

CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE

Regular City Commission Meeting
June 13, 2005

The City Commission met in a formal session Monday, June 13, 2005, at 5:00 p.m. in The Alcazar Room at City Hall. The meeting was called to order by Mayor George Gardner, and the following were present:

1. Roll Call:

George Gardner, Mayor/City Commissioner
Joe Boles, City Commissioner
Donald A. Crichlow, City Commissioner
Errol D. Jones, City Commissioner

Absent: Susan Burk, Vice Mayor/City Commissioner (excused)

Timothy A. Burchfield, Chief Administrative Officer
James P. Wilson, City Attorney
John Regan, Chief Operations Officer
Mark Knight, Director, Planning and Building Department
Mark Litzinger, City Comptroller
Robert Leetch, Director of Utilities
William H. Harding, Director, Public Works
Dr. William Adams, Director, Heritage Tourism
James Whitehouse, Staff Attorney
Paul K. Williamson, Director, Public Affairs
Loran Lueders, Chief of Police
James Owens, Fire Chief
Karen Rogers, Recording Secretary

2. INVOCATION AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Assistant Pastor Roy Yelvington, Lighthouse Church of God, delivered the invocation and Commissioner Jones led the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

3.A/ Modification of Agenda

(None)

3.B/ Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the regular City Commission meeting of May 23, 2005 were approved as presented.

3.C/ Proclamations

(None Scheduled)

4. General Public Presentations and Comments (3 minutes per presentation with maximum total time limit of 20 minutes).

Mayor Gardner stated that he had a number of speaker cards regarding flying flags on the Bridge of Lions, which was Item 11.A.1., Resolution 2005-12, on the agenda, and he questioned whether they should allow the speakers to talk during general public comments or hear them during the agenda item for the resolution.

Mayor Gardner, Commissioners Boles and Crichlow thought they should hear the speakers during the public comments and

Commissioner Jones thought it would be more appropriate to hear the speakers during the resolution item.

MOTION

Commissioner Crichlow MOVED for public comment on the flag issue during general public presentations. Commissioner Boles SECONDED the motion.

VOTE ON MOTION

AYES: Crichlow, Boles, Gardner,

NAYES: Jones

MOTION CARRIED 3/1

Bob Jones, 35 Carrera Street, reported an unfair vending situation in front of the Cathedral Basilica, as well as vending before 1:00 p.m. on Sunday, and he requested that the City enforce the existing vendor ordinance.

Leslie Garcia, 4102 Arricola, referred to vending in the Plaza and suggested that the City eliminate the rotating zone process in the Plaza since they had the mulched squares and that the City eliminate the 1:00 p.m. start time on Sundays. He stated that the City should not make rules that limited the vendor's ability to support themselves. He recommended better enforcement of the ordinance.

Mayor Gardner recommended changing the time limit for the public hearing to two minutes per person in order to get through all the speaker cards.

Kristina Rosenbaum, 2 Fletcher Lane, spoke regarding the reconstruction project on Charlotte Street and the negative affect it was having on her restaurant business. She suggested that the loss she had suffered was due to a lack of communication and concern on the part of the City.

The Following people spoke regarding flags flying on the Bridge of Lions:

- Ruth Jensen, 2905 CR 214
- Swan Rubins, 85 ½ Duero Street

- Kat Vello, 8 Ewing Street
- Alan Kelso, 4010 Bella Vista Boulevard
- Jan Parham, 6680 A Madison Street
- Sumner Gray, 144 Oviedo Street
- Randy Bender, Commander of the local Sons of Confederate Veteran Camp, 70 Ocean Drive
- Curtis Register, 369 Varella Avenue
- Dr. John Frederick, 205 wildwood Drive
- Ed Slavin, St. Augustine
- David Thundershield Queen, 1600 Fountain of Youth Boulevard

Some of the comments made regarding flags flying on the Bridge of Lions were as follows:

- Reverse the resolution regarding the flying of the flags and be fair to every organization
- Allow non-profit Florida corporations with a 501-C3 designation to fly their flags in coordination with an event taking place within the City limits
- Establish a flag policy in which personal opinions would not regulate who was allowed to fly flags
- It was surprising that in 2005 three Commissioners would try to take away the Civil Rights of a group of people and allow segregation
- The Bridge of Lions looked beautiful with the rainbow flags flying on it
- Restrict the flags on the bridge to U.S., State and City flags
- The City should not celebrate a situation that was against State Statutes, as sodomy was illegal according to the statutes
- The confederate flag once flew over St. Augustine and that was a matter of history that could not be changed
- To deny flying the confederate flag on the bridge would be denying 80 million Americans with confederate blood their historical heritage
- The Bridge of Lions belonged to everyone in the community because of taxes; therefore, there should be equal say and access
- To limit the flags to government institutions would admit fear of specific

groups of people and give into a pathetic minorities while demonstrating the lack of creativity to develop a policy that was fair to all citizens

- If there were going to be any flag beside the state flag flown on the bridge it should be a Christian flag, and if the Commission did not pass the resolution he would encourage every church in the community to support flying the Christian flag
- It was not right to deny the same Civil Rights to all humans no matter what their background was
- The proposed resolution was well written and discriminated against no one
- The KKK was a terrorist group that once ran the local law enforcement
- Support a national search to pick a new City Attorney and City Manager
- Do not pass the resolution, because any respectful group should be able to fly their beautiful flags on the bridge

5. PRESENTATIONS AND STAFF REPORTS

5.A/ Presentation by St. Johns River Water Management District.

Melinda Granlund, St. Johns River Water Management District, reported that "Think Two" was their new irrigation rule that allowed lawn irrigation two days a week between the hours of 10:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. She pointed out that the rule was a good way to conserve water, and recent research had revealed that less water was better for lawns because over watering increased weed growth and made it more susceptible to drought and disease, but when the irrigation was cut back the roots grew deeper and healthier. She said that they anticipated that the rule would be adopted in October of 2005.

Ms. Granlund announced that they currently had an online system for permit applications. She said that the public could also search online for the type of permits submitted to the Water Management District.

Ms. Granlund stated that staff had developed a new education curriculum called "The Great Water Odyssey" for third, fourth and fifth graders. She said that the goal was to teach children about water and the importance of conservation.

5.B/ Presentation by John P. Regan, Chief Operation Officer, regarding the Charlotte Street construction project.

Mr. Regan stated that the City was sensitive to how the project would affect businesses, as they would no doubt be impacted. He said that when the City did a downtown infrastructure repair they targeted low tourism months and aimed at completing any project in 4-5 weeks. He explained that they had sent a notice to the property owners and staff had met with the business community on January 19, 2005, and the community had chosen the schedule for the project. He said that the City had distributed notices to the businesses on May 3, 2005, discussed the project with the Commission, put an article in the newspaper, and they had held another meeting with the business community on May 11, 2005 to fine tune the plan. He said that they developed an extensive maintenance and traffic plan to try to keep the road open as much as possible. He said the project began on May 16, 2005, and they planned completion prior to the July 4th weekend.

Mr. Regan said the scope of the project was massive, as they had to completely rebuild all the water and wastewater, add a stormwater system, remove and replace the damaged sidewalks, widen the southern end of the street, and they would install elegant new lighting. He added that on the 24th staff would be reinstalling the original bricks.

Mr. Regan said that because they were concerned for the businesses impacted by the construction, staff had researched whether there were any Federal Government agencies that provided assistance in such instances; however, they had not found anything other than the Small Business Administration for relief.

Mr. Regan said that their goal was to rebuild the historic brick streets and reuse the existing Reynolds pavers that had been installed by Henry Flagler. He pointed out that when pulling up the existing bricks some of the inventory was lost, and they had to decide how to make up the loss. He said research revealed that new brick pavers blended in at a four to one ratio and would provide a good look to the street. He referred to the exhibit of the blend and pointed out that the new bricks were distressed. He also pointed out the new lighting and distributed a photograph depicting the type of cement pole that would house the light fixtures.

Mr. Regan said that in the original design they had tried to minimize the inventory by installing a gutter system; however, the stormwater system for Charlotte Street would not require a gutter system, because the drains would be in the middle of the street. He said that further research indicated that during the Flagler Era gutters were not used, as they were a 20th century invention. He questioned the Commissioner's opinion of the old and new brick blend.

After a brief discussion the proposal was approved as an acceptable alternative for the project, until they could identify a manufacturer to reproduce the bricks.

Commissioner Boles questioned whether there would be a weight limit on the sand blocked brick streets.

Mr. Regan said that staff would research the matter.

Commissioner Boles questioned the situation of printing their own manufactured bricks with *St. Augustine* on them for identification.

Mr. Regan replied that the manufacturing matter was a work in progress, but they were looking into manufactured brick in the same dimension as the Reynolds Block, and with permission from the Reynolds' Company to put their name on it. Or, he said that they

could put the City's name on the brick. He stated that one of the advantages of manufacturing their own brick would be to match the Reynolds and as generations went by there would be no ownership involved with Reynold's Block or Southern Clay. He stated that the bricks were approximately \$1.83 each.

Commissioner Boles challenged the public to come up with a place to make the brick locally.

A discussion ensued regarding whether the bricks would be assorted colors, and the determination was that historically the bricks were assorted colors, and the intention was to remain historically correct.

Commissioner Crichlow suggested mixing cement with the sand when laying the bricks to provide more stability and prevent people from taking bricks for souvenirs.

Mr. Regan replied that he would talk with the paving contractor about the matter. He said that the project was at a point that they were going to push harder in order to finish the job. He said that they intended on putting in 12 inches of crushedcrete base, which was a combination of granite and concrete that compacted quite solid and provided good compressive strength. He said that granite was a difficult material to get, but they had negotiated to keep the material on the temporary parking site at the end of the job, which would provide the City with more cost control material. He concluded that the Charlotte Street project was the beginning of a great thing with the brick streets. The Commission concurred that Mr. Regan should proceed as planned.

5.C/ Presentation by John P. Regan, Chief Operation Officer, regarding the residential parking permit program.

Mr. Regan reported that the allotted time had lapsed, and it was his plan to draft an ordinance reflecting the will of the Commission and bring it before the

Commission for the subsequent meeting. He said that approval of the ordinance would allow staff to proceed with a residential parking plan on Avenida Menendez as discussed.

Commissioner Boles said that the Commission had requested a definition of *resident*, because one of the requestors on Avenida Menendez was not a resident according to the current definition. He suggested establishing the definition first.

Mr. Regan said that staff had collected 6-7 definitions from around the state for the Commissioners to review.

6. ITEMS BY CITY ATTORNEY

(None Scheduled)

7. ITEMS BY CITY CLERK

In the City Clerk's absence Mr. Burchfield reported that they did not have a date as to when Harvey Simms would be leaving the Planning and Zoning Board, but once that had been established the matter of appointment to Mr. Simms seat would be brought before the Commission.

7. A/ Notification of Proclamations.

- 2005-24 Greek Landing Days.

- 2005-25 Recognizing Sally Walton and the Sally Walton Dance Centre.

- 2005-26 Welcoming the Florida Memorial University Alumni Association Summer Annual Conference

8. ITEMS BY CITY MANAGER (Includes Consent Agenda – noted with an asterisk)

8. A/ Consent Agenda

8.A.1/ Preview of upcoming Commission Meetings.

8.A.2/ Release of Liens on Unit Connection Fee Mortgages.

8.A.3/ Notification of one vacancy on the Historic Preservation Advisory Committee.

8.A.4/ Status report regarding Lighthouse Park Restaurant.

8.A.5/ Consideration of Grant Administration Contract for the Commercial Revitalization

8.A.6/ Consideration of Mutual Aid Agreement between the Law Enforcement Agencies.

8.A.7/ Approval of the final plat for Pelican Reef Phase 5 Subdivision.

8.A.8/ Determination of legal sufficiency and acceptance of an application to appeal a Historic Architectural Review Board decision relative to property located at 36 Comares Avenue.

Mayor Gardner stated that he would like to remove Item 8.A.4. regarding the Lighthouse Park Restaurant for discussion.

MOTION

Commissioner Crichlow **MOVED** to approve Items 8.A.1. through 8.A.3. and 8.A.5 through 8.A.8. on the Consent Agenda. The motion was **SECONDED** by Commissioner Jones and approved by **UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE**.

8.A.4/ Status report regarding Lighthouse Park Restaurant.

Mr. Burchfield reported that there was a need for some minor repair to the building, and during the subsequent meeting staff would be seeking the Commissioner's direction. He added that they were working with the City Attorney to determine whether any action was necessary regarding the former tenant Michael Klipsch, as there had been no formal action taken to release him from his lease.

Commissioner Boles stated that he did not want to waste time and money on pursuing Mr. Klipsch considering that the City had no deposit and the tenant had clearly not made any money; moreover, Mr. Klipsch had reportedly already moved his equipment out of the building. He suggested simply ending that chapter.

Mr. Wilson said that he agreed with the Commissioner's evaluation regarding the financial situation, although he thought it might be worthwhile to pursue a judgment against Mr. Klipsch in case anything were to occur. He said that it was his understanding that Mr. Klipsch had left the state, and although they knew Mr. Klipsch had not paid the rent they had not thought he would move the equipment out so quickly. He added that it was the first time the City had experienced such a problem with the restaurant. He pointed out that Mr. Klipsch had held the lease for the restaurant for 10-years.

Commissioner Jones questioned whether they had a deposit for the lease on the restaurant.

Mr. Burchfield replied that City policy did not require a deposit.

Commissioner Jones recommended, based on the negative experience, that in the future the City should look at ways to avoid a similar situation.

Mayor Gardner agreed with the Commissioner unless of course there were some legalities involved.

Mr. Burchfield said that Mr. Klipsch had taken a couple of items, for which he had since contacted the person who purchased the equipment from Mr. Klipsch, and that person agreed to return those items within a couple of days.

Mayor Gardner suggested that the Commission revisit the outline for use of the restaurant, as he assumed that unless the City had some use for the property the lease would go to bid.

Mr. Burchfield replied that use of the property would be determined by the Commission, but if it was to remain a restaurant he suggested a more detailed business plan for the property.

Mayor Gardner questioned whether there was any potential for expansion of the building either up or out.

Mr. Burchfield replied that up was not feasible; however, there was property located north of the structure that could be used for expansion.

Commissioner Boles stated that the property was on the borderline of being a headache, as there was a lighthouse community that enjoyed a moderately successful restaurant in the area; however, they would not want to see a very successful restaurant. He said that when they had a discussion regarding the property they would be dealing with a philosophical matter as to whether it should be a restaurant at all. He added that they had experienced so much trouble about the restaurant over the years.

MOTION

Commissioner Boles MOVED to approve Item 8.A.4. and instruct the City Attorney not to proceed with legal action regarding the previous tenant. The motion was SECONDED by Commissioner Crichlow.

Commissioner Jones stated that as a governmental body responsible for public

dollars, they should never turn away and just let such a situation go. He said that he understood not throwing good money away after bad money, but to tell the attorney to do nothing to pursue the situation was not appropriate.

Commissioner Boles said that he could amend his motion, but he pointed out that the assets belonged to the tenant.

Mr. Wilson stated that he would research the matter further.

Mayor Gardner reiterated that the motion was to approve Item 8.A.4. instructing the City Attorney not to pursue legal action against the tenant unless assets...

Commissioner Jones interrupted that he would like to strike the language *not to pursue*, as he believed the attorney understood their direction, as he might find something

MOTION APPROVED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE.

8. B/ Discussion Items

8.B.1/ Discussion regarding the status of lease agreements for the Casa del Hidalgo.

Commissioner Boles reported that he had represented one of the tenants prior to becoming a Commissioner.

Mr. Wilson said that the Commissioner would not have to recuse himself at that point of the proceedings, and he questioned whether Mr. Boles still represented that person, and the response was affirmative. He said that Commissioner Boles would not be able to vote on anything that related to that particular tenant.

Mr. Burchfield said that staff had negotiated with potential tenants for use of the five suites

in the Casa del Hidalgo, and they had negotiated leases with four of the five tenants. He said that one tenant had signed a lease, another would sign July 1, 2005, one tenant could not sign until after the elevator was installed, and the fourth tenant was holding back for the potential to lease suite 105, which was a larger space, because negotiation with that tenant had fallen through. However, he said that staff required the Commission's permission to negotiate for the space, unless the Commission would prefer to put the space back out for proposal.¹

Mayor Gardner clarified that they would have to put one of the spaces out for bid.

A brief discussion resulted regarding the ranking for the previous bidding.

Mayor Gardner suggested that they keep their option open for both spaces.

Mr. Burchfield stated that they could have the bid out and available by the end of the week, allow two weeks for response and take a week for review; therefore, it would take a month before going before the Commission again.

Mayor Gardner requested an updated sketch of the floor plan.

MOTION

Commissioner Jones MOVED to instruct staff to prepare a rebid on suite 105 (in the Casa del Hidalgo) to open up to new bidders. The motion was SECONDED by Mayor Gardner.

Mayor Gardner said that they had a prospective tenant for suite 102 that was interested in suite 105; therefore, he wondered whether there was some way the

¹ End of audio tape one

motion for bidding could be structured to allow a show of interest for either space.

Commissioner Jones said that he understood and agreed. He suggested configuring the bidding some way for suites 102 and 105.

Mr. Wilson said that people put time and money into the bids, which would make it difficult to put the bid up for suite 102 before they knew what was happening with suite 105.²

MOTION WAS APPROVED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE.

9. ITEMS BY THE MAYOR AND COMMISSIONERS

9.A./ Discussion regarding a Community Task Force – Mayor Gardner

Mayor Gardner stated that he along with the National Trust for Historic Preservation recommended a Community Task Force, but he was not recommending that the Commission officially appoint the task force, because that would require copious records and legal notice for meetings etc. He said that he envisioned the task force to be something like the County Civic Round Table. He said that the task force would draw all the shareholders together to deal with matters of tourism, zoning, historic preservation, and all the challenges the City was facing. He said that he would like the Commission's input, because if the Commission was comfortable with the proposal he would be looking for 2-3 votes for people spearheading the proposal and developing the actual task force.

Commissioner Boles said that it could be beneficial to the Commission to have a community group to review and give opinions; however, that began to feel like the Commissioners would be dodging tough decisions. He said the suggestion made him think of the Aggregation Task Force that had been working for a couple of years. He

suggested that the Commission could learn from that process by not subjecting any more citizens to that kind of tough job. He added that the job for the Aggregation Task Force was going to get tougher in order for them to present their findings. He suggested developing policy and setting goals for the historic properties to encourage the state to give the properties to the City or lease them to the City long-term. He said in that instance they would need a public private partnership type of arrangement with a 501-C3 community core group, and they would need another group to deal with the issue of the endangered structures. He said that some people would give to municipalities, but generally that kind of community effort could be best served by government and a private group that could be formed by the Commission. He said that at the City level they had the enforcement power to stop demolition of structures, but they had to put their money where their mouth was. He said that if they were going to start buying properties there would be lawsuits falling on them right and left, because they could not tell people they could not tear their homes down without an alternative. He said that the market was so good that if the City or the City and a group that was raising money for that purpose purchased a property, put deed restrictions on it and offered it on the open market; they would not have trouble finding buyers. He said that those were the two big issues.

Commissioner Boles stated that it would take six months to determine who would be on the task force, and it would take the task force another six months to get together on the issues and make recommendations to the Commission. He said that they were going to have to be creative to find solutions and present them to the community and find people that would help; moreover, they would have to do it on a case-by-case basis. He said that if they found people to help it would be like another layer beneath the Commission.

² A Brief recess from 6:44 until 7:05 p.m.

Commissioner Jones said that he agreed with Commissioner Boles. He said that he had not been in favor of the task force in the past, and currently he was somewhat confused as to whether the task force would be official and in the sunshine or unofficial and out of the sunshine, but he was not certain how feasible it would be one way or the other. He said that he perceived the proposal as another layer of government and they already had a lot of committees, neighborhood associations, community groups and St. Augustine was a small City. He said that any individual or existing group for non-profit or businesses could get in touch with the Commission, and if they had ideas to improve the City each individual Commissioner was available to them. He said that there was the Chamber and individual business groups, restaurants and bed and breakfast establishments etc. and they could bring ideas to the Commission; however, ideas cost dollars. He stated that the buck stopped with the Commission, and in all honesty his observation of the Aggregation Task Force was that it had been tough for them, and they worked at their task for two years. He emphasized that he did not want to create a similar situation.

Commissioner Jones said that the Mayor's list of who would be on the task force would exclude people, and turn into another elitist group of people that had time on their hands to meet. He continued that he was unclear about the goals of the proposed task force and could not see continuing to talk about it if they did not know what they would be asking a task force to do. He said it would take the proposed task force a year and a half to develop an agenda and two-years more to decide to agree, and in the mean time the Commission would get bombarded. He said that he would not want to set a task force up for failure or ask for their opinion and then do nothing. He concluded that he was not in favor of the proposal.

Mayor Gardner stated that the atmosphere of the community was better than it had been three-years earlier. He agreed that there

were groups all over town, but not a diverse group sitting together to work out problems, such as café tables on the sidewalks at night. He said that a 17 member panel had been suggested by the National Trust for Historic Preservation with two representatives from the following:

- Residents
- Non-profit attractions
- Tour companies
- Restaurants
- Retail Business
- Lodging
- Institutions (Flagler College & Florida School for the Deaf and Blind)

Mayor Gardner said the list represented a cross section of the community. He added that things were moving too fast, and the proposed task force could relieve some of the burden on staff.

Commissioner Jones stated that starting a task force might slow things down. He reiterated that St. Augustine was a small town and in spite of the fact that currently there were so many groups, they consisted primarily of the same people. He said those that were most involved were those that made themselves available. He stated that he did not see a need to create another layer of government.

Commissioner Crichlow expressed concern about areas that would overlap, because he did not believe that they should be overlapping the responsibility of other boards. He said that it could cause confusion, complications and resentment. He said that he had nothing against looking further into the matter, although he would not want the task force in the sunshine, because the law made it difficult to discuss matters.

Mayor Gardner said that subsequently he would put some things on the table for consideration.

Commissioner Jones said that they could talk about it all night long, but it seemed that they were not ready for the task force at that point.

Commissioner Crichlow stated that he was totally in favor of the Sunshine Law, but the proposed task force would be strictly a citizen's sounding board.

Commissioner Jones pointed out that the citizens could organize independent of the Commission.

Commissioner Boles stated that the proposal made sense, and they had a better chance to be responsive by getting in front of problems and finding solutions, which was not always possible. He pointed out that they did not have to look for input for areas that required attention and named a number of active groups, and he said that demolition was a subject that they needed to address. He said the issues were right in front of them, plus the fact that they only had a five-year lease on the historic properties was also an issue. He stated that those were the kind of issues that he would like to see addressed. He said that the Secretary of State had been in St. Augustine talking about her passion for historic preservation. He stated that her response to his questions about a longer lease on the historic properties was that she thought they were going to do something about that a year ago. He said that they should be in Tallahassee working with the legislative delegation for a proposal that would provide the City with a long-term relationship with the properties, or the state should give them to the City outright, but they had to have a plan. He said those challenges were right in front of them and everyone was interested. He offered to talk to Bill Proctor and said he would do so, but it needed to be done quickly.

Mayor Gardner questioned whether they had to go to the legislature or the cabinet, and the response was the cabinet.

Commissioner Boles referred to the money they planned to use for a consultant and said

that his hope was that the consultant would evaluate the City's product and see how it could be enhanced and more marketable for repeat business.

Mr. Burchfield stated that during the subsequent meeting they would bring the proposals for a business planner for HP to the Commission.

Commissioner Jones stated that there were enough challenges out there, and they did not need a task force.

Mayor Gardner suggesting moving on with the meeting.

Commissioner Boles – Mooring Fields

Commissioner Boles said that the Sea Grant Program related to the University of Florida had tons of information regarding mooring fields, and they planned to come to St. Augustine and make a presentation to the Commission

Commissioner Crichlow – Park Service Orientation Center

Commissioner Crichlow pointed out that if the park service moved the orientation center beside the Spanish Quarter it would change how the facility would operate. He said that he was on board about acquiring a consulting company and perhaps their duties would be advisory in terms of a business plan considering that the facility would change.

Mr. Burchfield said that currently staff had a design for a trailer train drop-off route on Castillo Drive and through the Mary Peck property, and they intended on telling the consulting company the City's long term goal for the drop off and that the City envisioned that as the main entrance to museum complex.

Commissioner Crichlow agreed that there were a lot of things a company could address now and later.

Commissioner Boles stated that there was an incredible view of the fort from the Spanish Quarter Museum, but people could not find it. He pointed out that the chamber mixer in the Spanish Quarter had not been well attended and probably because of the location. He said that they could start addressing the matter now. He said that joint tickets for the fort and Spanish Quarter would probably give the museum more exposure, but that still did not address where to put the generated revenue to better the City's product.

Vendors in the Plaza

Commissioner Crichlow stated that they had to stay on top of enforcement for the vendors in the Plaza. He said that the rotation on the vendor sites in the Plaza was designed to give all the vendors' time in the best locations. He continued that the homeless loitering in the park was getting worse and questioned why there was no law for loitering.

Mr. Wilson replied that most loitering laws had been stricken by the courts as being over broad and unconstitutional. He said that there were other methods of discouraging loitering.

Mayor Gardner said that the St. Francis House had discontinued evening meals and closed the house at 5-6 p.m. with the idea that anyone hanging around after that time would be trespassing. However, the police had told the neighbors that they needed a loitering law in order to move the people away.

Mr. Wilson said that they needed trespass warnings.

Mayor Gardner questioned whether nothing could be done if they were sitting on the public curb.

Mr. Wilson said that was correct, unless they were obstructing traffic or causing a disturbance.

Commissioner Crichlow said that, more than anything else, he heard about the situation in the Plaza from the citizens. He said that it was hard to tell the public that there was nothing the City could do.

Aggregation Task Force

Mayor Gardner requested an update on the status of the task force.

Commissioner Crichlow replied that during the last meeting the task force determined that they needed to move ahead with something that could be approved in the ordinance. He said that they had pulled two aspects out, height on nonconforming lots and tearing down one house on a number of nonconforming lots and not allowing construction on each of those nonconforming lots, but allowing the lots to be replatted to conform for construction.

Commissioner Crichlow said that at the same time the PZB had moved to restrict height in proportion to lot size and would bring the matter to the Commission. Therefore, he said that the aggregation ordinance would contain the one item, which had to go before the PZB before it could go before the Commission. He said that his concern was the number of situations where houses were being torn down and more and more homes built on nonconforming lots; therefore, they needed to get something on the books to address the issue. He reiterated that the ordinance would contain only the one aspect of tearing down and rebuilding on nonconforming lots.

Mayor Gardner questioned how they could fast track the ordinance.

Mr. Wilson pointed out that the ordinance would require at least two public hearings; moreover, the ordinance would have to follow the normal process including notice for public hearing.

Mayor Gardner stated that they were seeing the aforementioned situation daily.

Commissioner Crichlow emphasized that the ordinance had to go before the PZB.

Mr. Wilson said that the ordinance had already gone through the PZB process; therefore it would only have to go before the Commission.

Commission Jones said that he understood that the task force had tried to simplify the ordinance for approval by eliminating the controversial aspects; however, they could not forget that they had experienced a packed audience for the workshop, because the proposal was such an issue for the community. He said that they had promised the citizens a public hearing to discuss all of the related issues, and they owed it to the public to carry through. He said that ideally they should go through the previous methods of notice and plan to use Flagler Auditorium for the workshop. He said that he was not prepared to run anything by the Commission that pertained to any portion of the ordinance unless they allowed the public hearing. He emphasized that he did not want to fast track anything that could short change the public.

Commissioner Crichlow said that the task force had voted in the same way; therefore, after presentation to the Commission the Commissioners would decide how to bring the matter to the public.

Commissioner Boles stated that the task force had attempted an extensive assignment that was difficult to explain. He said that he thought the task force had decided to reduce the scope of their recommendation, but there should still be a public hearing to make the citizens aware of the situation. He said that the task force would be reporting the results of their work to the Commission; they would get public input and then they could determine which direction to go. He said that when a situation was perfectly clear fast tracking was appropriate, but they had not reached that point of clarity.

Mayor Gardner clarified that he would not want to fast track the ordinance without a public hearing.

Commissioner Boles added that they were talking about *Eyes of the beholder*, because not all people shared the Mayor's vision that a 35-foot tall home next to a one story house constituted a monstrosity. He agreed with Commissioner Jones that the meeting at the auditorium had to be announced and held, after which it would become the Commissioner's matter to deal with, as currently the ordinance was a task force recommendation. He suggested that they were having difficulty, because they had not experienced a ground swell of public outcry regarding the issue. He said that perhaps if some of the ills that the Mayor had expressed concern about came to fruition it would prove his point, but not everyone would consider the Mayor's concerns as evils or ills.

Mayor Gardner replied that was why they had public hearings.

Commissioner Boles suggested scheduling the public hearing.

Commissioner Crichlow stated that the task force had to go over the draft one more time. He questioned whether the matter had to go back before the PZB, and the response was negative. He said that after the task force meeting they would bring the matter to the Commission.

A brief discussion determined that they would schedule, advertise and hold a public hearing in the Flagler Auditorium when the auditorium was available in late July or early August.

10. Appeals and Public Hearings

10.A/ Public hearing regarding an appeal of a HARB decision by David White and Barbara Rice and an Order by Circuit Court Judge J. Michael Traynor.

Mr. Wilson reported that the court ordered the City to grant the application originally filed by

Mr. White regarding the windows, as the court had found that there was no indication in the record why the permit should not be granted. He said that Mr. White would be allowed to install plate glass windows in the building in the same fashion they had been during the early part of the last century. He advised that they could hold a public hearing; however, they could not take further evidence to change the court order. He said that basically they were instructed to take action in accordance with the order.

Commissioner Crichlow commented that he wanted it understood that the court ruling had nothing to do with HARB's decision to deny the installation of the window, as the window was inappropriate and not in keeping with the City's historic architectural guidelines. He emphasized that HARB had made the right decision. He said the ruling had nothing to do with the Commission's decision to uphold the HARB decision, as that had also been the right decision. He stated that the court's ruling was the result of a loophole in how the City presented the supporting evidence to deny the request. He explained that the board's testimony and discussion could not be accepted as evidence, because it had to be testimony by a witness outside of the board.

Commissioner Crichlow stated that he was bringing the matter up because the boards had to be conducted in a manner to prevent similar situations. He said that they had to make sure there were no loopholes, because there were people who would take advantage of loopholes to get around the City's Historical Architectural Guidelines. He added that because of the loophole the City's architectural character would be compromised, and they had no choice but to allow the historically inappropriate window to be installed. He stated that the situation might not seem significant; however, with repetition in the future there could be significant architectural changes that could escalate the City to a faux historical architecture, and the City could become a cheap tourist trap. He said that the HARB

guidelines had been established to preserve the unique architectural heritage, and if they lost sight of that they would be in real trouble. He suggested that they must constantly keep their guard up against those that looked for loopholes regardless of what affect it would have on the City's visual character. He said that the City had made the decision about their image and not developers, special masters or the courts.

Mayor Gardner said that during the Special Master hearing there had been discussion about divided panes in the plate glass window, and he questioned whether that would prevail.

Mr. Wilson agreed that there had been some discussion in that direction; however, that was not part of the court order, which related to the original application for a plate glass window.

Mayor Gardner thanked Commissioner Crichlow and referred to the fact that they had both served on the PZB, and pointed out that the courts had over ruled the appointed representatives of the community and dismissed their judgment as mere opinions. He said that it came down to legal mumbo-jumbo that had nothing to do with what the community or its' representatives wanted. He said that it was wrong for the court to dismiss the citizen's voices. He suggested that all those trying to serve the community get better versed in the law. He expressed appreciation for a citizen's offering of information regarding boards and meetings and the suggestion that board members be trained. He questioned whether the Commissioners agreed that the boards required training to deal with court challenges.

Commissioner Boles replied that he thought the boards did a good job of staying out of court. He pointed out that the City had lost the case, because the City did not have any evidence other than the PZB and Commission discussions.

Commissioner Crichlow disagreed stating that they had evidence, but it had not been presented correctly. He asked the Police Chief to escort Mr. Slavin from the Commission room, because he was interrupting the meeting with his lack of decorum.

Mr. Wilson stated that no one had testified against the application and without testimony to back up the position the decision could not be upheld. He said the same situation had occurred regarding some of the dock lawsuits the City had lost; however, in the current instance he thought that the City was possibly close enough to win the case considering the discussion that was held by the HARB and the Commission, but the court had not agreed with his argument.

Commissioner Crichlow said obviously not; therefore, in any similar situation they would have to have someone from the public or an outside source present a statement regarding the board's decision.

Mr. Wilson said that the people who had complained about the application and losing the lawsuit were the ones that should have attended the HARB meetings to testify rather than complaining about the situation after the fact. He added that the item had been advertised a number of times and there had been at least five meetings regarding the matter, but clearly it was not a subject of enough interest for people to attend the meetings.

Mayor Gardner said that meant the deliberations of HARB or the Commission carried no weight with the court.

Mr. Wilson said that 98% of the HARB decisions were upheld, because they were not appealed. He added that the case was unusual, as it had been a long time since a HARB appeal had gone to court, as generally a HARB decision was correct; therefore, a HARB appeal would not be successful, and there was little sense to pay lawyer fees to lose.

Mayor Gardner questioned whether the lawsuit set a precedent for the adjacent building that was owned by the same person, as well as the O. C. White's Restaurant building.

Mr. Wilson replied not at all, but if no one testified in opposition to something they felt was improper there could be a problem.

Mayor Gardner said that the court relied on a staff report, but when he was on the PZB there had never been recommendations, but he had pushed for some kind of recommendation in order to make the board's job easier. He said that he had hoped for an opinion from staff.

Mr. Wilson pointed out that any recommendation had to be based on the Code, and within the Code the proposed windows were permissible under certain circumstances, and those types of windows were permissible at the time that the building had been built.

Commissioner Jones stated that he did not want to keep going over the matter, as he had voted to allow the windows originally and had the Commission followed suit they would not have ended up court. He added that Mr. White had agreed to individual panes during the mediation, but rehashing the whole thing would do nothing in their favor to encourage him to stay with the individual panes. He said that some of the Commissioners were perpetuating the lawsuit when it was done. He questioned whether the Commissioners had considered that perhaps Mr. White was right, and he had every right to go to court. He said that maybe some of the Commissioners did not want the windows, but the Code allowed them. He stated that they tried to create something that had not existed, because the building had not looked like it currently did due to remodeling, but Mr. White was attempting to take it back to the original building. He said that he would like to vote; moreover, it was appropriate that they accept the judges ruling and move on.

MOTION

Commissioner Jones MOVED to grant Mr. White's application for the plate glass window as originally submitted and enter an order in accordance with the court's order. The motion was SECONDED by Commissioner Boles and approved by UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE.

11. RESOLUTIONS AND ORDINANCES (To include public hearing)

11.A/ Resolutions

11.A.1/ Resolution 2005-12, regarding flags on the Bridge of Lions.

Mr. Wilson reported that after the court action Commissioner Jones had requested a resolution stating that the only flags to fly on the bridge would be put up by the FDOT and the City of St. Augustine, and he had added a section that made it clear that free speech rights were not being violated. He said that people could not attach anything to the bridge, because there was no inherent right to the bridge as a public forum other than for marching or speaking while holding signs and banners. He said that the court felt the City had opened the public forum, but he had prepared a resolution that he considered legal, and it was before the Commission for consideration.

Commissioner Boles questioned whether they could approve the resolution if the DOT indicated that the City had no say regarding the bridge, because it was not the City's bridge. He said that historically it was the Altrusa Club that originally put up and maintained U. S. flags on the bridge every year, and the situation had escalated from there. He reiterated whether they had permission to consider the bridge the City's to control, and if they could, he believed they needed a resolution. He added that he did not want to do all the work and have the state tell them to get the flags off the bridge. He pointed out that in a year they would not be

flying any flags, because of the bridge restoration.

Mr. Wilson replied that truthfully he was not aware of where the authority had come from, but the state had allowed the City to fly flags, without interference, but if the state instructed the City to remove the flags, they would have to do so.

Commissioner Boles stated that he did not want to waste all their time or over step their bounds.

Mayor Gardner said that there was no formal document allowing the City to fly flags; however, the City currently had a policy concerning the matter. He said that he saw no reason not to approve the resolution, and if the state stepped in that would be fine.

Commissioner Jones stated that the judge had ordered the City to fly the rainbow flags with assumption that the City had that authority and the state had not stepped forward; therefore, until otherwise instructed they should follow through with the precedent, and currently they had a policy in place. He said that they could eliminate the policy, leave it in place or amend it. He suggested that they had to take some action.³

MOTION

Commissioner Jones MOVED that Resolution 2005-12 be approved. The motion was SECONDED by Commissioner Crichlow.

Commissioner Crichlow said that the City had been accused of creating a resolution specifically to prevent the gay rainbow flag from being flown for spite. He stated that he did not want to be accused of discriminating against any group, because that was not what they were doing. He stated that he was in favor of the resolution, and he wanted to move forward as the resolution had nothing

³ End of audio tape two

to do with gay rights. He said that the City did not want to have to deal with rights stuff, they needed to move on with business that was critical to the City.

Commissioner Boles said even a cursory review indicated that the existing flag policy was fraught with peril while putting a big burden on the City Manager. He said that he had suggested a moratorium on flags until they developed some workable criteria. He said the lawsuit should not have surprised anyone, but the resolution was a simplistic answer that would get rid of the controversy and it was defensible, because it allowed the U. S., City and State flags. But, he said that the resolution did allow them to use a historical landmark as a way of celebrating City events. He said that he liked the promotional aspect of the flags, although he did not agree with commercial flags. He urged the Commission not to pass the resolution until they worked on the matter, as anytime they tried to craft legislation to prevent or include a particular group's participation there would be problems. He said that they needed to make the matter defensible, benefit the community and enhance the bridge. He said that in 10-months the renovation would prevent flags for three years. He concluded that he would prefer to see no criteria or no flag rather than something they might have to live with when the bridge was renovated.

A brief discussion reiterating the situation resulted.

VOTE ON MOTION

AYES: Jones, Crichlow, Gardner

NAYES: Boles

MOTION CARRIED 3/1

Mayor Gardner said the resolution stated that the City would accept no further applications to fly flags. He said that they had already issued permits to fly flags for Greek Landing Day and for Flagler College on three different dates. He questioned how the Commission would like to handle the situation.

MOTION

Commissioner Boles MOVED to approve the flags that were already permitted. The motion was SECONDED by Commissioner Crichlow.

Commissioner Jones stated that he would rather approve the Greek Landing Day flags and cancel the three Flagler College permits and refund their money.

Mr. Wilson suggested that, legally speaking, they allow all the permitted flags considering that they had been issued under the old policy.

Commissioner Jones suggested approaching Flagler College and asking them to withdraw their permits and refund their money. He suggested bringing the matter before the Commission if the college would not withdraw the permits.

Commissioner Boles questioned why the Commissioner was picking on Flagler College.

Mr. Wilson said that he would check with both groups, but if they did not agree he was not certain whether they would file a lawsuit against the City, but he felt the court would uphold the permitted groups, because they had applied under the old rules, and they had a vested right.

Commissioner Jones requested that staff go to both groups and ask them to withdraw their applications.

Mayor Gardner agreed that the recent situation had been stressful, but he said they should allow the already permitted flags if the groups would not agree to withdraw their permits.

VOTE ON MOTION

AYES: Boles, Crichlow, Jones, Gardner

NAYES: None

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

11.B/ Ordinances - First Reading

11.B.1/ Tabled from 05/23/05 - Introduction and consideration of Ordinance 2005-10, designating property located on the north side of Live Oak Street as Residential Low Density.

Mr. Knight said that the next three ordinances related to the same piece of property. He said that Ordinance 2005-10 designated the property Residential Low Density, Ordinance 2005-11 rezoned the property to Residential Single Two and Ordinance 2005-16 provided the option to rezone the property to a Planned Unit Development. He said that during the previous meeting the Commission had expressed concern regarding the odd shaped lots, and to correct the odd shape they had discussed the PUD. He said that Mr. Tringali had agreed to the limitation of one story height or 27-feet with 5,000 square foot lots. He said that if the Commission preferred the PUD they would adopt 2005-16.

MOTION

Commissioner Crichlow MOVED to place Ordinance 2005-10 on first reading, ready by title only and approved. The motion was SECONDED by Commissioner Jones.

Mr. Wilson read the title as follows:

ORDINANCE NO. 2005-10

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE, FLORIDA, AMENDING THE CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, FUTURE LAND USE MAP, TO INCORPORATE AND DESIGNATE APPROXIMATELY 0.38 ACRES OF PROPERTY, LYING ON THE NORTH SIDE OF LIVE OAK STREET, WEST OF S. WHITNEY STREET, AS RESIDENTIAL LOW DENSITY; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

APPROVED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE.

11.B.2/ Tabled from 05/23/05 - Introduction and consideration of Ordinance 2005-11, designating property located on the north side of Live Oak Street as Residential Single-Family-Two (RS-2).

Ordinance was not adopted.

11.B.3/ Introduction and consideration of Ordinance 2005-16, designating property located on the north side of Live Oak Street as the Tringali Planned Unit Development (PUD).

MOTION

Commissioner Jones MOVED to place Ordinance 2005-16 on first reading, read by title only and approved. Mayor Gardner SECONDED the motion.

Mr. Wilson read the title as follows:

ORDINANCE NO. 2005-16

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE, FLORIDA, ESTABLISHING THE TRINGALI PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT (PUD) PURSUANT TO SECTION 28-289 OF THE CODE OF THE CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE; PROVIDING FOR TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THE PUD; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY; AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE

MOTION APPROVED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE.

11.C/ Ordinances – First Reading – Public Hearing Required

(None Scheduled)

11.D/ Ordinances - Second Reading Public Hearing

11.D.1/ Public Hearing - Ordinance 2005-12, reclassifying City owned property

located at W. King Street and Elkton Lane from Commercial Medium Intensity to Public/Semi-Public.

Mr. Knight reported that Ordinance 2005-12 and Ordinance 2005-13 were related to property that the City recently purchased on West King Street. He said that the structures that were on the property had been relocated to the adjacent property owner. He explained that the City had purchased the property to expand the Public Works/Utilities and Fleets Operations complex to West King Street, and they wanted to change the Commercial Zoning to Government Use; therefore, the land use classification would designate the property as Public/Semi-public in Ordinance 2005-12 and rezoning to GU in Ordinance 2005-13.

Mayor Gardner opened the public hearing for both ordinances, but there was no response.

MOTION

Commissioner Crichlow MOVED that Ordinance 2005-12 be placed on the second reading, read by title only and passed. Commissioner Jones SECONDED the motion.

Mr. Wilson read the title as follows:

ORDINANCE NO. 2005-12

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE, FLORIDA, AMENDING THE CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, FUTURE LAND USE MAP, TO RECLASSIFY A PARCEL OF LAND LOCATED AT THE INTERSECTION OF W. KING STREET AND ELKTON LANE, CONTAINING APPROXIMATELY 1.3 ACRES IN THE CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE, FROM COMMERCIAL MEDIUM INTENSITY TO PUBLIC/SEMI-PUBLIC; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

MOTION WAS APPROVED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE.

11.D.2/ Public Hearing - Ordinance 2005-13, rezoning City owned property located at W. King Street and Elkton Lane from Commercial Medium-Two (CM-2) to Government Use (GU).

MOTION

Commissioner Crichlow MOVED that Ordinance 2005-13 be placed on the second reading, read by title only and passed. Commissioner Jones SECONDED the motion.

Mr. Wilson read the title as follows:

ORDINANCE NO. 2005-13

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE, FLORIDA, REZONING PROPERTY LOCATED AT THE INTERSECTION OF W. KING STREET AND ELKTON LANE, CONTAINING APPROXIMATELY 1.3 ACRES IN THE CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE, AND MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED HEREINAFTER, FROM ITS CURRENT CLASSIFICATION OF COMMERCIAL MEDIUM-TWO (CM-2) TO THE CLASSIFICATION OF GOVERNMENT USE (GU); REPEALING ALL ORDINANCES OR PARTS OF ORDINANCES IN CONFLICT HERewith; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE

MOTION WAS APPROVED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE.

11.D.3/ Public Hearing - Ordinance 2005-14, relating to Pensions and Retirement for the Professional Firefighters of St. Augustine, Local 2282.

Mayor Gardner opened the public hearing; however, there was no response.

MOTION

Commissioner Jones **MOVED** that Ordinance 2005-14 be placed on the second reading, read by title only and passed. Mayor Gardner **SECONDED** the motion.

Mr. Wilson read the title as follows:

ORDINANCE NO. 2005-14

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE, FLORIDA, AMENDING CHAPTER 20, PENSIONS AND RETIREMENT, ARTICLE V, FIREFIGHTERS' PENSION TRUST FUND, OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES OF ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE; AMENDING SECTION 20-191, DEFINITIONS, REVISING THE DEFINITION OF "CREDITED SERVICE" TO INCLUDE A PROVISION FOR THE PURCHASE OF CERTAIN MILITARY AND PRIOR SERVICE AS A FIREFIGHTER; AMENDING SECTION 20-196, BENEFIT AMOUNTS AND ELIGIBILITY, PROVIDING FOR NORMAL RETIREMENT AFTER TWENTY-FIVE YEARS OF SERVICE AND PROVIDING FOR AN INCREASED MULTIPLIER; CREATING A NEW SECTION 20-215, PROVIDING FOR A DEFERRED RETIREMENT OPTION PLAN; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY OF PROVISIONS; PROVIDING FOR INCLUSION IN THE CODE OF ORDINANCES OF ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE

MOTION WAS APPROVED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE.

11.D.4/ Public Hearing - Ordinance 2005-15, relating to residency requirements to serve on the Historic Architectural Review Board (HARB).

Mayor Gardner opened the public, but there was no response.

MOTION

Commissioner Boles **MOVED** to place 2005-15 on second reading, read by title only and approved. The motion was **SECONDED** by Commissioner Jones.

Mr. Wilson read the title as follows:

ORDINANCE NO. 2005-15

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE, FLORIDA, AMENDING SECTIONS 28-82 AND 28-83 OF THE CODE OF THE CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE, FLORIDA, TO ADD A MINIMUM QUALIFICATION CRITERIA TO MEMBERS OF THE HISTORIC ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY; PROVIDING FOR INCLUSION IN THE CODE; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

MOTION WAS APPROVED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE.

12.A/ General Public Comments (5 minutes per individual).

Kristina Rosenbaum, 2 Fletcher Lane, spoke further regarding her restaurant on Charlotte Street and the impact the street construction was having on her business. She stated that the City should be protecting them. She said that communications with the small business owners had not been satisfactory, and the City had shown them a lack of respect. She said that the circumstance had rendered her business invisible, inaccessible and put into an unsafe and unsanitary environment during a busy time of the year. She stated that the City must find a way to help compensate for their losses. She said that she simply wanted to know whether anyone was listening and willing to help them find a solution.

After a discussion it was determined that the SBA was the only source of relief, the City would do whatever they could do to help but there was never a good time for that type of project, and when the repair was complete it would enhance the businesses on Charlotte Street

Alan Kelso, 4010 Bella Vista Boulevard,
thanked the Commission for all they did for
the City. He stated that his intention was to
be a participant in the Commission meetings
in the future.

**12.B/ GENERAL PUBLIC
PRESENTATIONS AND COMMENTS (15
minutes per presentations)**

(None Scheduled)

13. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting
was adjourned 9:12 p.m. ⁴

MAYOR

CITY CLERK

⁴Transcribed by Karen Rogers, Recording
Secretary