

**CITY OF ANNA MARIA  
REGULAR CITY COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES  
MEETING HELD AT ANNA MARIA COMMISSION CHAMBERS  
10005 GULF DRIVE – ANNA MARIA, FL  
THURSDAY, APRIL 24, 2008  
7:00 P.M.**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Commission Chair Quam called the Meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

**PLEDGE OF CONDUCT**

**PLEDGE TO THE FLAG**

**ROLL CALL:** Mayor Fran Barford, Commissioner Jo Ann Mattick, Commissioner Dale Woodland, Chair John Quam, Deputy Chair Christine Tollette, and Commissioner Duke Miller.

**Staff present:** City Clerk Alice Baird, Deputy City Clerk/Finance Director Diane Percycoe, Public Works Director George McKay, City Attorney Jim Dye, City Engineer Tom Wilcox, and Building Official Bob Welch.

**Press present:** Sun and Islander.

**1. CONSENT AGENDA**

- a. **Minutes – City Commission Meeting – March 27, 2008**
- b. **Special Event: Island Run – May 4, 2008 – 6:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.**
- c. **Proclamation: National Arbor Day – April 25, 2008**
- d. **Proclamation: Therapy Dogs – May 10, 2008**
- e. **Appoint Susan Brownell to the Environmental Enhancement and Education Committee for Term Expiring: January 2011**
- f. **Line Item Transfer for Bayview Place Drainage Project - \$21,500**

*Commissioner Woodland* asked that Item f. be removed from the consent agenda and considered separately.

**MOTION:** Consent Agenda items a. through e. were approved on motion made by Commissioner Woodland and seconded by Commissioner Mattick.  
Motion carried – All Aye.

- f. **Line Item Transfer for Bayview Place Drainage Project - \$21,500**  
*Public Works Director McKay* provided clarification relating to this line item transfer.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Woodland moved to approve Consent Agenda item f. Commissioner Tollette seconded the motion.  
Motion carried – All Aye.

**2. REPORTS AND UPDATES.****a. Commissioners****Commissioner Woodland – Relating to Item 2.d.**

*Public Works Director McKay* responded to *Commissioner Woodland's* question relating to an item on the Public Works Department written report relating to Lake LaVista starting in early May. Commissioner Woodland felt that the channel was already in good condition.

**Commissioner Woodland – Relating to Item 2.f.**

*Commissioner Woodland* questioned the City Pier report submitted by the Code Enforcement Officer relating to "We left Mario and David both know that if this continues the city will take over the area and see that it is maintained properly and the cost would be payable as additional rent." He asked what Mario and David's response was and what effect it would have on the lease.

*Commissioner Tollette* informed that Mario was not at the meeting and had agreed to send a letter, along with photographs that were taken of the dumpster/garbage problem that needed to be addressed. She said the actual discussion was not that there would be additional rent, rather that the City would bill them for any time the City would have to clean it up.

Commissioner Woodland voiced concern that if the City did have to collect any funds that it be in accordance with the lease agreement.

*Mayor Barford* responded that the City did not anticipate taking over any of the responsibility for the dumpster, however, if it's found to be a bad situation the City would call Waste Management to make a special pickup and it would be billed to the Pier. Several options, such as five-day pickups during the heavy season, are being looked at with the Pier Lessor to make it a better situation.

- b. Sheriff's Report (Written)**
- c. Building Department Report (Written)**
- d. Public Works Department Report (Written) – See Comments - 2.a**
- e. Code Enforcement Report (Written)**
- f. City Pier Report (Written) – See Comments - 2.a**
- g. Ordinance Update (Written)**
- h. Resolution Update (Written)**
- i. Financial Report (Written)**
- j. Line of Credit Report (Written)**
- k. Mayor's Report**  
**Change on April 24 Meeting Agenda**

*Mayor Barford* asked that agenda item # 5 be switched with # 3.

**Beach Renourishment Update**

*Mayor Barford* reported that Manatee County is leaving Anna Maria out of the Beach Renourishment program and she felt it important the City restate its case for the need of Beach Renourishment. The County's reasons are that Anna Maria does not generate enough tax dollars and that there are inadequate parking requirements.

A joint meeting will be held with the Manatee County Commission on Friday, May 30, 2008 at 11:30 a.m. Lunch will be provided on the beach. The Community Center will be providing a bus to transport the attendees to the areas of the beach that are badly in need of renourishment. Mayor Barford asked that each Commissioner plan to attend. The meeting should last no later than 2:15 p.m.

Mayor Barford reported that earlier that day State representatives had reviewed the City's parking requirements on the Beach with Public Works Director McKay. The State has indicated the City has met the parking requirements.

**Stormwater Project – Phase I Update**

*Mayor Barford* informed Phase I of the Stormwater Project had been postponed. The City is working with SWFMUD to obtain the permit that will come later than anticipated. Due to the delay it would cause the project to start during the rainy season. Therefore the contract will be renegotiated with Atkins Construction. If they are agreeable, the contract will be brought back to the Commission for their approval. The project will be postponed until a mutually agreed time.

**Agenda Format Change**

*Mayor Barford* stated that the Agenda format would be changed for cost-effective purposes. She had met with Chair Quam and City Clerk Baird and it was agreed that the Consent Agenda and Reports (except for Commission and Mayor's reports) sections of the Agenda would be moved to the end of the meeting to allow for scheduling the City's Consultant items to be placed at the beginning of the meeting.

**Fiske Lawsuit**

*City Attorney Dye* informed that the Fiskes', who own property at the end of S. Bay Blvd., had served the City with a lawsuit earlier that week. The lawsuit alleges the City is harassing the owners over the non-residential use of the property – marina type operations, fishing, etc.

According to City Attorney Dye, he will be responding to the lawsuit and a Shade meeting will not be required at this point.

**3. Adopt Stormwater Utility Rate per ESU.**

*City Attorney Dye* informed that the legal format in regard to the Stormwater is that the City cannot adopt a final formal ESU until after the Property Appraiser releases the proposed roll on July 1. Any rate adopted by the Commission that

evening would serve as a working number only and could not be made final until after July 1. Upon formal adoption, the amount will be submitted to the Property Appraiser and Tax Collector for billing in the fall. He informed that City Engineer Wilcox would be proposing a rate to be set based on the budget.

*City Engineer Wilcox* addressed the Commission pointing out there are 1,749.12 ESU's in the City. It was hoped that Phase I would be completed by the time the assessments were mailed by the County, however, Phase I would now be delayed until the dry season with an approximate completion date of April to June 2009. He explained that due to the delay any assessment set would be collected during 2009. He said the Commission might want to consider a one-half year assessment to begin with. Explanation relating to the detailed costs followed by Engineer Wilcox.

Engineer Wilcox informed that for cost purposes a different type of ground cover that would only require mowing a couple of times per year will be looked at for the next Phases of the project.

*Commissioner Woodland* said he would be more comfortable with being consistent and not initially assessing for only one-half of the year. He said he would agree to an initial annual assessment of \$40 to \$50.

*Commissioner Tollette* asked if there would be any type explanation sent with the initial assessment explaining what it is for.

City Attorney Dye explained that it would show as a separate line item on the tax bill. The Public Hearing would serve as the official notification of the assessment. A mass mailing is required informing of the rate and ESU prior to the Public Hearing.

*Commissioner Mattick* said she was originally opposed to a \$40 to \$50 annual assessment but now agrees to that amount in order to allow for building up the City's reserves for maintaining the infrastructure.

*Commissioner Miller* agreed and suggested setting the assessment at \$45.

*Chair Quam* felt the initial assessment should be \$30 since the eventual maximum assessment will be around \$50. Discussion followed.

**ACTION:** After discussion, it was the consensus of the Commission that the initial working annual assessment would be set at \$45. The next formal action and Public Hearing will be held after the roll is released. City Clerk Baird will make sure that all deadlines will be met.

#### **Public Comment**

*Jim Conoly*, N. Shore Dr., asked what specific categories the assessment dollars would be used for.

*Mayor Barford* responded that pursuant to Statute it would be used strictly for the maintenance of any of the City's stormwater infrastructure.

*Commissioner Miller* asked if a trigger mechanism should be established to indicate when future Commission's would be required to lower the assessment. He asked that the Commission consider the idea.

*City Attorney Dye* advised that language could be included in the Ordinance.

**Tom Turner**, N. Shore Dr., asked if any funds would be set aside for dredging of the canals.

**4. Adopt Proposed City Schedule of Fees – Resolution No. R08-635.**

*City Clerk Baird* read the Resolution by title.

*Building Official Welch* presented the proposed City Schedules of Fees and the changes suggested by FEMA to Exhibit A – Fee Schedule for Commercial Buildings.

Building Official Welch suggested that the City postpone implementing the fees for approximately one month since the Contractors have already estimated their costs for any new upcoming jobs.

In response to *Commissioner Mattick's* question about the difference in the Residential versus Commercial fees and the fees charged in the RO, Building Official Welch stated the commercial fees include a surcharge and the commercial fee schedule would be utilized for the ROR District. Commissioner Mattick suggested that Commercial/ROR be used on the Fee Schedule.

Discussion followed relating to the Special Event Fee Applications listed at \$10 and Special Events with alcohol listed at \$500.

Building Official Welch informed the \$10 Special Event Fee Applications was incorrect and should be \$100.

*Commissioner Tollette* asked if any exceptions would be made for non-profit organizations for the Special Events Banners (\$50) and Special Events.

Building Official Welch said the Commission might want to consider allowing him to waive certain fees or reserve the right for the Commission to do so.

*City Attorney Dye* made reference to Exhibit "A" – Code Enforcement Fees/Fines. He said they are actually not fees but rather are fines. However, in order to fine someone a due process step is required to allow the person to present his or her side of the issue. The entire Code Enforcement process would first be required prior to the City assessing any type fines. He recommended not adopting that page.

Mayor Barford said the fees/fines relates to abandoned property and it was her understanding City Attorney Dye had previously indicated the fees/fines could be charged. She reminded that a separate issue relating to repeat offenders' leaving their trash out longer than allowed is being processed through the Code Enforcement process.

City Attorney Dye said there was also a process required relating to abandoned property. He presented two options – 1) Remove Exhibit “A” (Code Enforcement Fees/Fines) from the Resolution that evening and if he finds it to be allowed it can be placed back into the Resolution for official adoption at the May meeting, or 2) Adopt the Resolution that evening and if found to not be the proper step it can be pulled out at that point.

Mayor Barford recommended the first option presented by City Attorney Dye.

In answer to Commissioner Tollette's question, City Attorney Dye informed that the Beach is a tough area to Police due to a line between the public and private property – above high waterline is private property whereas below is public property - and property can be treated as if left behind. He said though it can be done, there is more of a process to follow in order for the City to go on private property. This also includes Turtle Season.

**ACTION: It was agreed that the effective date of the Resolution would be set as June 2, 2008.**

#### **Public Comment**

**Robin Wall** felt the proposed Fences/Walls/Barriers as listed on the Residential Buildings Fee Schedule was a little excessive. She did not agree in adding the \$1.00 per lineal foot on top of the \$75.00 application fee.

*Building Official Welch* responded stating all fees would be re-evaluated in six months and then again in one year.

*Commissioner Mattick* asked about the Residential Miscellaneous Administrative Charges relating to the 30-Day Temporary C.O. (1 & 2 family) @ \$250 per unit versus a regular C.O. at only \$40 per unit.

Building Official Welch informed the fee amount was not to discourage anyone from obtaining a Temporary C.O. it is that additional work is involved with a 30-Day Temporary C.O.

Commissioner Mattick said she agreed with Robin Wall as far as the \$1.00 per lineal foot for Residential fences. She felt it would be more reasonable to go back to the \$0.10 per lineal foot.

*Mayor Barford* clarified that the fee increases were not for increasing revenue for the City; it was to cover the City's costs.

*Commissioner's Tollette and Miller* was both in agreement of the \$1.00 per lineal foot.

**ACTION:** It was the consensus of the Commission to leave the Residential fee schedule – Item # 8 – Fences/Walls/Barriers at the \$1.00 Per lineal ft, as presented.

**Randall Stover**, N. Shore Dr., asked how many pages the City's current fee schedule is and felt that the proposed fees were "absolutely exorbitant."

Building Official Welch responded stating that the new fees would cover the administrative costs along with the Inspector's cost in the field and all hidden costs including the actual costs in the department.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Miller moved to adopt Resolution 08-635 with an effective date of June 2, 2008 with amendments as discussed in the attached exhibits and deleting Exhibit A relating to Code Enforcement. Commissioner Woodland seconded the motion.  
Motion carried on unanimous Roll Call Vote of the Commission.

5. **First Reading – Ordinance No. 08-687 – Defining the Term 'Lot/Structure' In Policy 1.3.5 of the Comp Plan.**

*City Clerk Baird* read the Ordinance by title.

*Chair Quam* informed that this Ordinance is scheduled for Second Reading at the next Regular Commission Meeting; however, City Attorney Dye would not be able to attend the May 22, 2008 meeting. He suggested that the next Regular Meeting be rescheduled for Thursday, May 29, 2008. The Planning & Zoning Board will hold a Public Hearing and review the Ordinance at their May 6, 2008 meeting.

**ACTION:** It was agreed that the next Regular Commission meeting be changed from Thursday May 22, 2008 to Thursday, May 29, 2008.

*City Attorney Dye* explained the changes made in the revised Ordinance presented to the Commission that evening. The main changes include creating a system of regulations allowing for the zero lot line structures in the ROR District (Section 3 of Ordinance 08-687). He stated that each structure, even though adjoining, could have a separate residential unit upstairs with no limitation on the number of businesses below except as stated for the ROR configuration limitations. Explanation followed.

*Commissioner Woodland* asked if Section Two, (3) a. "Such unit is occupied by the owner or tenant of the associated retail, service or office use," should still be left in the proposed Ordinance.

*City Attorney Dye* will research Commissioner Woodland's question.

### **Public Comment**

**Tom Turner**, N. Shore Dr., said with allowing more than two businesses on the main level and two buildings to be attached it would appear to be similar to a condo situation. He voiced concern there would need to be some sort of agreement between the two owners and there may be confusion on who would own the businesses below the residences. He did not feel the proposed Ordinance was clear in that respect and asked if the true owner would be required to live at the location.

*City Attorney Dye* said he would check the Code to verify if the true owner was required to live at the location and operate the business below. As far as having agreements between the owners, he felt it would be an owner type decision that the City would not be getting involved with. Serving as a Condo type situation would require review of the Division of Condominium in Tallahassee in which the City would not be part of. He further stated that the City had not looked at private agreements as part of the land-use process, nor was there a roll in the City to do so.

**Rick DeFrank** stated that parking and not square footage dictates the number of businesses that can be operated in one structure. He felt the City should address the Parking Ordinance in relation to businesses.

**Randall Stover**, N. Shore Dr., made reference to Section Two (2) "Office uses and coin-operated or owner/attendant-operated retail and service uses,..." He used the example of two residential units above with two separate owners and businesses below being leasing from the developer or owner. He stated there had been discussion about how the land would be taxed and said there could be several different owners, which could become a very difficult issue.

**Michael Coleman**, Pine Ave., stated that at the joint City Commission/P&Z Board meeting two drawings and ideas were reviewed. He felt the Ordinance drafted by the City Attorney addressed both of the issues that had been presented.

He said he was unsure that a 27-foot height limit on Pine Ave. was the appropriate height.

He said he was anxious to hear whether or not the language involving whether or not the owner must live above and own the business below was stricken or under review.

**Anna Maria Resident** pointed out that duplexes had never been permitted in ROR. She asked if "structures" was being redefined in the Comp Plan.

6. **Second Reading and Public Hearing – Ordinance No. 08-685 - Establishing a Definition of Community Center and Amending Zoning District Regulations for Community Centers.**  
*City Clerk Baird* read the Ordinance by title.

*Chair Quam* officially declared the Public Hearing open.

**Attorney Scott Rudacille** addressed the Commission on behalf of the Community Center and in support of the Ordinance as proposed.

*Hearing no further public comment, Chair Quam* officially closed the Public portion of the Hearing.

**MOTION: Commissioner Tollette moved to adopt Ordinance 08-685. Commissioner Miller seconded the motion.**  
**Motion carried on unanimous Roll Call Vote of the Commission.**

7. **Request from Charter Review Committee for Commission to Provide Feedback on the Following:**

- **Is the Commission in favor of a requirement for a super majority vote on future amendments to the Comprehensive Plan?**
- **Do you wish for this to be a part of the City Charter?**
- **If the Commission is in favor of such a requirement, should it pertain to the Comp Plan in its entirety or to a specific or limited element of the Comp Plan?**

*Commissioner Miller* made reference to an e-mail received from Tom Aposporos, Charter Review Committee.

Commissioner Miller suggested to place the following on the November 2008 ballot and authorize the City Attorney Dye to draft the appropriate Ordinance: Whether or not that the Charter of the City should be changed that requires a Super Majority vote for any changes to the Future Land Use Element portion of the Comprehensive Plan.

*Commissioner Woodland* said he supports the Super Majority in order to protect the Land Use Element from being changed. Explanation followed.

Commissioner Woodland said he was unsure why the Commission would not want to allow the citizens to make the decision.

*Commissioner Mattick* felt there was a misunderstanding of what can and cannot be done as a City as far as the Comp Plan is concerned. She quoted the State Statute relating to the not allowing the increase of density.

Commissioner Mattick felt the Commission was elected to make the decisions for the City and she said she was not in favor of a Super Majority or for putting it on the ballot.

*Commissioner Tollette* agreed with Commissioner Mattick and asked if there was a cost to place an item on the ballot.

*City Attorney Dye* said if an item is on the General Ballot there is no cost – only if at a Special Election.

*Chair Quam* made reference to the Ordinance adopted by the City of Sarasota calling a referendum of the qualified electors. He said he would be in agreement to place the question on the ballot.

Commissioner Woodland said the Florida Legislature is being pressured by developers around the State to relax the standard relating to not allowing the increase of density. He did not want the City to be dependent on the State Government to protect us.

Commissioner Woodland felt the City should be proactive relating to this issue in order to provide an additional protection for the City.

In answer to *Chair Quam's* question, City Attorney Dye confirmed that “changing the Future Land Use classification of the property” would be changing it from Residential to Commercial or Commercial to Residential, etc.

### **Public Comment**

***Robin Wall*** said she was in favor of the Super Majority and having the question placed on the November ballot. She felt the Commission should determine whether they want the amendment to include the full Future Land Use Element or just the Future Land Use Map, the number of allowable floors in any land use category, or an amendment that would increase the amount of maximum allowable dwelling unit density.

Ms. Wall made reference to the Florida Administrative Code and the recent Statute adopted relating to the density and hurricane evacuation issue.

***Randall Stover***, N. Shore Dr., felt the work involved in adopting the Comprehensive Plan was very well worked out. He stated that the Future Land Use Map was only an outline of what is said in the Land Use Element and if one has changed the other changes.

Mr. Stover felt the citizens of Anna Maria should have a vote for any changes made to the Comp Plan and did not feel that five people (City Commission) should not be the deciding on any changes.

***Resident***, Gulf Dr., said he had lived in Anna Maria and hoped that the ambience would be the same when he retired.

**Michael Coleman**, Pine Ave., felt someone might approach the City in the future asking for more restrictions. He said he was concerned about future good requests that may happen and was not thought about when originally developing the Comprehensive Plan.

**Tom Turner**, N. Shore Dr., believed a Super Majority should be required for the changes to the Future Land Use Element and should be placed in the City's Charter.

**Margaret Jenkins**, Chilson Ave., thanked the Commission for all the work put in on the Comp Plan. She said she was in agreement with requiring a Super Majority and felt it should be part of the Comp Plan. She also agreed the question should be placed on the ballot.

**Peter, Anna Maria**, felt requiring a Super Majority should include all elements of the Comp Plan.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Miller moved to authorize the City Attorney to draft an Ordinance and prepare related materials intended to create a ballot question asking the City voters to approve or reject a change to the City Charter mandating a Super Majority Vote of the City Commission for any changes to the Future Land Use Element of the City Comprehensive Plan. Commissioner Woodland seconded the motion.

Commissioner Mattick stated she was not in favor of a Super Majority, however, feeling it is an important issue she would be in agreement to placing it on the ballot.

**Roll Call Vote –**  
**Commissioner Mattick – Yes**  
**Commissioner Woodland – Yes**  
**Chair Quam – Yes**  
**Commissioner Tollette – No**  
**Commissioner Miller – Yes**

**ACTION:** Motion carried on a vote of 4 – 1.

--- **MOTION:** 9:00 p.m. - Commissioner Miller moved to continue the meeting until completion of the Agenda. Commissioner Woodland seconded the motion.  
Motion carried – All Aye

**8. Second Reading and Public Hearing – Ordinance No. 08-686 - Authorizing the Borrowing of not Exceeding \$1,000,000 to Finance Stormwater Projects Phase I & II.**

*City Clerk Baird* read the Ordinance by title.

*Chair Quam* officially opened the Public Hearing.

*Deputy City Clerk/Director of Finance Percycoe* explained that the \$1,000,000 was being borrowed for the stormwater project and brought attention to Exhibit A of the Ordinance where it states it will be used for “Various road improvements and resurfacing projects...”

Ms. Percycoe informed that the Ordinance could be adopted now and the funds could be drawn down later. The City has been asked to provide at least a four-week notice prior to the funds being drawn down.

*Commissioner Woodland* stated that the Commission must approve each of the projects that the funding would be used for so he recommended the Ordinance be adopted as written.

*Hearing no Public Comment, Chair Quam* officially closed the Public Hearing.

**MOTION: Commissioner Tollette moved to adopt Ordinance 08-686. Commissioner Woodland seconded the motion.  
Motion carried on unanimous Roll Call Vote of the Commission.**

**9. Approve Budget Calendar.**

*Commissioner Tollette* suggested the budget work session start at 5:00 or 5:30 p.m. *Commissioner Mattick* asked if the Commission could meet during the day.

*Deputy City Clerk/Finance Director Percycoe* suggested that the public hearing still be held at 6:30 p.m.

**ACTION: After discussion, the Commission agreed on the following dates for discussion of the FY 2008-2009 Budget:**

<b>Tuesday</b>	<b>July 22</b>	<b>5:00 p.m.</b>	<b>Budget Work Session</b>
<b>Thursday</b>	<b>July 24</b>	<b>7:00 p.m.</b>	<b>Regular Meeting – Set Tentative Millage, Rolled-Back Rate, Date, Time, and Place</b>
<b>Tuesday</b>	<b>August 5</b>	<b>5:00 p.m.</b>	<b>Budget Work Session</b>
<b>Tuesday</b>	<b>August 19</b>	<b>5:00 p.m.</b>	<b>Budget Work Session (if needed)</b>
<b>Thursday</b>	<b>September 4</b>	<b>6:30 p.m.</b>	<b>First Public Hearing</b>
<b>Thursday</b>	<b>September 18</b>	<b>6:30 p.m.</b>	<b>Final Public Hearing</b>

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

**Rick DeFrank**, asked how much the City's Engineer had been paid so far for the Phase I Stormwater project.

*Chair Quam* informed that the information could be found on the handout.

Mr. DeFrank stated that the City's Engineer had submitted the plans to SWFMUD two different times without following through with the requirements previously set forth by SWFWMD and had still not responded to them. He questioned why the Engineer was being paid when he was not meeting the requirements of his duty.

Mr. DeFrank then stated that the materials used during Phase A – which were installed approximately 1 ½ years ago, are now falling apart.

Mr. DeFrank said he had filed a complaint on numerous occasions relating to a property that is an economic strain on its neighborhood – there is no electricity on the property and the ceiling is falling in. He stated that the City Attorney had informed there was nothing the City could do about the property without being sued. He questioned why the City could not pursue the complaint since there are violations on the property.

**Tom Turner**, N. Shore Dr., made reference to the stormwater products recently exhibited and presented to the City. He discussed the current condition the equipment is in.

Mr. Turner said in his opinion there is no need for a filter in any of the outflows. He felt City Engineer Wilcox should further research that portion of the Phase I & II projects.

**Randall Stover**, N. Shore Dr., did not feel there was a good check and balance system in the City regarding the projects and suggested that the engineering project may be one of those.

Mr. Stover suggested the Mayor appoint a citizens committee responsible for checking the performance of those hired for projects in the City.

**Realtor Don Schroeder**, Holmes Beach, addressed the Commission on behalf property owner at 308 Pine Ave.

Mr. Schroeder acknowledged the Commission approving the First Reading of Ordinance No. 08-687 relating to the term Lot/Structure. He pointed out that all property on the north side of Pine Ave. is 7,500 sq. feet and the only place in the City where there's an exception. He felt it was discriminatory to his client. Mr. Schroeder suggested 114.282 now be addressed.

As a member of the Community Center Board of Director's, Mr. Schroeder thanked the Commission for all action and support provided by the City Commission.

**Anna Maria Resident** responded to Mr. Stover's comments. He stated that the Consultant and the Engineer are one in the same, there are no checks and balances, and felt that was a problem. He stated he would gladly volunteer to serve on any committee pertaining to the stormwater drainage projects.

**Commissioner Woodland** provided an evaluation and the advantages of the recent presentation of the stormwater project equipment. He briefed the Commission on how the City originally ended up with the inferior product.

Commissioner Woodland assured that they are working with the Engineer and looking at the problems that will not be repeated in the future.

**Mayor Barford** informed she and Commission Woodland had also been working with SWFMUD regarding the permit, infrastructure involved with Phase I, etc.

**Commissioner Mattick** asked if the City had established the maximum dollar amount to be spent on Engineering/Consultant fees. Discussion followed.

**Commissioner Miller** felt an over-sight committee would be a good idea.

**PRESS COMMENT**

**Laurie Krosney**, Sun News, asked what the requirements of the Capital Improvements Advisory Committee were and asked if they have any oversight responsibilities.

**Mayor Barford** said they could.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**On motion made by Commissioner Miller and seconded by Commissioner Tollette the meeting was adjourned at 9:29 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.**

**The next regular meeting is scheduled for Thursday May 29, 2008.**

---

**Alice Baird, CMC, City Clerk**

**Minutes approved:** \_\_\_\_\_