

COMMISSION CONFERENCE**March 16, 2004**

<u>Agenda Item</u>		<u>Page</u>
I-A	Executive Airport – proposed Changes to Florida Statute 475	1
I-B	Executive Airport – Proposed Changes to Florida Statute 333	1
I-C	FY 2004-2005 Budget Calendar and Process	1
I-D	Reconsideration of Ordinance No. C-40, Increase in Fire Inspection Fees (City Ordinance Fire Safety Fee Schedule 0-53)	3
I-E	2004 State Legislative Agenda	4, 9
I-F	Fiscal Year 2003 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) And Auditor's Opinion	8
I-G	Project 10363 – Executive Airport Rescue and Fire Fighting/Emergency Operations Center – Proposed Funding Program	10
II-A	Report of Investment Results for the Fiscal Year Ended September 30, 2003	12
II-B	Report on Contract Extensions	12
II-C	Parks Bond Status Report	12
II-D	Status Report: Housing and Assistance Programs and Production	12
II-E	Contractual Compliance Report – Large User Wastewater Agreements	12
II-F	Evaluation and Appraisal Report (EAR) Update	12
II-G	Financial and Overtime Monitoring Reports – February 2004	17
III-B	Advisory Board and Committee Vacancies	17
	1. Budget Advisory Board	17
	2. Cemeteries Board of Trustees	18
	3. Community Appearance Board	(Deferred)
	4. Community Services Board	(Deferred)
	5. Economic Development Advisory Board	(Deferred)
	6. Education Advisory Board	(Deferred)
	7. Historic Preservation Advisory Board	(Deferred)
	8. Insurance Advisory Board	(Deferred)
	9. Northwest-Progresso-Flagler Heights Redevelopment Advisory Board	(Deferred)
	10. Nuisance Abatement Advisory Board	(Deferred)
	11. Unsafe Structures and Housing Appeals Board	(Deferred)
	12. Utility Advisory Committee	(Deferred)
IV	Commission Reports	19
	1. Reconsideration of Impact Fees	19
	2. Parking/Las Olas	19
	3. Code Amnesty Program	20
	4. Jackson Tower Complaint	22
	5. City Clerk Contract	23
V	City Manager Reports	24

COMMISSION CONFERENCE

1:32 P.M.

MARCH 16, 2004

Present: Mayor Naugle
Commissioners Hutchinson, Teel, Moore and Trantalis

Also Present: Acting City Manager
City Attorney
Assistant City Clerk
Sergeant At Arms – Sergeant Victor London

I-A – Executive Airport – Proposed Changes to Florida Statute 475

Clara Bennett, Acting Airport Director, stated that they recommended that the City support these measures due to the impact they would have on the Airport in the future.

Action: As recommended.

I-B – Executive Airport – Proposed Changes to Florida Statute 333

Clara Bennett, Acting Airport Director, stated that they felt that Statute 333 should remain in effect.

Action: None taken.

I-C – FY 2004-2005 Budget Calendar and Process

Commissioner Moore asked what reorganization they were specifically referring to when mentioning April.

The Acting City Manager stated that at the April 7, 2004 Commission meeting they were looking to discuss Community and Economic Development and Public Services, and coming up with recommendations so they could be included in next year's budget.

Commissioner Moore asked if that was what had been agreed to at the Workshop at the Airport. The Acting City Manager confirmed, and stated that in addition to that they would be presenting the initial indication of white paper dealing with the City Manager's Office, along with other departments. Commissioner Moore asked for further clarification regarding the white paper. The Acting City Manager explained that there were parts of the strategic planning management analysis and other items which had been identified to be integrated into next year's budget, and they were thinking of including those in the Manager's budget. He added that concerns had also been raised as to the size of the Manager's budget, and they wanted to give an indication of such. He further stated that for all intents and purposes, it was important to identify a certain funding level and FTE level so he had the resources available to put things into place.

Commissioner Moore stated that he did not think they should get involved in the specifics of a reorganization, but they did need to propose what type of budget was being offered to the incoming manager to operate his division. He reiterated that when it came to the organizational structure of the Manager's Office, he felt the new Manager should deal with its organizational structure or the methodology he wanted to operate

under. He felt the white paper should only be about the budgeted monies proposed for the operation of the Manager's Office for the upcoming fiscal year.

Mayor Naugle stated that he felt comfortable with the discussion and recommendations regarding the structure of the City Manager's office. He stated the recommendations did not have to be implemented, but he felt it was good to have a healthy discussion.

Commissioner Moore asked what was the definition of deputy and assistant manager. Mayor Naugle explained that the deputy was a position that would be approved by the City Commission in accordance with the City Charter, but the assistants were not.

Commissioner Teel clarified that such recommendations had been made in the Latimer Report. Mayor Naugle confirmed. He stated that they had implemented most of the recommendations made in the Latimer Report.

Commissioner Moore stated that the Latimer Report had made some great recommendations, and it was up to the majority of the Commission as to what they wanted to implement from that report. He reiterated that if a white paper was to be written then he wanted a definition of the term "deputy," and if it was a Charter change and it was to be someone appointed by the Commission, then he wanted to understand that and have it clarified. He asked that there also be some discussion in the white paper as to the definition of assistant, and what was the difference between the two entities.

Mayor Naugle suggested that a copy of the Charter be attached to the white paper.

The Acting City Manager stated that also in the white paper would be changes that could be made in other departments for the long term, but not necessarily included in this year's budget. He further stated that the CIP would be considered at the same time this year as the regular budget, so there would be an indication of that level of capital outlay that would be necessary, plus they could measure whether or not staff would be capable of implementation.

Mayor Naugle asked how the Acting City Manager was going to handle the CIP and the potential for the bond issue because they would not know if there were going to be a bond until after the budget process. The Acting City Manager stated that he was anticipating that the construction under the bond issue would be included with the bond issue amount so that project management would come within that amount. He stated further it would probably start the following fiscal year, and there would be no impact for this year except to the extent of borrowing in anticipation of the bond issuance.

Commissioner Moore stated if there was to be a proposal of a bond based upon past discussions, he felt it would be appropriate to put something in this budget dealing with public information. He stated that was not a normal budgeting concept, and therefore, asked that it be considered.

Mayor Naugle stated that by law they could explain all the facts regarding the process.

Action: White paper to be submitted with recommendations.

I-D – Reconsideration of Ordinance No. C-40, Increase in Fire Inspection Fees (City Ordinance Fire Safety Fee Schedule 0-53)

The Acting City Manager stated that in December 2003, they had anticipated a \$12 Million reallocation of resources that included not only cuts in FTE and expenditure levels, but also included revenue enhancements. He continued stating that based on the approval received on December 16, 2003; they were to move forward with such enhancements through ordinances. He stated that the item not yet approved, and which had been rejected at the last Commission meeting, was one that dealt with an increase in fire fees. He stated this was a matter of concern because in December 2003, it had been included as part of the budget in anticipation that the ordinance would be passed and they could recoup the funds to the tune of \$150,000 this year. To the extent that the funds would not be available and not approved through an ordinance, he stated that such funds would have to be removed from the budget, and he would have to reduce the expenditure portion. He asked the Chief what the implications would be with a reduction of \$150,000, and how the fees would stack up in regard to other localities and whether they would still be competitive.

Otis Latin, Chief Fire-Rescue, stated that they would have to find those funds somewhere else, and the only place left was personnel. He stated that when they made this proposal, they felt this would be the best place for them to pick up additional revenues and not have to affect personnel. He continued stating that the fees had not been raised for 10 years, and they felt that they would be competitive with other departments in the area with implementing this increase. He added that there was a projection of \$300,000 for the next fiscal year.

Mayor Naugle asked if the rates were not increased, what cuts would have to be implemented. Chief Latin reiterated the only other alternative would be cuts in personnel. He stated that many cuts had been made in the administration portion, and there was no room for further ones. Therefore, they would have to look at operations. He stated if they looked to fire prevention, then they would be reducing revenues that would be generated under normal conditions.

Commissioner Teel stated that people at her pre-agenda meeting had originally stated that a 25% increase was a large amount of money, but in reviewing the facts and seeing that increase over a period of 10 years, their opinions changed. They had stated they would have been happier with a 2.5% increase each year. She stated that the citizens did not want their services reduced and they were ready to accept this increase.

Commissioner Trantalis asked why this expense had been paid for out of the fee versus it being a line item in the budget. He asked if it was normal for municipalities to charge a fire inspection fee in order to cover expenses for the department, as opposed to it being part of the budget. The Acting City Manager explained that normally when a budget was created for a department, there were various revenue sources that went into the financing of the department. He stated that the Fire Department was a unique case because they could also have a fire assessment fee, which would cover fire type activities, as distinguished from the rescue portion of the department. He stated there were EMS charges to cover those costs. Commissioner Trantalis asked if these were statutory authorized fees. The Acting City Manager confirmed and stated that those fees were allowable by law. He explained that some of the fees were a result of a review of plans. He explained that the Building Department was fully financed by the fees they

generated from permit fees. He stated they were looking to increase these fees by 25% since they had not been increased in the last 10 years. He reiterated that they would still not be recovering the full costs of operation. He added that as part of the budget process, they would be doing an analysis as to what the fees should be to cover costs. Then, they would return to the Commission with such information and ask if they wanted to subsidize those costs. Then, a determination would have to be made as to how much they wanted to subsidize those fees. He explained that any time there was a user fee charge; it was because it was a discreet activity or benefit conferred upon someone.

Mayor Naugle stated it was also a legislative mandate that cities inspect all commercial and multi-family buildings annually. He continued stating that he remembered when it had first been implemented that some of the inspections had been done from suppression. He asked if any fire departments were doing inspections from suppression.

Chief Latin replied that if anyone was doing it that way, then they were probably very small departments.

Steve Kastner, Fire Marshall, stated that suppression programs were mostly done by small departments in smaller cities.

Mayor Naugle stated it was good to have comparison information from the other cities that they had not been provided with previously. He asked why those cities had been selected. Chief Latin stated that one of the problems they had was in attempting to compare their fee schedule with other municipalities. He explained they attempted to use cities that had similar fee structures.

Chief Kastner explained that Fort Lauderdale had been the first city to go into the fire inspection fee schedule, and he had tried to find fee schedules that would be comparable. He stated that Pembroke Pines was in the fire assessment fees and he had been unable to obtain that information. He stated that he had been given the same information regarding Hollywood.

The Acting City Manager stated that the fire assessment fee was the residual between all the other resources.

Mayor Naugle asked what would be the reduction in employees if this increase were not approved. Chief Latin stated they had to look that it was \$160,000 for this year. He added that the average salary for a firefighter was \$60,000. The Acting City Manager stated there were termination benefits involved and it would be about \$20,000 per person for the remainder of the year, involving 8 positions.

Action: To be reconsidered if the majority approved.

I-E – 2004 State Legislative Agenda

Commissioner Moore stated that he wanted this matter discussed because some items had arisen at the League of Cities. He stated the first issue was in regard to the red light cameras. He stated that the Commission had decided to continue with that item. He stated that it might save lives, but he had a problem with individuals being photographed and felt it was inappropriate.

Commissioner Moore stated the other matter was regarding the November elections. He advised that the City of Westin had proposed that municipal elections also be held during the month of November. He felt that municipal elections should be held in March because it gave the taxpayer the opportunity to concentrate on their City government. He stated that the Broward League had not taken any position on the issue due to the fact that they were waiting to hear comments from other municipal entities.

Commissioner Hutchinson clarified that if it passed, it would be an option and the cities did not have to do it. Commissioner Moore confirmed and stated the issue was whether they wanted to have a supported resolution for the consideration of the State Legislature.

Commissioner Teel stated that more people probably voted in November, but then the ballot was extremely long and many people did not even finish voting. She stated that having the elections in March gave the taxpayer the distinct purpose for being there. She stated it was also out of sync since they had 3-year terms.

Mayor Naugle stated if the City were to consider this, they would have to change their terms to either 2 or 4 years. He suggested that the Commission not take a position on this.

Commissioner Trantalis stated he was not in favor of changing it to November, but he felt it would be too confusing having the elections at the same time. He felt it made more sense to have the elections in March.

Mayor Naugle stated that the political scientists felt that a November election benefited all candidates from name recognition, and that November elections would favor incumbents. He felt they would have a more informed voter at the municipal elections who researched their candidates.

Commissioner Moore stated that the next issue was Exhibit 3, and he stated that they had not been able to come to an agreement with the Broward County Board of County Commissioners. He remarked that he was surprised they had agreed on Home Rule. He stated the last item referred to the Federal agenda, and these were joint issues that should be addressed. Among such items were home rule, beach renourishment, and homeland security.

Commissioner Hutchinson stated that she had received the following from the League of Cities: "As you know, we have several items of substantial interest before the Legislature this year, including the possible legislation that we return exclusive planning authority to the municipalities in Broward. In preparation for the final weeks of the Session, we would appreciate you providing the following information: (1) The League would like to know who lobbied for the City. If any lobbyists also lobbied for Broward County, would the City be willing to require that they not lobby on any issue on which Broward County and the cities disagreed. (2) Would you be willing to ask your lobbyist to work with other city lobbyists and the League lobbyist in support of a bill that would return exclusive planning authority to the municipalities in Broward in the event that such legislation is filed."

Mayor Naugle reiterated that they supported home rule. Commissioner Hutchinson asked if the Commission was saying "yes" to the 2 questions and provides them with the City's lobbyist's name. Commissioner Moore confirmed.

Mayor Naugle reiterated that the Commission was not taking a position regarding the election dates.

The City Attorney stated that a resolution was not needed if no position was being taken.

Commissioner Moore stated that at the next League of Cities meeting, they could state that the Commission was in agreement with the League and the County positions regarding Federal and State issues. He reiterated that the Commission was taking no action in connection with the municipal elections. He stated they had previously taken a position regarding the cameras.

Commissioner Hutchinson left the meeting at approximately 2:08 p.m. and returned at 2:09 p.m.

Mayor Naugle asked if the Bill was going to be filed by Senator Geller. Commissioner Moore stated that Senator Geller had been a champion for the cities regarding that issue and reiterated that he was getting a great deal of comment from the State.

Mayor Naugle asked if the new DCA Secretary would be an ally in regard to the City's position. Commissioner Moore stated that his staff had gone to Tallahassee and had made a presentation and the item had been discussed.

Commissioner Moore stated that another issue which had been discussed at that meeting was hometown democracy, and he remarked that it was going to be a petition effort. He explained there was a proposed petition that would be well-funded to have legislation stating that zoning changes in a municipal entity had to be taken to a public vote. He felt this was going to be an interesting effort. Mayor Naugle stated he thought this was to cover a land use change that would increase density and not a zoning change. Commissioner Moore stated it could be both, but it was perceived as a density increase. Mayor Naugle reiterated that it would not stop development, but would stop them from coming in and getting a zoning change. Commissioner Moore stated they were talking about a density and zoning change.

Commissioner Moore reiterated that the hometown democracy issue was a concern. He stated that a foundation had been created and was known as "The Foundation for Florida's Future" which attempted to inform the public of the possibilities of the negatives this could have in allowing the cities to proceed forward with their development. He urged everyone to watch this carefully. He stated that he hoped they would be active in watching both sides of this issue. He explained that many entities were forming this foundation, including regional planning councils and developers. He stated there could be positive and negative effects. He felt they should be careful and monitor the issue closely. He stated they had also been told that a very wealthy person was about to fund the hometown democracy issuing by paying \$8 per signature in regard to the petition drive. He felt this could become a state-wide issue. He emphasized that 4,000 signatures would be needed, and the individual funding those signatures was Ted Turner.

Commissioner Trantalis stated this issue had been percolating in their community for quite some time, and the attempt by the County to grab and have more of a say in redevelopment was an outgrowth of individuals crying out saying the cities had been running rampant and had not been controlled. He felt this was an effort to try and provide an answer to a trend, and he felt it was dangerous and could backfire. He felt the individuals should speak through their elected officials. He stated that he had cautioned people on the Beach stating that individuals living on the Barrier Island might not think the same way as individuals living on the west side of town. He stated it would be inappropriate to pit one group against the other.

Commissioner Moore stated that he agreed and stated he believed if there was going to be an opportunity for the taxpayer to state that the concept of development was going either the way they wanted it to or not, it was the local elected official who should be contacted. He reiterated that what the County was proposing did not make sense in his eyes.

Mayor Naugle stated that this week the Planning Department had received plans for a new housing development that would increase the density by 32%.

Commissioner Hutchinson stated that she was concerned when she heard the public buying into the anti-development campaign the County was promoting in order to take some redevelopment powers away from the cities. She stated if one looked west of I-95 they could see what had been done, and she reiterated that the individuals there now did not want to continue to commute and were moving east. She stated they needed to be careful for what they wished for as far as the group thinking that the County would look out for their best interest in the various cities.

Commissioner Moore stated that this morning there had been a telephone conference with the Florida League. He asked Mr. Bentley and the City's consultant to follow various bills and were items that the State League was concerned about. He stated that it was Senate Bill 1174 offered by Senator Bennett, House Bill 1217 by Ackerson, and House Bill 1477 by Gardner. He explained there was to be a demonstration on April 1, 2004 in support of Senate Bill 1002 which dealt with the issue of hometown democracy. He stated that the City might want to play a role in the matter. He stated the Senate Bill was dealing with the pension benefits.

Bud Bentley, Assistant City Manager, stated that there was a bill submitted by a coalition of utilities that would in essence pre-empt any of their efforts to control and manage the vegetation near electrical lines. He stated he would check as to whom was filing that and report later on during today's meeting.

Commissioner Moore left the meeting at approximately 2:19 p.m.

Mr. Bentley further stated that given the Commission's past positions, he felt there would be a consensus to oppose such legislature.

Commissioner Teel stated that last year she and Mr. Bentley had attended Broward Days and had visited various legislative offices asking for support for various bills. Due to budget restraints, she asked who would be attending Broward Days. Mayor Naugle stated that he was going up on the 24th, and possibly the 13th. Commissioner Hutchinson advised that she would attend on the 30th and 31st.

Commissioner Moore returned to the meeting at approximately 2:20 p.m.

Commissioner Teel stated that she felt at least one member of staff should attend. Mr. Bentley stated that Linda Cox would be there and he did not feel it was necessary for staff to attend.

Action: Commission is supporting all positions consistent with legislative recommendations, but would take no position regarding elections.

Item continued on page 9.

I-F -- Fiscal Year 2003 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) and Auditor's Opinion

Terry Sharp, Finance Director, stated that they were back on track in getting these reports out timely. He stated that the numbers from September 30, 2003 had already been seen. He stated that the Audit Advisory Board had held 3 meetings and a memorandum was attached from that Board. He added that they had reviewed the management letter and comments had been made. He stated that Tom Bradley of Ernst & Young would provide further detail.

Tom Bradley stated that they issued an opinion regarding the financial statements, along with an opinion on internal controls and compliance with laws and regulations. He stated they had a clean opinion regarding the financial statements, along with the City's results of operations for the year. He stated they had no material findings in terms of non-compliance with laws and regulations. He stated they had received excellent cooperation from the City this year and had completed their audit 5 months earlier than last year.

Commissioner Hutchinson stated that she had met with her appointment to the Audit Advisory Board, and one of the biggest things they had discussed was procedures in place so the ongoing compliance regarding some of the issues in the management letter had been addressed appropriately and fixed.

Commissioner Trantalis stated that on page 35 where it referred to deposits made to the General Fund meant that they had more money or less than what they had thought. Mr. Bradley stated there was more money than what they had thought there would be. Commissioner Trantalis asked what they had been doing with those additional funds. Mr. Bradley stated that this related to items that had been reported as liabilities last year because they were going to be restricted for future use, but actually once the monies had been received by the City, there were no restrictions. He stated that nothing was being done with the money per se, but it was in a liability account and now had been reclassified into the fund balance of the City.

Mr. Sharp stated that these had been trust funds set aside for a specific purpose. He stated they had recognized that it was current revenue, and they had designated the purpose as they were brought forward. He stated that detailed information could be supplied explaining what such funds had been created for, but advised they were in the General Fund and could be reviewed by the Commission and changes could be made.

Mayor Naugle stated that the financial report showed that the Insurance Fund was over. The Acting City Manager advised it had been over by \$21 Million. Mr. Bradley explained that there was a deficit balance of \$21 Million.

The Acting City Manager stated that the \$1 Million had been designated due to coming from a trust account.

Mayor Naugle stated there had been a lot of discussion regarding the Amnesty funds being "found money," but he felt that reduced the liabilities owed to the City, and in the end they would collect less.

The Acting City Manager stated that they were receiving more money this fiscal year, but what would happen in the following years they did not know.

Commissioner Teel asked if the \$1.4 Million was in the General Fund was there a tendency to think there would be no restrictions, and asked further if the monies should be transferred into the restricted funds. Mr. Sharp stated they could keep restrictions in place, and they were able to keep track of it separately. He gave as an example that when purchasing a building permit, there were surcharges on it to pay for certification for building inspectors that was held in a trust fund. He stated their intent was to continue to have such revenues restricted for such purposes, unless the Commission decided to make some changes. He reiterated that those revenues were actually "spoken for." He further stated they had not increased the undesignated, unreserved portion of the General Fund with such transaction. He explained there had been a change in the approach regarding the accounting for such funds.

Action: None taken.

I-E -- 2004 State Legislative Agenda

Continued from page 8.

Commissioner Moore clarified that the issue regarding Bill 1477 dealt with transportation and the possibility of merging the MPO and removing the local controls regarding the spending of transportation dollars. He stated the other issue concerned the Bennett Bill #1174 which addressed the Sadowski Trust Fund under the general government. He stated this was a concern in regard to affordable housing opportunities and the utilization of those funds that could have a negative impact. He added that on the first page of #1174 it referred to the passing down of the administration and operation of the Court system to County and municipal entities. He added they were opposed to such action.

Mayor Naugle asked if the City had done an analysis in regard to how the City would be affected regarding filing of this Bill.

The City Attorney stated it would be expensive for the City because they were not presently paying a filing fee for processing, and there were quite a number of prosecutions during the year. He added that he would get the numbers that were done in one year.

Commissioner Moore stated it would be helpful to forward such number to the Florida League of Cities so they could have an idea of the fiscal impact that would occur on the City.

I-G -- Project 10363 – Executive Airport Rescue and Fire Fighting/Emergency Operations Center – Proposed Funding Program

Horace McHugh stated that at the last Commission meeting concern was expressed in regard to how projects were managed. He stated that in terms of staffing, there would be a discussion of the Construction Services Manager in conjunction with the City Manager's budget process. He further stated that in regard to this project, they had attempted to identify some of the fiscal impacts that could occur if this item was not approved. He urged the Commission to approve this matter. He stated that Station #88 required some improvements, along with Fire Station #29. He stated they could lose the FDOT funds and other funds that they would be receiving if this matter was not approved. He further stated that one of the things Construction Services had suggested was that they could have some enhanced funding assigned to a project manager and it could be "beefed up" by \$80,000 which would increase the scope of the project, which could provide the additional construction services inspections in conjunction with engineering from the Airport.

Mr. McHugh further stated they were proposing Exhibit B as an attachment with an increase of \$80,000 over the previous estimate provided to the Commission.

Commissioner Hutchinson stated that she reviewed the two-step approach as it related to construction bids, but asked where the \$80,000 would come from. Mr. McHugh replied that in this case it would be an additional project cost. He reiterated that any method would have a cost.

The Acting City Manager stated it would also depend on where the financing would come from, and added that they would be selling the property that would reduce the amount of the hit from either of those two sources.

Commissioner Hutchinson asked if the sale of Station #29 would not build the new station or was it to be part of the bond. Mr. McHugh explained that the value of the project would increase by \$80,000 regardless of where it was coming from. He reiterated that they were suggesting in the interim that the discussion could occur in November during the bond process.

Mayor Naugle asked if the administration building and Fire Station #2 were design build. Chief Latin stated that he thought they were design build.

Hector Castro, Engineering, stated that Fire Station #2 had been design build. He stated this would be a bid with a conventional separate design and it would be awarded to the low responsible bidder.

Mayor Naugle asked if the Airport administration building had been design build. Mr. Castro confirmed and stated that Carter Park had been a design bid. Mayor Naugle stated that it only took 2 readings of an ordinance to put the construction manager at risk in place, and asked why that was not being further explored. Mr. Castro explained that the construction manager at risk would be the best of both worlds. He added they were

presently researching the matter, and added that Broward County was doing that successfully. He explained that part of the reconstruction of the construction manager area would be part of the budget discussion and this approach would be included. He stated that today the Commission was being asked to approve the funding concept and the concept to move forward with the regional facility at the Airport, as opposed to a separate Airport fire rescue station.

Commissioner Moore stated that design build, design bid and the new concept all sounded great, but once they began implementing it, the development industry, construction industry, the engineers and the architects would begin finding ways around what it was. He stated that there had been some great design builds that had come under budget and were on time, but there had been some failures. He felt it had a lot to do with the timing of the project, the demand of the companies at the time, and the flow of money. He felt they needed "eyes" on the staff monitoring the projects. He stated his fear of the whole thing was that everyone was overworked, and they did not have enough money to operate. Therefore, no matter what game they called it; the ball would get knocked out of the field. He stated that this concept for the Airport helped get everyone there with the additional \$80,000, but he felt they needed to work to the point of having a competent staff that was not overworked in order to guide whatever methodology that was used to develop projects in the City. He stated he supported this concept because it gave them the additional monies so they could make the reach with the utilization of the Airport.

Mayor Naugle stated that he was not convinced they had the capability of managing such a project, and he did not think it was a matter of individuals being overworked.

Chief Latin stated that in regard to this project since the engineer had been overseeing the Airport project, which had come in under bid, he would also be overseeing this project with additional outside help.

Commissioner Moore reiterated that this would be the best way to go. Commissioner Hutchinson stated that she would support this.

The Acting City Manager stated there were obvious concerns regarding construction management, and at the meeting on April 7, 2004, he would be presenting a reorganization of Public Services. He explained that reorganization would call for a Department of Public Works that would have a Construction Management Division that would be adequately staffed. He added that talks had been held with the County as to what type of organizational structure they had and what methodology they used.

Commissioner Teel added that she would also support this matter, and added that one of the things that were very clear was that she did not want to see them spend \$128,000 and only do "patch work" on certain facilities. She felt this was a good place to begin.

Mr. Castro advised that Kimley-Horn were the consultants doing the design work. Cartaya were the subcontractors and were the ones who had done the administration building.

Action: None taken.

II-A -- Report of Investment Results for the Fiscal Year Ended September 30, 2003

Action: No discussion held or action taken.

II-B -- Report on Contract Extensions

Action: No discussion held or action taken.

II-C -- Parks Bond Status Report

Commissioner Moore asked about the status of Carter Park.

Hector Castro, Engineer, stated that they had hired a Construction Manager and the site had been evaluated and a construction schedule was to be submitted within the next couple of weeks.

Commissioner Moore stated that the community was bombarding him with questions regarding this park. He suggested that signs be posted at the site informing the public of the status of the project. Mr. Castro advised that separate agreements were being contracted between the existing subcontractors and the surety.

Commissioner Teel asked about the status of the Bayview School ball field.

Vince Gizzi, Parks and Recreation, stated that the contractor now had his permit and was proceeding to gather the subcontractors, and should be back on site within the next couple of weeks. He reiterated that this was a School Board project and they were monitoring the situation.

Action: None taken.

II-D -- Status Report: Housing and Assistance Programs and Production

Mayor Naugle asked if things were moving along at the Sweetings Estate. Commissioner Moore confirmed and stated he had been there for the demolition of the building.

Action: None taken.

II-E -- Contractual Compliance Report -- Large User Wastewater Agreements

Action: No discussion held or action taken.

II-F -- Evaluation and Appraisal Report (EAR) Update

Bruce Chatterton, Planning and Zoning Services Manager, stated that this was a follow-up to the February 3, 2004 Commission Conference meeting when the Commission had voted in connection with EAR issues regarding compatibility on the Barrier Island and RAC changes. He stated these were items being proposed as part of the County's EAR process.

Commissioner Moore left the meeting at approximately 2:57 p.m.

Mr. Chatterton continued stating that the Commission had voted to join the Coalition of Cities regarding these issues. He stated there had been a lot of activity since that meeting. He advised that the Planning Council and the County Commission had voted to approve and transmit the EAR, including the changes to the RAC that they had been concerned about. He further stated that the Planning Council had recommended the compatibility review for the Barrier Island to the County. He added that the League of Cities had unanimously voted to request a dialogue with the County, and wanted to look for legislative action to change the current system.

Mr. Chatterton further stated there were important "next steps" to be taken. He stated that the Coalition had brought the resolution to this point. He advised that compatibility on the Barrier Island was due to come before the County Commission once again, and the sufficiency review by the Regional Planning Council was also scheduled. He further stated that the EAR based comprehensive plan amendments would be going through an 18-24 month process. He stated these were areas in which the City and the Coalition would continue to participate. He stated the question was whether this Commission wanted to continue to participate actively in this.

Mr. Chatterton stated that in speaking for staff, they appreciated having the resources of the Coalition and the efforts of the Council.

Commissioner Hutchinson stated that the League had supported the Coalition and she felt it was important to participate, and encouraged the Commission to continue to be a part of the Coalition. Mayor Naugle stated they were thrilled to have the City's name on this and the money was probably less important.

Commissioner Trantalis stated if the State Legislature took action keeping within what the Coalition was seeking, then the continuation of the Coalition would be moot. Mr. Chatterton confirmed and stated that was a political process. Commissioner Trantalis stated that he felt it would make sense to keep things going until the end of April, and then the situation would be re-evaluated.

Commissioner Moore returned to the meeting at approximately 3:00 p.m.

David Orshefsky, Co-Counsel to the EAR Coalition, stated the next steps involved discussions with the County, the County initiated text amendment in connection with the Barrier Island that would be heard on the 23rd, and the ongoing activities controlled by the County with respect to the EAR based amendment. He stated their recommendation was to continue monitoring and participating in the EAR Coalition until they were informed as to what was taking place in Tallahassee.

Mayor Naugle asked if they had benefited by having the City's name associated with this movement. Mr. Orshefsky confirmed. It was stated that the County was considering a challenge in the event this Bill was adopted, and if passed it probably would not be effective immediately.

Commissioner Trantalis stated that they were saying to be prepared to write a check regardless of the outcome of the legislative effort.

Commissioner Moore stated he had not heard that.

Mayor Naugle pointed out that this City was also contributing towards the fight through their lobbyist in Tallahassee who was also working on the matter. He added the City was also lending their name to the issue.

Commissioner Moore stated that during this legislative session the City had their lobbyist who would address the issue, and such assistance could be offered to the Coalition. In April, he felt they needed to revisit the benefits of the possibilities.

Mr. Orshefsky stated that when they came to the Commission in February, the Coalition anticipated being successful with the County at the time of the EAR transmittal, and they anticipated the Coalition would come to an end in March, but now they wanted to talk about the next steps. He stated they were looking to the coalition cities to expand the Coalition and request that the City join as a full partner in this effort. He further stated the effort was short term at this time, and a status conference would be held. He stated they were requesting participation by the City, both in terms of substance and cost, and added they wanted to expand the number of cities involved to dilute the costs. He reiterated that they wanted to reform a continuing coalition, which could or could not become moot in April.

Commissioner Moore asked what type of expense would be involved for the City to continue with the Coalition. Mr. Orshefsky stated that if he could define a budget, he would, but part of the difficult was that one of the recommendations they were making was to be available to the League and individuals in Tallahassee in response to questions that might arise. He stated it was going to be a reactive situation, and it was difficult to say what that level of effort would be.

Commissioner Moore stated that possibly the City needed to break away from the Coalition. He stated they did not have a method of controlling the cost. He stated he could not support this.

Mayor Naugle stated the City should remain in the Coalition until April and see what happened then.

Commissioner Moore stated that he was hearing that there would be an expense involved in going to Tallahassee and dealing with the lobbyists. Mr. Orshefsky clarified they were not going to Tallahassee, but if they asked questions responses would be provided. Commissioner Moore asked if they had any idea as to the amount of cost that the Coalition would need to operate. Mr. Orshefsky stated they had been asked this question by a number of cities, and the only discreet Land Use Plan Amendment which was currently scheduled that they could tangibly touch was the one with respect to the Barrier Island flexibility. He stated it was going to transmittal at the County on March 23, 2004, and then would go through the normal process.

Commissioner Moore reiterated that his question was still not being answered. Mr. Orshefsky stated that at the low end, if they only sent paper and they did not participate in the hearings, it would be about \$5,000 spread across the entire Coalition. He reiterated that the high end was about \$20,000 with participation spread across the Coalition.

Mayor Naugle asked what the amendment regarding the Barrier Island would accomplish. Mr. Orshefsky stated if the County initiated the amendment, all use of flex would be subject to compatibility review, except if it was in an in-fill or redevelopment area. He explained that certain portions of the Barrier Island were within the exemption, and the County was proposing to remove that exemption for any use of flex on the Island. He stated it could be a good thing depending how one viewed it.

Commissioner Moore left the meeting at approximately 3:08 p.m.

Mr. Chatterton stated there had been an instance in Hollywood where the community was in favor of a project, but because the compatibility review applied, the County Commission felt it was not compatible and the project did not proceed. He stated the project was not on the Barrier Island, but it was a similar situation where the County had compatibility review which differed from the jurisdiction. He reiterated that the City had a very detailed compatibility review. Mayor Naugle stated that it did not work and gave the Harbor Beach Condominiums as an example. He stated further that he agreed with the Coalition until they got to the Barrier Island, and then he felt it went cross-purpose to what they were attempting to accomplish. Mr. Orshefsky stated there had been a number of instances where a local decision made after compatibility review achieved a finding of compatibility at a local level. He stated there was a potential at the County level for an inconsistent finding of compatibility so they ended up with a "yes" at the local level based on compatibility standards applied by this Board, but then again reviewed under different standards leading to a potential inconsistent result at the County level. Mayor Naugle asked what would happen if there was a "no" at the local level, but a "yes" at the County level. Mr. Orshefsky explained that if there were a "no" from the local level, it would not proceed to the County level.

Commissioner Trantalis stated why should they give the County veto power over their decision that is what this was attempting to do, and he did not think that was appropriate. Commissioner Hutchinson stated that would be one "toe in the door," and then they could veto everything. He stated he was not sure the County was the entity in the best position to make such decisions for the local entity.

Mr. Orshefsky stated that another thing which had been brought up was how the proposed language was presently drafted for inclusion in the County's Comprehensive Plan. He explained that any single flex unit would trigger the review, and one of the items raised during discussions was that perhaps County staff should come up with some sort of De minimis criteria whereby one or two units would not have to go through this ordeal. He stated that the discussion at the Planning Council was that there would be workshops held on that and other issues, as well as creating such language. He felt it did not make sense as a procedural matter for every flex unit to be reviewed by both levels of government. He explained that the rationale in the areas of the Barrier Island was designated for revitalization. He explained it was just sections of the Barrier Island that were part of the redevelopment effort, and in order to make the redevelopment efforts work, the idea was to come up with a flexible and more manageable process so every development decision would not have to go through the hoop twice.

It was stated the Broward County Planning Council had fought hard for the workshops in an effort to ensure that the cities had a voice in the plan amendment process.

Commissioner Moore returned to the meeting at approximately 3:11 p.m.

Mr. Orshefsky further stated that such opportunities were being made by non-coastal cities in some instances, and they were attempting to arrive at a consensus in dealing with the County.

Commissioner Moore reiterated that he was always open to communication, but the County had already stated their position. He felt the only point they had at this time was the legislature. He believed they should have a coalition effort to try and persuade the situation.

Mayor Naugle asked if the Bill did not pass, then who would settle this issue and asked if it would be the DCA. Commissioner Moore confirmed. Mayor Naugle reiterated that they should continue in the Coalition until April and then revisit the matter. Commissioner Moore reiterated that their concentration should be on the legislature.

Mr. Orshefsky stated that they were looking for direction from the Commission as to whether the City wanted to continue to actively participate in the Coalition. He continued stating that he was hearing they should return in late April and give a status report to the Commission regarding the legislature.

Commissioner Hutchinson asked if the contribution the City made, along with its resolution, take them through to the end of April as a participant in the Coalition. Mr. Orshefsky stated that they would take this before the balance of the Coalition members. He reiterated that they were looking for a broader support from the City than that.

The Commission was asked if they wanted to participate in the Coastal Plan Amendment. Commissioner Hutchinson stated that in regard to the Barrier Island, she felt they should participate.

Commissioner Moore stated that he felt the Coalition efforts were only to continue saying the County was wrong, and added that David and Susan had done an excellent job of keeping everyone informed.

Commissioner Trantalis stated that he was concerned about the County's population figures, and he felt it was almost a given that they anticipated such population growth. He added that he did not accept those figures. He stated he did not know if they had ever been on record as being committed to a program or process to stop the population growth at the Beach.

Mayor Naugle stated that the whole initiative clearly did not include the Barrier Island.

Commissioner Teel stated that one of her biggest concerns was that if they were not part of the Coalition, it looked bad and she felt it was important to have their name on it. She felt it still kept sending their message across. She stated that after seeing how the process moved, she had no faith that the County would do what they should do in regard to the Barrier Island. She felt if they could take the industrial land within their own land use plan that was appropriate to be by the Executive Airport, and suddenly construct 150 units of housing, it was not sound thinking. She stated if those were the same individuals who were going to overlook the Barrier Island, she was totally lost in the process.

Commissioner Moore stated that he understood everyone's sentiments regarding the Barrier Island, but it was a policy that the Commission should be making and not the County. He stressed that he believed in home rule all of the time.

Mayor Naugle stated that he felt it would be good to have an extra layer of protection.

Commissioner Teel stated that in regard to the housing units placed by the Airport, she felt that was the most unbelievable example of poor government she had ever seen.

Mr. Chatterton stated that for the short term, staff needed some direction.

Commissioner Moore stated that a coalition was to show strength, and they had pulled together with the Coalition and showed strength but they had said "good-bye." He felt if they dealt with them on the State level, they would get their attention better. He stated if the Coalition was revolving around the State issue, then it might be reasonable to consider. He reiterated they were proposing that they continue to deal with the County, and he found that inappropriate. He stated that the Coalition had done a good job of educating everyone and had attempted to stop "the train," but it didn't work. He felt that as a leading City in the State of Florida fighting this issue and urging support from the State legislature would be the best position they could take.

Commissioner Hutchinson stated that as a Coalition, they should fight together and focus on the State.

Commissioner Moore asked if David and Susan had any objection to proposing to the Coalition what was being proposed today by the Commission. It was stated that they understood the effort and they were volunteering their services to the effort, and they wanted the City to be covered in the event such effort did not deliver as quickly or completely as hoped. Commissioner Moore stated that the Coalition should continue to use the City's name regarding local issues, but they were not going to fund any effort unless it was on a state-wide initiative.

Mr. Orshefsky stated that the Tallahassee effort was currently priority #1, and one of the major players in moving that forward was the Broward League of Cities.

Commissioner Moore reiterated that Senator Geller had made it very clear that this was to be his major legislative item.

Action: City to remain in the Coalition and the item would be re-visited in April.

II-G – Financial and Overtime Monitoring Reports – February 2004

No discussion held.

Action: None taken.

III-B – Advisory Board and Committee Vacancies

Budget Advisory Board

Commissioner Moore appointed Mark Dozier to the Budget Advisory Board.

Action: Formal action to be taken at the Regular Meeting.

Cemeteries Board of Trustees

Commissioner Teel appointed John Baller to the Cemeteries Board of Trustees.

Action: Formal action to be taken at the Regular Meeting.

Community Appearance Board

Action: Deferred

Community Services Board

Action: Deferred

Economic Development Advisory Board

Action: Deferred

Education Advisory Board

Action: Deferred

Historic Preservation Board

Action: Deferred

Insurance Advisory Board

Action: Deferred

Northwest-Progresso-Flagler Heights Redevelopment Advisory Board

Action: Deferred

Nuisance Abatement Advisory Board

Action: Deferred

Unsafe Structures and Housing Appeals Board

Action: Deferred

Utility Advisory Committee

Action: Deferred

IV – Commission Reports

Reconsideration of Impact Fees

Commissioner Hutchinson stated that tonight she was going to bring forward the reconsideration of the impact fees. She added that it had nothing to do with home rule.

Parking/Las Olas

Commissioner Hutchinson stated that she had met with the group from Las Olas in regard to parking. She stated that these individuals needed some relief. She added that if she knew then what she knew now, she might not have approved the rate increase without certain things in place.

Mayor Naugle reiterated that he had not supported the rate hike because the business community had not provided any input regarding the issue.

Commissioner Hutchinson stated that she wanted to go through some of the suggestions made by the business community. She added that quite a few individuals had attended the meeting. She stated that one of the things they wanted was parking on the Boulevard 7 days a week. Other items raised by the group were machines that could take credit cards, and if the promoter during the art show was paying for the loss of revenue.

Doug Gottshall, Parking Division, stated that to his knowledge they were not being paid.

Commissioner Hutchinson asked why the City was not being paid, especially since they could not use the boulevard, along with some of the lots. She stated that some enforcement was not customer friendly. She further stated that she had been informed that Lauderdale-By-The-Sea had a new parking privatization in regard to meters and collection. She stated that she would obtain such information and distribute it to the Commission and the Parking Department for their review. She further stated that the enforcement hours should be put back to 9 o'clock. She also stated that at the Venezia one could only park for one hour at this time. She stated that the towing signs were still posted and concerned the area. She stated that most of the discussion centered on residents using the businesses and the hassle of the parking situation.

Commissioner Hutchinson continued stating that the group wanted to revisit the possibility of on-street parking at SE 1st Avenue and SE 8th Avenue that currently did not exist. Originally, she stated there had been parking on SE 1st Avenue, but when the condominiums had been built, it ceased to exist. She reiterated there was some discussion to revisit the issue for at least one side of the street.

Commissioner Hutchinson added that both Beverly Heights and Colee Hammock wanted to look at the possibility of residential parking permits. She suggested that they proceed one step at a time and start with evening permits, and then move forward.

Mayor Naugle suggested they meet with the City Manager and bring forth some recommendations.

Commissioner Trantalis stated that this was an excellent approach in an attempt to dilute the hard and fast rules. He stated when they had voted on the issue, he also had not realized the impacts on the area.

Mayor Naugle stated that a public meeting should be held in order to get the residents input.

Action: Recommendation to be brought to the Commission.

Code Amnesty Program

Commissioner Trantalis stated that the Code Amnesty Program had exceeded their goal, and asked if what was collected and what had been needed was indeed a surplus. He asked Lori Milano for a number as to what they had anticipated collecting for the entire year. He further stated that it was unfortunate that in the budget cutting process they had decimated certain departments that had paralyzed many programs, especially some of the neighborhood improvement programs. Mayor Naugle reiterated that some of the engineers had been transferred to WaterWorks.

Commissioner Trantalis asked if they would reconsider for the balance of the fiscal year using some of these funds for the NCIP that had been in place and were scheduled to happen.

Mayor Naugle stated that it was his recollection that they had decided to continue with the slate of projects that had been in the works. Commissioner Trantalis stressed that it was staff that was needed in order to get the programs implemented. He reiterated that staff had informed him that they had not received the "go-ahead" for using engineer time and other support service time to move these projects forward. He emphasized it had nothing to do with the actual cost of the project, but the implementation. He stated that neighborhoods were beginning to complain.

Cecelia Hollar, Acting Public Services Director, stated that she was not aware of staff giving out such response, but she had heard that additional things were being requested as far as traffic planning which staff was not able to do at this time. She stated they were working on the NCIP projects that the Commission had directed staff to proceed with, and added that it may take longer since they did not have all resources available. She added that in sharing some of the engineering staff which had been sent to WaterWorks 2011 had commitments, so they were attempting to manage the time. She reiterated that it did create a delay.

Commissioner Trantalis stated that he had met with Hector Castro and Peter Partington, and they had contradicted what was presently being stated. Ms. Hollar reiterated that she felt Commissioner Trantalis was hearing that there were some transportation projects that they wanted staff to proceed with, but that had not yet been done. She reiterated further that they could not do all the projects at once, and they would have to be put in some sort of order. She stated they were all saying the same thing and that was that the resources were not available. Commissioner Trantalis agreed. He further stated that some of the projects involved Dolphin Isles and 13th Street.

Hector Castro, engineering, stated that they were down to one person in their traffic/engineering area. He added they were having trouble focusing on the large long-

term projects such as Seabreeze, A1A 3+2, and 13th Street, and added they were getting a lot of traffic issues from the communities, including parking. He stated that he had told staff to focus on the larger projects, but they would be unable to support in a timely manner the requests from the communities. Ms. Hollar reiterated that it was the other traffic issues that kept arising that staff could not respond to timely. Mr. Castro stated they had committed to doing two of the assessment projects.

Peter Partington, Engineering, stated that Dolphin Isles was an assessment project which was different from NCIP. He further stated that the assessment group had lost 50% of their people, and they were struggling with the administrative work.

Commissioner Trantalis stated that another project involved was 7 Isles who had a block party several weeks ago and had reiterated their frustrations. Mr. Partington stated there were no staff members available to work on that project at this time.

Ms. Hollar reiterated they were attempting to go through the list of projects and put them in order. She further stated they were attempting to create a concept of a transit manager with a transportation planner, along with someone doing pedestrian planning, and fold those into one role with possibly an assistant. She stated they were working on those matters in regard to the upcoming budget.

Commissioner Trantalis asked how they could pick up where they had left off. Mayor Naugle stated if he believed there was a surplus, he felt it would actually be an increased deficit. He stated they had now received more funds than anticipated which meant they would receive less fund in the future.

Commissioner Trantalis stated that was a subject that could be debated forever because it was an uncertainty. At this point, he had hoped they could use a fraction of the unanticipated cash flow to try and continue the programs to the end of the fiscal year.

Commissioner Teel stated that she had attempted to make it clear to the residents of District I that there would be delays, and everyone had been warned there would be impacts due to the budget constraints. She stated that she was receiving letters from residents saying not to spend the extra monies on anything but the PSAs for next year.

Mr. Partington further stated that Dolphin Isles was controversial, but 95% of the design work was done. He added that the next stage would be the public hearing, and that was where they were struggling at this time. He stated the administrator of that program had been transferred to WaterWorks 2011.

Ms. Hollar further stated that in engineering they were attempting to list all projects and bring the matter back with a recommendation to the Commission, along with timelines and schedules. She added that if additional resources could be added, and then the timelines could be decreased.

Commissioner Moore stated that he wanted the Chief of Police to understand that he had received messages from a number of constituents that he represented stating that officers were informing the residents that the length of time it took to service the areas was due to the hiring of the PSAs. He stated that he had told the constituents to get such officers' names, badge and vehicle numbers because they were misrepresenting the facts. He did not think that any person who served the public should state they were

not doing their work appropriately due to action taken by the local government to stabilize itself.

Mayor Naugle stated that most of the police officers were doing their jobs appropriately, but there were a few who were not. He added that the performance of the Union President during the budget hearings had been inappropriate. He stated that he had absolutely lied to the public.

Commissioner Moore stated they had selected a Chief who could operate the department, and if he had a work force that insulted the taxpayers, then they would then work in some other work force.

Bruce Roberts, Chief of Police, stated that he agreed it was a misstatement and he would get the word out and reiterated that PSAs had not been lost. He felt there was also some misunderstanding because they were currently training about half of the PSAs who were newly assigned due to the bumping process, and were not yet on the road.

Commissioner Teel remarked that it was important to get such information back to the Chief of Police. She stated she also had experienced such misinformation in her district.

Mayor Naugle stated that he believed that 90% of the officers were doing their job correctly. Chief Roberts stated that he would deal with this issue on a case-by-case basis.

Jackson Tower Complaint

Mayor Naugle stated that there had been a complaint from Jackson Tower regarding the late night activities at Beach Bums and Beach Place. He stated that if things did not improve, they had the ability to rescind the 4:00 a.m. license from the liquor merchants. He reiterated that if the Chief of Police felt that things could not be controlled, and then a recommendation should be brought forth to the Commission regarding a rescinding of such licenses.

Commissioner Trantalis stated it was terrible they had decided to confuse their districts. He continued stating that the ULI Report had suggested they divide the Beach into 5 districts, and one should be an entertainment district. He stated that area would be around Las Olas and A1A, but yet they continue to issue building permits for residential dwellings right in the middle of the entertainment district. Therefore, they were always going to have a battle back and forth. He felt there should be a better way to resolve this issue than by cutting off a merchant's license. He reiterated that it was not fair to either party involved.

Mayor Naugle stated that they could turn down the volume of the music and the activities described in the letter should be curtailed. He stated further that he realized there would not be a park-like setting, but they needed to strike a balance.

Commissioner Hutchinson stated that she had just been to the Beach and there were loads of people on spring break at this time, but she felt the largest concentration was in front of the Merrimac. She felt a lot of the issues that she had recently received complaints on were now during spring break. She agreed that some of the behavior was

inappropriate and some of the club owners condoned it. She further stated that the music was also too loud. She felt if the police continued to be present in the area, then there were other ways to handle the issue.

Commissioner Teel stated that it appeared to also be a battle between the amplifiers on A1A, especially at Beach Bums.

City Clerk Contract

The City Attorney stated that last week he had sent the Commission a Friday memo in regard to the contract for the newly selected City Clerk. He asked that this matter be discussed briefly today and then have a walk-on for approval at the Regular Meeting. He pointed out that the contract was a mirror image of the one used with Lucy Kisela. He added that it left the contract without a term because it had been a continuing contract. He stated that the contract provided for a probationary period of 6 months with 3 months severance during the first probationary period, and after the probationary period a 6-month severance pay would be provided. He added that there was no end to the contract. He also stated that the contract did not provide any requirement that the individual had to live within the City. He stated the pay would be at a management 034 level, schedule N.

Commissioner Hutchinson stated they had talked with the newly selected clerk about living in the City, and that eventually it had been required of Lucy Kisela. The City Attorney stated that Lucy's contract had been done in 1996 which was a continuing contract, and had provided for a \$4,000 one-time payment for her move into the City.

Commissioner Hutchinson asked if it had been required of other management employees, other than the individuals appointed by the Commission. The City Attorney stated that department heads had to live within the City boundaries. Commissioner Moore asked why this position should be any different. Mayor Naugle stated he thought there had been department heads who had not lived within the City. The City Attorney stated there had been department heads who had been promoted but had not lived within the City at that time, but then were required to move.

Bud Bentley, Assistant City Manager, stated that if a department head was hired from outside the City, they had 6 months to move, but if an employee had been promoted, they did not have to move into the City.

Commissioner Moore reiterated that if individuals were governing the City, then they should live within the City limits. Commissioner Hutchinson remarked that the policy needed to be consistent. The City Attorney suggested that the City Clerk's contract be amended since there was a 6-month probationary period, and they could then give that person an additional 6 months to move within the City.

Commissioner Trantalis added that he felt the severance was a "little rich." Commissioner Moore agreed. The Acting City Manager stated that he disagreed with any type of severance that was that long. Commissioner Trantalis suggested that 3 months would be sufficient.

Commissioner Moore stated that if this position did not work out, he wanted the individual to have sufficient time to find gainful employment. He felt that was the reason

for severance. He reiterated that individuals could not be attracted, if assurances were not provided to them. He felt that 3 months would be sufficient.

Commissioner Hutchinson stated that the previous City Clerk's contract had not contained a probationary period, and it had been her suggestion that one be included.

Mayor Naugle stated that one of the reasons the previous City Clerk had the severance included was because she had been an employee who had Civil Service protection, which had been given up when accepting the City Clerk position.

Action: City Clerk contract to be amended giving 12 months for that individual to move within the City limits, and that 3 months severance be included.

V – City Manager Reports

None given.

There being no further business to come before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 4:25 p.m.