S REPORT:

a) RESOLUTION NO. 1922-05: A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF WINTER PARK, FLORIDA, TO SUPPORT ORANGE COUNTY IN IMPLEMENTING THE FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION’S EFFORTS TO SECURE THE FUNDING NECESSARY TO PLAN, DESIGN, ACQUIRE RIGHT-OF-WAY, CONSTRUCT AND OPERATE A COMMUTER RAIL SYSTEM TO BE OPERATED ON CSXT’S “A” LINE, RUNNING FROM VOLUSIA COUNTY THROUGH SEMINOLE AND ORANGE COUNTY AND TERMINATING IN OSCEOLA COUNTY.

Attorney Cheek read the resolution by title. No public comments were made.

FDOT Project Manager for the commuter rail study, Tawney Olore, provided a power point presentation regarding the proposed services for the commuter rail system; proposed rail car amenities, travel times of the rail system to each station; proposed station prototype; Winter Park/Park Avenue Station; proposed maintenance facilities and layover areas; proposed operating plan; preliminary timeline; and proposed schedule for implementation of the system.
She spoke about their efforts to obtain an agreement of terms for CSX by December with completed negotiations in the summer 2006. She stated they hope to have phase 1 operational by 2009. She summarized the adoption of resolutions in support of commuter rail by the various counties and cities.

Mayor Marchman asked whether all the resolutions adopted were a standard resolution. Ms. Olore stated resolutions were different, depending on the amount of funding they were allocating but that there were not other major differences between them.

Jim Harrison, Director of Growth Management, Orange County, spoke about the resolutions between the various counties and cities. He stated he believed that Winter Park’s resolution is identical to the FDOT resolution. Commissioner DeVane expressed concerns with the portion of the resolution that states the City will help the County with their $44.3 million expenditure.

The allocation of parking spaces in Winter Park was discussed. The issue of Winter Park being a destination point and that the Winter Park station should be more of an urban type station was addressed by the Mayor. Mayor Marchman also spoke about the importance of smooth commuter rail service so as not to interfere with the CSX trains. Commissioner Metcalf inquired about the allocated funding for parking in Winter Park. Ms. Olore summarized the funding available for parking and other amenities. Mr. Harrison addressed the preliminary discussions with staff in terms of sharing some of the costs allocated to Orange County for this project. He stated the discussion included that each jurisdiction (Orange County, Orlando and Winter Park) would be responsible for the cost of the station in their jurisdiction plus a proportionate share of the remainder. He stated that the County is not trying to hold the City into a dollar amount at this time. He commented about the need for the City to inform the County that Winter Park is supportive of commuter rail. Mayor Marchman stated that the County was already informed that Winter Park wanted to remain on board, that we wanted to know the financial impact and be certain we had smooth and efficient commuter rail operation. Mr. Harrison stated the cost to the City would depend on the parking. Mayor Marchman stated he could not see 100 spaces being held for commuter rail in Winter Park because a majority of time they would be unused.

Commissioner DeVane asked why the entire amount is not being paid for by Orange County. She spoke about the need for other methods of transportation to and from the station for people to get to their destination which she believed would be the City’s responsibility. She stated she supports commuter rail, but not if the City has financial responsibility for what the County should be responsible for. She suggested that Orange County explore setting up an independent taxing authority for this so each entity is aware of their financial responsibility. Mr. Harrison stated that a regional funding model could be a topic of discussion in the future. He addressed the expansion of the Lynx bus service being included in the proposal as well as the operating costs including any additional costs associated with an expanded Lynx bus service. Commissioner DeVane addressed the need to provide methods of transportation to Winter Park Hospital, the Mayflower, Winter Park Towers and Rollins College, the Winter Park Village, etc. if this is going to be successful. Ms. Olore stated this was previously discussed and that the plan for Lynx has been modified for commuter rail that includes additional buses in the near and far future.

Commissioner Eckbert inquired as to how the proportionate amount for funding is determined for each entity. It was clarified that the resolution presented this evening indicates the City’s willingness to participate in the funding. Other suggestions for changing the language was
addressed. Mr. Harrison stated that Orange County did not anticipate asking Winter Park to participate in the $2.3 million allocation in December 2005 for FDOT to begin the preliminary engineering study. He stated they fully understand the City’s challenge with the budget timing process.

Further discussion ensued regarding the language in the resolution that binds the City to a financial obligation. Mr. Harrison stated that Orange County is asking that this resolution be an expression of support and that the portion of the resolution outlining the financial responsibility and timing of those allocations are irrelevant and that #2 in the resolution can be deleted. He stated the general language about participating in the proportionate share for funding is something that we have discussed and cannot say what the number is because of details that need to be worked out such as parking and Federal funding that is being provided to Winter Park. He stated he understands the City’s support from the July 11 meeting but that a resolution carries more weight.

Ken Murrah, 1601 Legion Drive, asked about the yearly operation cost to the City. Mr. Harrison responded to Mr. Murrah’s concerns regarding the operation costs. He also asked that a public forum take place before a resolution is adopted. He addressed the need for relocation of the CSX lines out of Winter Park and that the Seminole County Commission did not want to use taxpayers money on a leased line but wanted government ownership to ensure more control over when and if freight trains use the tracks. He urged the Commission to remain as strong as the Seminole County Commission. Ms. Olore stated the resolution that was adopted by Seminole County did not have this language in it.

Dick Harkey, Congressman Mica’s office, addressed the overwhelming support of other cities in Florida and the benefits and economic advantage of commuter rail.

Commissioner DeVane suggested modifications to the proposed resolutions. She addressed #2 and suggested it read as follows: “The City of Winter Park agrees to the plan and concept presented by the Department to the City Commission on August 8, 2005 and agrees to participate by locating a station in Central Park with amenities as recommended for proposed stations.” She spoke about the current station and the improvements that may have to be made to the station which should be relatively inexpensive. She addressed the need for public dialogue as to how this will be funded.

Mr. Harrison addressed the wording in the resolution. He stated the most important thing they are asking for is a formal recognition of the consensus reached by the Commission on July 11 for the City’s commitment to the project and willingness to move forward and continue discussions with Orange County. He stated that is embodied within #1 within the resolution. He stated they are also asking for the dialogue to continue in terms of the funding and recognize that the City has a lot of questions regarding parking, station configuration and about the funding mechanism. He addressed the binding nature of this resolution. He stated nothing will move forward without an Interlocal Agreement which will have to come back to the Commission for approval.

Commissioner Eckbert suggested changes to #2 within the resolution. Mayor Marchman made suggestions to the language regarding the funding. Commissioner DeVane stated the language needs to not commit the City to any type of proportionate share because she is uncomfortable
with committing dollar amounts at this point without being guaranteed that Winter Park will be part of the discussions. She also addressed the need to relocate CSXT’s freight outside or off of the “A” line. She also spoke about the need for language stating that Winter Park would like to work with everyone in developing the financing plans. Commissioner Storer addressed his concern with proportionate share versus an appropriate share. Mayor Marchman stated he wanted to use the language “appropriate share.” Discussion ensued regarding the train station that the City owns that will be used for commuter rail.

Motion made by Commissioner Eckbert and amended to adopt the resolution with the following revisions: strike #3; keep #2 through line 3 but add “an agreed share deemed appropriate by the City of Winter Park”; and add language regarding the freight trains being excluded from the “A” line; seconded by Commissioner DeVane. Upon a roll call vote, Mayor Marchman and Commissioners Storer, Eckbert, Metcalf and DeVane voted yes. The motion carried unanimously with a 5-0 vote. Approved revisions will be made to the resolution by the City Attorney.

CONSENT AGENDA:

a) Approve the minutes of 7/25/05.
b) Approve the following change order:
   1) Change Order to PO #118023, RD Michaels (WP-8-2005) for metal storage canopy at the Facility Management Building in the Central Compound, 1409 Howell Branch Road; $34,791.00.
c) Approve an additional six month extension (by February 6, 2006) to begin construction of the Sprint redevelopment project due to the delay being beyond the control of the developer.

No public comments were made.

Motion made by Commissioner Eckbert to approve the Consent Agenda; seconded by Commissioner Metcalf. The motion carried unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

a) ORDINANCE NO. 2639-05: AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF WINTER PARK, FLORIDA VACATING AND ABANDONING THE UTILITY EASEMENT WITHIN THE PROPERTY AT 1770 GLENCOE ROAD, MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED HEREIN. Second Reading

Attorney Cheek read the ordinance by title. No public comments were made.

Motion made by Commissioner Eckbert to adopt the ordinance, seconded by Commissioner Storer. Upon a roll call vote, Mayor Marchman and Commissioners Storer, Eckbert, Metcalf and DeVane voted yes. The motion carried with a 5-0 vote.

b) Request of the City of Winter Park for approximately four acres of the Howell Branch Preserve property located adjacent to Howell Branch Road
ORDINANCE NO. 2640-05: AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF WINTER PARK, FLORIDA, AMENDING CHAPTER 58 “LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE” ARTICLE I, “COMPREHENSIVE PLAN” AND THE FUTURE LAND USE PLAN MAP SO AS TO CHANGE THE SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL FUTURE LAND USE DESIGNATION TO OPEN SPACE AND RECREATION ON THE FOUR ACRES OF THE HOWELL BRANCH PRESERVE PROPERTY, MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED HEREIN. Second Reading

ORDINANCE NO. 2641-05: AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF WINTER PARK, FLORIDA, AMENDING CHAPTER 58 LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE” ARTICLE III, “ZONING” AND THE OFFICIAL ZONING MAP SO AS TO CHANGE THE EXISTING LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (R-2) ZONING DISTRICT DESIGNATION TO PARKS AND RECREATION (PR) ZONING DESIGNATION ON THE FOUR ACRES OF THE HOWELL BRANCH PRESERVE PROPERTY, MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED HEREIN. Second Reading

Attorney Cheek read both ordinances by title. No public comments were made.

Motion made by Commissioner Storer to adopt the comprehensive plan ordinance, seconded by Commissioner DeVane. Upon a roll call vote, Mayor Marchman and Commissioners Storer, Eckbert, Metcalf and DeVane voted yes. The motion carried with a 5-0 vote.

Motion made by Commissioner DeVane to adopt the zoning ordinance, seconded by Commissioner Storer. Upon a roll call vote, Mayor Marchman and Commissioners Storer, Eckbert, Metcalf and DeVane voted yes. The motion carried with a 5-0 vote.

c) Request of the City of Winter Park:

ORDINANCE NO. 2642-05: AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF WINTER PARK, FLORIDA, AMENDING CHAPTER 58 “LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE” ARTICLE III, “ZONING REGULATIONS” SECTIONS 58-81 “OFF-STREET PARKING AND LOADING REGULATIONS” SO AS TO REQUIRE ADDITIONAL PARKING FOR RESIDENTIAL PROJECTS OF THREE UNITS OR MORE. Second Reading

Attorney Cheek read the ordinance by title. No public comments were made.

Motion made by Commissioner DeVane to adopt the ordinance, seconded by Commissioner Storer. Upon a roll call vote, Mayor Marchman and Commissioners Storer, Eckbert, Metcalf and DeVane voted yes. The motion carried with a 5-0 vote.

d) ORDINANCE NO. 2643-03: AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF WINTER PARK, FLORIDA AUTHORIZING THE CONVEYANCE OF THE CITY PROPERTY AT 650, 662, 701, 681, 671, 661, 651 ISREAL SIMPSON COURT; 652, 654 CANTON AVENUE; AND 657 SYMONDS AVENUE SUBJECT TO MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS AS SET FORTH HEREIN. Second Reading

Attorney Cheek read the ordinance by title. Mary Daniels, 650 Canton Avenue, expressed her excitement with the project. No further public comments were made.
Motion made by Commissioner DeVane to adopt the ordinance, seconded by Commissioner Metcalf. Upon a roll call vote, Mayor Marchman and Commissioners Storer, Eckbert, Metcalf and DeVane voted yes. The motion carried with a 5-0 vote.

e) SUBD- Mr. and Mrs. Jahanmiry to split the property at 791 Northwood Circle into two single family lots. (Tabled at the 7/25/05 meeting).

Planner Jeff Briggs addressed the issue of the wall from the previous meeting. He stated that two meetings were held to try to reach a consensus and that the neighborhood wants a wall, but the property owner only desires to install a metal picket fence. He stated the neighborhood opposes paying for the difference in cost. Mr. Briggs explained that the recommendation from the Planning and Zoning Commission requires that the developer pay for the wall and provide the easement to guarantee its permanency. There was discussion that the original wall lacked the granting of an easement that would have guaranteed its permanency.

CRA Manager Alberto Vargas provided renderings of the suggested wall designs and finishes that were provided at the consensus building meetings. There was discussion of the preference of a brick veneer as a finish for the wall. Commissioner Storer inquired whether the residents of Northwood have ever applied for a neighborhood improvement grant. Mr. Vargas responded that the development does not have an organized neighborhood association. He said the residents need to establish one in order to apply for a grant. Mr. Briggs explained that the development may be an ideal candidate for a grant that could be used to upgrade the south section of the wall with the brick veneer to match whatever is built on the north side.

Frank Hamner, representing the property owner, thanked everyone for their efforts, but noted that this issue involves private property. Mr. Hamner provided a brief history of the wall and its removal by the previous property owner and the lack of a dedicated easement. He said his client is amenable and prepared to install and fund a metal picket fence that meets with the City’s code requirements. He said the property owner is also willing to allow a four foot wall to be placed on the property in either a red brick structure or a lighter colored brick with a modified sign. Mr. Hamner stated that the purpose of this discussion is to determine the type of wall that the property owner will consent to have placed on his property.

Commissioner DeVane provided a brief history of the wall for the benefit of Commissioner Storer who was unable to attend the last Commission meeting. She said this issue should be resolved so that it does not become a problem in the future. She suggested that an easement be granted on the property for the wall. Mr. Hamner noted that although the property owner is unwilling to grant an easement that would dedicate the property to the City, he is willing to grant a maintenance and access easement to maintain the wall for the residents of Northwood Circle. Commissioner Storer inquired if at the time the property was sold the survey indicated the wall in question. Mr. Hamner responded that the wall had already been removed at the time of purchase. He said there was no easement or survey delineating the wall. Commissioner Storer inquired into who removed the wall. There was discussion that the wall had been damaged as a result of last year’s hurricane season.

Mr. Hamner reiterated the applicant’s request to approve the lot split with a limitation of a masonry wall of no more than four feet in height and that the applicant is to provide at no cost an access/maintenance easement for the maintenance for the wall. He said a deeded easement
will eliminate the problem once and for all. Commissioner DeVane inquired into the ownership of the wall. Mr. Hamner responded that the wall will be owned by the property owner because it is located on his property. Attorney Cheek inquired whether the property owner will make a commitment that the wall will continue to exist. Mr. Hamner responded affirmatively.

Rudolph Scott, 750 Northwood Circle, explained how the wall was damaged by last year’s storms and removed by the previous property owner. He elaborated on the series of events that led to the removal of the wall and how he believed the City allowed the wall to be removed.

Mariah Walker, undisclosed address, expressed concern over the removal of the wall and offered to help pay for and maintain the wall.

Annie Ray, 761 Northwood Circle, spoke about a portion of the fence being located on private and City property.

John Considine, 640 Northwood Circle, expressed his preference of granting the lot split but noted that the current property owner should bear a portion of the responsibility. He urged the Commission that a decision be withheld on the lot split until this issue is resolved in its entirety.

Lurline Fletcher, 790 Lyman Avenue, expressed her concern with the removal of the wall.

Mr. Hamner offered his services to prepare the documents to establish an organized homeowners association that would result in the possibility of obtaining a grant from the City that would help pay for the wall.

Appreciative of the comments provided by the residents, Commissioner Storer stated that he was supportive of the recommendations from the Planning and Zoning Commission. Mayor Marchman expressed the point that this would not have been an issue if it was done correctly from the beginning. He elaborated on how the wall was a part of the community and that it needs to be erected.

Commissioner Eckbert expressed his concern with the P&Z recommendation because it treated the north side of the entrance differently and it does not address the south side of the entrance, but that both the north and south side property owners are amenable to access/maintenance easements. Commissioner Storer expressed his concern with the cost for the north wall and that it should be the responsibility of the developer. He said the south side wall should be pursued with a neighborhood grant from the City. At the request of Commissioner Eckbert, Commissioner Storer explained the reasoning that he used to distinguish how the north and south side walls should be funded. Commissioner DeVane spoke about requiring the applicant to replace the wall with concrete block with the brick veneer on both sides with funding to be provided with a neighborhood grant and a commitment from the property owner that the wall will remain, along with a dedicated easement.

Commissioner Eckbert asked to be briefed on the circumstances that resulted in the denial of the previous application to remove the wall. Building Official George Wiggins and Planner Jeff Briggs provided an update of the applications submitted prior to the one under consideration.
Motion by Commissioner Storer to accept the recommendation from the Planning and Zoning Commission to approve the subdivision lot split request with the following conditions: Design, layout and orientation on these two lots require the front doors face and driveway access be onto Northwood Circle; applicant deed a one/two foot easement along the Pennsylvania Avenue frontage of these lots and the access rights to Pennsylvania Avenue and that within the easement and adjacent right-of-way, the applicant construct (per a design approved by the City) a perimeter wall (block wall compatible to the south wall) and subdivision identification sign; final site plan submittal to the Planning Commission including wall plan; and the caveat that there be a access/maintenance easement for the construction of the north side wall by the developer, seconded by Commissioner DeVane. The motion carried 4-1. Commissioner Eckbert voted no.

Commissioner DeVane asked that staff return with the cost to add brick veneer to both sides of the wall for the Commission to consider funding the cost with a neighborhood grant.

CITY MANAGER’S REPORT:


Building Official George Wiggins introduced Utilities Lobbyist Bill Peebles who summarized the legislation that passed regarding telecommunications and related utility issues. He elaborated on the unsuccessful legislative proposals that would have dictated how municipal electric utilities should do business, post storm expenditures for investor-owned electric utilities, changes made to electric and natural gas taxes and gross receipts, and the Growth Management Act as it relates to water and wastewater. Mr. Peebles explained the legislative decisions and procedures that if adhered to will result in immunity from liabilities for electric utilities. Lastly, he elaborated on the bill that was passed that created the framework of what is required of cities that are seeking to provide telecommunication services.

Commissioner Metcalf elaborated on his interpretation of the telecommunication services bill that was recently passed by the legislature. Mr. Peebles provided a brief summary of the telecommunications bill and the standards included. Commissioner DeVane inquired whether telecommunication companies can be forced to underground utility lines before the City undergrounds electric lines. There was discussion that all lines should be dealt with and buried at the same time.

b) Selection Committee – City Attorney services.

Mayor Marchman expressed his preference that the Selection Committee should be comprised of himself (Mayor), City Manager, Director of Planning and Community Development, City Planner, Building Code Enforcement Director, Police Chief and the CRA Advisory Board Chairperson Harold Barley. He said Mr. Barley is amendable to serving on the committee. Mayor Marchman explained that his selection of members is suitable because they would have the most direct contact with the City Attorney.
Commissioner Eckbert expressed he believed that although input from the individuals considered is critical and crucial, their opinions can be expressed by the City Manager. He said he would rather see a citizen oriented evaluation of the applicants. Commissioner Metcalf concurred with Commissioner Eckbert. He expressed his preference of comprising the committee of the Mayor, City Manager and citizens. Commissioner DeVane spoke of the importance of staff on the committee because of their specific needs. She suggested board members as committee members; specifically chairpersons of the Board of Adjustment and the Planning and Zoning Commission. No public comments were provided.

Commissioner Storer expressed that he was supportive of the Mayor’s recommendation. He said the public input should be at the Commission level once the recommendation is delivered by the Selection Committee to the Commission.

Motion by Commissioner Storer to include the Mayor, City Manager, Director of Planning and Community Development, City Planner, Building Code Enforcement Director, Police Chief and the CRA Advisory Board Chairperson Harold Barley to the Selection Committee for the evaluation of the applicants for the services of a City Attorney, seconded by Mayor Marchman. The motion carried with a 3-2 vote. Commissioners Eckbert and Metcalf voted no.

Commissioner Storer departed from the meeting.

c) General Fund budget priorities.

Finance Director Wes Hamil presented the general fund budget priorities. Commissioner Eckbert suggested that each Commissioner submit a spreadsheet of the budget priorities ranked in order and have someone rank all the projects identified. Commissioner DeVane spoke of the need to discuss what needs to be funded and why. She expressed her preference of not including items in the budget that can be paid and replaced by fees collected. Commissioner Metcalf spoke of the need to consider the funds needed for the commuter rail project, for the facility replacement account, and road improvements. There was discussion on whether a work session needs to be scheduled to discuss this issue in greater depth. It was decided to schedule a Commission Work Session for August 15, 2005, at 2:00 p.m., to discuss the budget along with the CRA Agency meeting that is scheduled for 3:30 p.m.

Commissioner DeVane asked that a spreadsheet be provided by department.

d) Update on electric utility (June/July 2005).

Electric Utility Director Don McBride provided an update on the electric utility system and the upgrades and challenges that have occurred. He spoke about how staff has addressed the problems that have resulted and the comments that have been received from customers.

NEW BUSINESS (CITY COMMISSION):

1. Mayor Marchman asked that the discussion and decision for the facilitator for the Strategic Planning session be addressed at the next Commission meeting under the City Manager’s Report. There was discussion on the possible fees for this service.
Mayor Marchman adjourned the meeting at 7:17 p.m.

____________________________
Mayor Kenneth R. Marchman

ATTEST:

___________________________
City Clerk Cynthia Bonham