



City of North Port

4970 CITY HALL BLVD
NORTH PORT, FL 34286

Meeting Minutes - Final City Commission Special Meeting

CITY COMMISSIONERS

Vanessa Carusone, Mayor
Linda M. Yates, Vice-Mayor
Christopher B. Hanks, Commissioner
Jill Luke, Commissioner
Debbie McDowell, Commissioner

APPOINTED OFFICIALS

Peter Lear, City Manager
Amber L. Slayton, City Attorney
Patsy Adkins, City Clerk
Kathryn Peto, Deputy City Clerk

Thursday, February 1, 2018

4:00 PM

CITY COMMISSION CHAMBERS

MINUTES APPROVED AT THE 04-24-2018 MEETING.

CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

The North Port City Commission Special Meeting was called to order at 4:02 p.m. in City Chambers by Mayor Carusone.

Present: Mayor Carusone; Vice-Mayor Yates; Commissioners Luke and McDowell, City Manager Lear; City Attorney Slayton; City Clerk Adkins; Deputy City Clerk Peto and Police Chief Vespia.

Absent: Commissioner Hanks

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Commissioner Luke.

1. APPROVAL OF AGENDA – COMMISSION

A motion was made by Vice-Mayor Yates, seconded by Commissioner Luke, to approve the Agenda as presented. The motion carried by the following vote, with Commissioner Hanks absent:

Yes: 4 - Mayor Carusone, Vice-Mayor Yates, Commissioner McDowell and Commissioner Luke

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were no announcements.

3. WELCOME OF NEW EMPLOYEES:

A. [18-035](#) Acknowledgement of New Employees

Human Resources Director McDade introduced the City's newest employees in the Finance Department, Fire and Rescue, General Services, Social Services, Parks and Recreation, Human Resources, Neighborhood Development Services, Police Department and Public Works.

4. PROCLAMATIONS AND RECOGNITIONS:

A. [18-022](#) Proclamation for Employee Appreciation Day 2018.

Mayor Carusone read the Employee Appreciation Day Proclamation into the record and presented it to Human Resources Director McDade, Human Resources Administrative Services Specialist Shorter and Human Resources Staff Assistant I Naylon.

B. [18-029](#) Proclamation "National Engineers Week in the City of North Port, Florida" February 18 through February 24, 2018, to be accepted by Gerardo Traverso, P.E. Engineering Division Manager.

Commissioner McDowell read the National Engineers Proclamation into the record and presented it to Public Works Director Bellia, Project Engineer Newman, P.E., Engineering Division Manager Traverso, and CDM Smith.

C. [18-037](#) Proclamation regarding Little Salt Spring and Preserve Appreciation Day February 24, 2018.

Commissioner Luke read the Little Salt Spring and Preserve Appreciation Day Proclamation into the record and presented it to Lawry Reid and Friends of the Little Salt Spring.

D. [18-056](#) Certificates of Appreciation for the Members of the Medical Hospital Task Force.

Vice-Mayor Yates read the Medical Hospital Task Force Certificates of Recognition into the record and presented them to Lee-En Chung and Charles Kotsaftis. All other Certificates will be mailed.

E. [18-049](#) Certificate of Completion presented to Commissioner McDowell for completion of the Institute for Elected municipal Officials.

Mayor Carusone read the Institute for Elected Municipal Officials Certificate of Completion from the Florida League of Cities into the record and presented it to Commissioner McDowell.

Mayor Carusone read a Proclamation for Fire Chief Taaffe's Retirement into the record and Interim Fire Chief Titus accepted it on behalf of Chief Taaffe.

5. PRESENTATIONS

A. [18-045](#) Finance Department Presentation

Finance Director Lowrie provided a PowerPoint presentation of the Finance Department.

There were no questions or comments from the Commission. There was no public comment.

6. PUBLIC COMMENT:

There was no public comment.

7. PUBLIC HEARINGS:**A. [18-055](#) Ordinance No. 2018-02, first reading, Use of Meeting Rooms in City Hall**

A motion was made by Vice-Mayor Yates, seconded by Commissioner Luke, to read Ordinance No. 2018-02 by title only. The motion carried by the following vote, with Commissioner Hanks absent:

Yes: 4 - Mayor Carusone, Vice-Mayor Yates, Commissioner McDowell and Commissioner Luke

City Clerk Adkins read Ordinance No. 2018-02 into the record by title only.

Discussion ensued: (1) it was explained that the public may complete a request form to use a room at City Hall and the request is approved or denied by Staff; (2) Staff keeps a calendar of meetings scheduled; (2) the City Clerk's Office will check for room availability and schedule meetings as needed; (3) it was noted that West Villages uses City Hall for meetings; (4) it was stated that historically Chamber of Commerce conducted meetings at City Hall; (5) the Tax Collector and the Veteran's Organization have designated office space that was historically approved by the Commission; (6) it was explained that a request from a movie production company had been denied use of City Chambers because they would not allow supervision of the room; (7) it was noted that the Commissioner's offices can be accessed from City Chambers; (8) the Ordinance does not provide for, nor does it prohibit, Staff to enter a room being utilized by the public; (9) it was clarified that to request a meeting room: [a] a request form is submitted to the City Manager's Office; [b] the Staff verifies with the City Clerk's Office if a room is available; [c] the City Clerk's Office schedules the meeting on the calendar; (10) it was explained that there is no charge for use of a room during regular City Hall hours, and that charges may apply either before or after hours; (11) it was stated that to charge a fee: [a] the Commission would need to direct Staff to establish a fee for after-hours use of City Hall; [b] it would be necessary to amend the City-wide Fee Ordinance to include a fee for use of City Hall; [c] that Staff would review fees and suggest an amount similar to what is charged for usage of other City buildings; (12) it was noted that the Ordinance does not require an entity to be within the City limits to schedule a room because some of the non-profit organizations serving North Port have offices outside the City; (13) it was noted that other governmental agencies, including the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT), Sarasota County Commission, Sarasota County School Board, Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), and Forest Florida Forest Service (FFS) have conducted meetings at City Hall; (14) it was explained that the new Ordinance would allow for other organizations in addition to non-profit organizations and other governmental entities; (15) it was stated that an Ordinance would be necessary to give the Commission authority to stop offering the use of City Hall, if they ever wished to do so; (16) it was recommended to establish a Resolution as the Charter and State Law define when Resolutions and Ordinances are appropriate, and that Administrative matters fall under the Resolution; (17) it was stated that facility use based on category would allow any entity within that category; (18) it was noted that Staff may administratively implement a written policy; (19) it was stated that liability rests with the practice and how it is applied, whether it is codified, in a Resolution, or in a written management policy, or if there is no policy; (20) it was noted that existing long-term users are more of an inter-local agreement; (21) it was clarified that what is being addressed now is for short term use and not for perpetual or

long-term use; (22) it was stated that the current process and use of City Hall is preferred; (23) it was noted that opening City Hall, without charge could become a free-for-all for non-profits and diminish the sanctity of City Hall; (24) it was explained that a Resolution that prevented the public from using City Hall was rescinded; (25) it was suggested the Commission create a Resolution to back up the Policy; (26) it was explained that if a Resolution was adopted similar to the Policy, the Chamber of Commerce and the Community Health Action Team (CHAT) would be able to request a meeting room at City Hall; (27) it was explained that limiting use to only governmental agencies could prevent use by non-governmental agencies such as Chamber of Commerce and Neighborhood Watch; (28) it was noted that to allow use of City Hall on a case-by-case basis may create issues; (29) it was noted there could be a problem with groups wanting to use City Hall free of charge because the Mullen Center and the Morgan Center both charge for use of their facilities; (30) it was suggested that a fee structure be considered for afterhours usage of City Hall; (31) it was noted that City affiliated groups should not be charged a fee because Staff would be present for their meetings; (32) it was suggested to consider a fee for groups that request use of the Chambers to utilize the audio/video equipment; (33) it was noted that Staff are affiliated with Chamber of Commerce, Neighborhood Watch, CHAT and attend some of their meetings; (34) it was suggested that groups allowed to use City Hall should have a governmental purpose; (35) it was noted that the School Board does charge a fee to the City for use of their facilities; (36) it was suggested that if a group charges a fee to the City for use of their facilities, they should be charged in kind; (37) it was suggested to give Staff the flexibility to charge a fee if necessary; (38) it was suggested to add language "as authorized by Commission" to differentiate users; (39) it was clarified that Teen Court does not have a lease or contract and that their use of City Hall is based on direction by the Commission; (40) it was noted that the Veteran's Representative does not have an Agreement with the City; (41) it was noted that historically space at City Hall was dedicated without Agreement for State Representatives and a Congressman; (42) it was stated that based on a request from Sarasota County the Tax Collector has an Agreement with the City for space at City Hall; (43) it was explained that to enter into a Contract there has to be give-and-take and that the City is providing space in consideration; (44) it was noted that part of the consideration is serving the local community; (45) a contract could encompass notice and termination, waiver of liability, obligation to maintain facilities and it would provide protection for the City and the users; (46) it was noted that a Contract would have to be implemented uniformly; (47) it was suggested that direction be provided for single use and a second direction for contractual agreements; (48) it was noted that the meeting room charges must be applied uniformly across a category; (49) it was explained that a "City affiliated entity" must have a "City related purpose" in order to use a room; (50) it was suggested to consider use based on "for other City government related purposes"; (51) it was clarified the Ordinance will be brought back in Resolution form; (52) it was explained that pursuant to Section 2-602(a), the City does not need to be included in a category as the City will always have first choice; (53) following an inquiry, it was clarified if the Commission specifies it doesn't want to charge a fee to governments that don't charge the City, Staff will review to make sure that legally it does not create a disparity that may give rise to a challenge; (54) it was suggested to include the caveat "unless otherwise approved by City Commission".

A motion was made by Vice-Mayor Yates, seconded by Commissioner McDowell, to have Staff bring the Commission a Resolution regarding the use of meeting rooms at City Hall; meeting rooms to be determined by the City Manager; and shall be available for use only by governmental entities, government sponsored or City affiliated entities for other City related purposes; the City Manager will establish the request form; and meeting room charges may apply as determined by the City Manager.

A motion was made by Commissioner McDowell, seconded by Vice-Mayor Yates, to amend the motion to state "City governmental purposes" instead of "City related purposes". The motion carried by the following vote, with Commissioner Hanks absent:

Yes: 4 - Mayor Carusone, Vice-Mayor Yates, Commissioner McDowell and Commissioner Luke

Discussion continued: (1) a concern was expressed that if the City Manager denies someone a meeting room and they come before the Commission seeking approval it may become a matter of "pick-and-choose"; (2) it was reiterated that the direction the Commission chooses to take has to be applied across the board to groups in the same category; (3) it was clarified the intent is for a one or two-time use of a meeting room and not for events; (4) Vice-Mayor Yates stated she cannot support the second amendment because it is too broad and it defeats the purpose of having a policy; (5) Commissioner Luke did not state her reasons for not supporting the second amendment.

A motion was made by Commissioner McDowell, seconded by Commissioner Luke, to amend the motion to include in the Resolution "unless approved by City Commission". The motion failed due to a tied vote, with Commissioner Hanks absent:

Yes: 2 - Mayor Carusone and Commissioner McDowell

No: 2 - Vice-Mayor Yates and Commissioner Luke

Discussion continued: (1) Mayor Carusone stated she cannot support a motion without allowing leniency in special instances; (2) it was stated that if a situation arises about a group that fits into one of the categories the Commission already has the ability to address it; (3) it was suggested to continue discussion when the drafted Resolution comes back to the Commission. There was no public comment.

A vote was taken on the main motion, as amended, to have Staff bring the Commission a Resolution regarding the use of meeting rooms at City Hall; meeting rooms to be determined by the City Manager; and shall be available for use only by governmental entities, government sponsored or City affiliated entities for other City related purposes; the City Manager will establish the request form; and meeting room charges may apply as determined by the City Manager, and to state "City governmental purposes" instead of "City related purposes". The motion carried by the following vote, with Mayor Carusone dissenting for reasons stated, and Commissioner Hanks absent:

Yes: 3 - Vice-Mayor Yates, Commissioner McDowell and Commissioner Luke

No: 1 - Mayor Carusone

8. GENERAL BUSINESS:

A. [18-052](#)

Smarsh Service Agreement to provide text archiving services to the City, for the estimated budgeted amount of \$22,460.00. The project was budgeted, and funding is available in Fiscal Year 2018.

City Manager Lear provided a brief overview of the item.

Discussion ensued: (1) following a question, it was explained that the City Clerk's office will be able to retrieve text messages through the web-portal, the same way that email is captured; (2) it was explained that text and voice traffic will go to the Verizon network,

and will flow into the Smarsh database; (3) it was explained that the City will be able to make all City mobile devices accept the text capturing and archiving Agreement request from Smarsh by utilizing AirWatch, a program that provides for mobile device management; (4) it was noted that if service is terminated, Smarsh will keep text data for six months; (5) it was clarified that: [a] Section 1.9 of the Agreement states Smarsh will provide records to the City Clerk's Office; [b] it would be the responsibility of the City Clerk's Office to request and retain the information; [c] records can be requested annually from Smarsh or as often as needed; (6) it was explained that pursuant to Chapter 119 Smarsh will retain records for as long as the Law requires them to; (7) the liability is with the vendor if an action was brought and they didn't retain the records; (8) ultimately it is the City's responsibility to retain the information; (9) it was suggested the City establish an internal Policy to annually request stored data from Smarsh; (10) it was explained that if the City changed the cell provider the City would have to migrate to another software compatible with the Vendor; (11) it was clarified that text messages, even if deleted, are captured in real-time and retained; (12) it was suggested to revise the City's Text Policy; (13) it was explained that if the Agreement is approved today installation of AirWatch and Smarsh on all City mobile devices may be completed by mid-March through April; (14) it was noted that the City of Venice is using the same system and Staff has discussed details and implementation of the software with them; (15) it was clarified that the Information Technology Department will be testing the software before it goes live and provide the City Clerk's Office with training; (16) testing and training will take approximately one week; (17) it was stated that the fee will be \$22,460, including a \$500 set-up fee, and then \$22,000 annually; (18) it was explained that Section 3.2 of the Agreement refers to the number of devices that are under the subscription and that the number of retained texts are unlimited; (19) it was noted that the City owns 350 mobile devices which include smartphones, android tablets and iPads; (20) it was explained that texting capabilities for the Apple iPads and android tablets will be disabled by use of the management software because texts from those devices cannot be captured; (21) it was clarified that the 255 devices under the contract is a minimum amount and more devices can be added at a cost of \$72 annually for each additional device; (22) it was clarified that the Agreement is a subscription and will renew annually unless terminated; (23) it was noted that the Agreement is a 12-month Contract and is not based on the Fiscal Year; (24) it was noted that Section 3.1 of the Agreement provides that fees can be increased at the renewal term with written notification from the Vendor; (25) it was explained that Smarsh is the only company working with Verizon that provides text capturing service. There was no public comment.

A motion was made by Commissioner McDowell, seconded by Vice-Mayor Yates, to approve the Smarsh Service Agreement to provide text archiving. The motion carried by the following vote, with Commissioner Hanks absent:

Yes: 4 - Mayor Carusone, Vice-Mayor Yates, Commissioner McDowell and Commissioner Luke

Recess 6:20 p.m. - 6:39 p.m.

B. [18-054](#)

Discussion and possible action regarding the Annual Performance Evaluation of the Deputy City Clerk.

Discussion ensued: (1) it was stated that Deputy City Clerk Peto has done a great job; (2) it was suggested that the City Clerk delegate responsibilities to the Deputy City Clerk; (3) it was suggested that the Commission give direction to have an Evaluation Form that is more specific to the Deputy City Clerk's duties; (4) it was noted that the Deputy City Clerk has demonstrated a willingness to learn and train, and has a compatible relationship with the City Clerk; (5) it was stated that Deputy City Clerk Peto is an asset to the Department and is working well with the City Clerk.

A motion was made by Vice-Mayor Yates, seconded by Commissioner Luke, to approve a three percent (3%) increase for the Deputy City Clerk annual salary effective on the anniversary date. The motion carried by the following vote, with Commissioner Hanks absent:

Yes: 4 - Mayor Carusone, Vice-Mayor Yates, Commissioner McDowell and Commissioner Luke

Discussion continued: (1) it was suggested that the evaluation form be provided to the Commission before it is complete so that the Commission can make additions to the form before final approval; (2) it was suggested the Commission allow the year to complete the evaluation form to provide time for determining specific duties due to the changes in software and activities within the Department; (3) it was noted that the City Clerk was commended for the good orchestration of the employees in her Office. There was no public comment.

A motion was made by Commissioner McDowell, seconded by Commissioner Luke, to direct the Deputy City Clerk and the City Clerk to work together to redo the annual performance evaluation form for the Deputy City Clerk, within the year. The motion carried by the following vote, with Commissioner Hanks absent:

Yes: 4 - Mayor Carusone, Vice-Mayor Yates, Commissioner McDowell and Commissioner Luke

C. 18-053

Discussion regarding parking lot improvements at the Myakkahatchee Creek S. Trail Head (Skate Park), Blue Ridge Park, Community Educational Center, and North Port Aquatic Center.

City Manager Lear and General Services Director Pfundheller provided an overview of the item.

Discussion ensued: (1) it was noted that projected costs and funding sources need to be identified for parking at the Butler Park Aquatic Center; (2) a change order can be sent to Kimley Horn for the parking design at Butler Park pool; (3) it was noted that parking for the Community Education Center is a priority and needs to be completed; (4) it was explained that Staff will know by mid-March if the Trailhead project is eligible for grant funding; (5) the Blue Ridge Park project could be moved out if the Commission chooses; (6) it was noted that Blue Ridge Park is popular and that current parking is not sufficient for the 60 times per year that it is rented; (7) it was stated that Blue Ridge Park Parking Lot, Community Education Center Parking Lot, Myakkahatchee Creek Trail Parking Lot are all at final design and ready to go out for bid; (8) it was clarified that to move the Blue Ridge project to 2018-2019 would not waste any work to date unless there are changes to standards, and that there may be changes to cost; (9) it was explained that a design would be needed to determine if parking space could be cut through the sidewalk to utilize the center area for parking, or other parking options, for the Aquatic Center; (10) it was suggested to explore other parking location options to avoid redesign of a storm water area; (11) it was explained that the Unified Land Development Code (ULDC) doesn't stipulate the parking needs for a pool; (12) it was noted that Staff looked at a similar facility in Marion County to calculate the number of parking spaces needed for the Aquatic Center; (13) it was explained that the Consultant looked at another facility in Collier County and this is why the two recommendations are different; (14) it was clarified that after accounting for 76 parking spaces at the Morgan Center, Kimley Horn recommends an additional 150 spaces and Staff recommends 263; (15) it was noted that the ULDC does not allow to count the grass parking space at the Morgan Center; (16) it was suggested the ULDC be changed to allow for the grass space to be utilized for parking; (17) it was suggested that there is property nearby for sale if the greater number

of parking spaces are necessary; (18) it was explained that the Commission can select the number of parking spaces to be created at the Aquatic Center and may issue a waiver of the ULDC to include the grass parking space; (19) a concern was expressed that to issue a waiver may result in other entities requesting the same waiver; (20) it was noted that additional parking for the pool can be addressed in the future as needed; (21) it was suggested to schedule a discussion between the City and the Engineer to ask about the methodology used in his determination and to negotiate a smaller amount of parking spaces; (22) it was noted that Staff informally calculated they could add 60-65 parking spaces based on the current available area; (23) it was noted that Southwest Florida Water Management District (SWFWMD) and the City's storm water Engineer may need to review changes; (24) it was noted that the playground could be moved between the trails or next to the basketball courts; (25) it is preferred to keep the playground where there is a visual from the building; (26) it was explained that Staff spoke with the School District and the middle school parking lot doesn't allow much use during school hours; (27) it was noted that the school is going to single point access in the summer making it difficult to utilize parking for the Aquatic Center; (28) it was clarified that the single point access is for entry into the school; (29) it was noted that an Agreement may be needed with the school regarding after-hours parking access; (30) it was explained that the Staff Development Review (SDR) can't be held with the schools until plans are at a certain point of completion; (31) it was noted that the SDR meeting with the school was held on December 6, 2017; (32) it was suggested that Staff clarify with the Engineer the difference in calculation of parking for swim meets or leisure use and which use requires quarter-mile regulation; (33) it was noted that the School Board indicated they will allow use of their parking on weekends, and after 4:00 p.m. on school days; (34) it was suggested that if distance from the school parking lot is an issue a shuttle bus or golf carts for transporting may be an option; (35) it was noted that the City Manager has the ability to allow shell or gravel parking and that the City Code is silent as to grass parking; (36) it was suggested that the Commission could allow for grass parking; (37) verification regarding the cost difference between asphalt and shell surfacing was requested; (38) it was noted that surfacing costs of 28 space is \$300,000 average; (39) 59 additional spaces would cost between \$300,000 - \$500,000; (40) \$757,000 has been budgeted for other parking improvements that do not include the Aquatic Center; (41) it was suggested to acquire the land around the storm water pond and designate it as grass parking only because it would be within a quarter-mile walking distance to the Aquatic Center; (42) it was noted a quarter-mile is generally the distance people are willing to walk; (43) it was explained that the Trailhead parking project must be fully funded to apply for the reimbursable grant and that construction would not start until approval of the grant; (44) it was noted that postponing improvements for the Trailhead Park which doesn't exist yet is better than not enhancing an existing Park; (45) it was suggested to seal off the secondary entrance from Price Road and use Spring Haven Drive as the main entrance to open more parking spaces; (46) it was noted that if the Engineer is instructed to utilize grass parking for the Aquatic Center the Engineer can determine specifically where parking can be located; (47) it was clarified that Section 25-5 A (2) (b) of the ULDC states that the City Manager may allow for shell and gravel parking; (48) it was explained that parking with the use of asphalt, gravel or shell covering would require review by SWFWMD and the City Storm Water Engineer; (49) it was clarified that to allow for grass parking would be open to anyone and not just this project; (50) it was clarified the grass parking spaces allotted in 2009 at the Morgan Center for the future pool were allowed as overflow parking, but not mandatory parking; (51) it was suggested that parking spaces at Potter Park be reviewed because it is in Sarasota County; (52) it was suggested that Staff review the ULDC to determine if the Commission can authorize the grass spaces to be allowed for parking at the Aquatic Center; (53) it was noted that the Commission has already met with the School Board regarding overflow parking and if construction of reduced parking space is acceptable the Staff can move forward at the discretion of the

Commission; (54) it was explained a change order can be placed with Kimley Horn for 59 parking spaces; (55) it was noted that any alterations after a SWFWMD review have to be reapproved; (56) it was suggested that the Commission can make a determination that the 59 additional parking spaces are compensated through Sarasota County School and give Staff direction to review alternatives for future parking spaces to move this project forward; (57) it was suggested funding may be available through the Sarasota County Economic Development Corporation to pay for the Aquatic Center parking area.

A motion was made by Vice-Mayor Yates, seconded by Commissioner McDowell, to direct Staff to utilize the Consultant's calculations for the Aquatic Center at Butler Park for the additional 59 parking spaces needed, utilize the school property as worked out with the School Board, and continue working with the Consultant through the change order for designing future expanded parking on site without delaying the project. The motion carried by the following vote, with Commissioner Hanks absent:

Yes: 4 - Mayor Carusone, Vice-Mayor Yates, Commissioner McDowell and Commissioner Luke

Discussion continued: (1) it was explained that the traffic maintenance expense for each parking lot is a Vendor cost for transporting heavy equipment; (2) it was noted that the property for the watershed has to be accounted for when making improvements; (3) it was explained that the parking lots for the three Capital Improvement Projects are small and the use of different materials will not make much of a difference in cost for improvement to the lots; (4) it was clarified that wheel stops for each project are approximately \$44,000 to \$55,000; (5) it was noted that true costs will be submitted when the projects are presented to the Commission for final approval; (6) it was explained that the Myakkahatchee Creek Trail Parking Lot project was originally planned to be parking for the State Park as a well as the Trailhead to the greenways; (7) it was stated that existing parking is sufficient as is for this location and that the Myakkahatchee Creek Trail Parking Lot project should be discontinued; (8) it was explained that there was a consensus to put frisbee golf by the greenway and existing bathrooms and that an 18 hole course could be put in by adding the trailhead; (9) it was noted that parking is available across the street from the existing skate park; (10) it was clarified that improvements are needed to establish the frisbee golf course and that it can be done without the parking lot improvements at this site; (11) it was noted that an access point has not been planned and that only tees and signage have been budgeted; (12) it was clarified that part of the reimbursement grant in process is based on forming the trailhead and that this project can be set aside until after the grant is awarded; (13) it was explained that the project is initially funded by the City and that 60% would be reimbursed by the grant; (14) it was suggested that Staff research the cost variation between asphalt and shell surfacing; (15) it was noted that Staff will know by March if the City is eligible for the grant and that the award determination should be known in May or June which will coincide with next year's Capital Improvement Projects; (16) if the grant is denied the budgeted amount this year can carry over until next year and additional funds can be added if necessary.

A motion was made by Vice-Mayor Yates, seconded by Commissioner Luke, to direct Staff for the Myakkahatchee Creek Trail Parking Lot, to only move forward with the project with the successful grant application, and if the grant is not received, to come back to the Commission. The motion carried by the following vote, with Commissioner Hanks absent:

Yes: 4 - Mayor Carusone, Vice-Mayor Yates, Commissioner McDowell and Commissioner Luke

Discussion continued: (1) concern was expressed that the field at Blue Ridge Park is used by the public for Lacrosse practice and parties; (2) it was noted that Blue Ridge Park is one of the top three parks, and people that rent Park space state there isn't enough parking; (3) it was explained that the existing shell parking would serve canoe and kayaking needs and that the proposed parking lot is for the pavilion and playground; (4) it was noted that along the existing trails a nine-hole frisbee golf course can be added; (5) concerns were expressed that to use the field for parking will diminish use of the entire complex except for the kayak launch; (6) it was suggested that staff remove the trees and underbrush because only minimal clearing is needed and this would save \$30,000 to \$50,000; (7) it was explained that the Consultant prepared designs for the three projects and the cost for the design is \$36,000; (8) it was noted that the design includes a new sidewalk stemming from the parking lot; (9) it was explained that the proposed parking lot is not currently accessible for vehicles and that the open field is being used for activities; (10) it was stated that it would be beneficial for the Commission to receive visual information of Capital Improvement Projects to envision proposed changes; (11) it was explained that it is not possible to expand and connect to the existing parking lot because of the septic and drain field; (12) it was noted that the property next to the existing parking lot is owned privately and is cost prohibitive; (13) it was explained that if the area to the left of the existing entrance is used for parking the dry retention area would need to be relocated; (14) it was noted that to preserve wooded areas, minimal clearing of trees was considered in the design; (15) it was explained that a memo was sent to the Commission with corrected prices for the project that included an addition; (16) it was suggested that the design be modified to twist the proposed layout to the right using less of the field for parking and shortening the entrance; (17) it was noted that the proposed sidewalk leads to a pavilion under the trees; (18) the sidewalk improves access for wheelchairs and scooters; (19) it was suggested the sidewalk be brought closer to the bathroom; (20) it was suggested to put the project on hold pending a better plan that will preserve the open field; (21) it was suggested to consider other options for parking space placement in addition to rotating the current design.

A motion was made by Vice-Mayor Yates, seconded by Commissioner Luke, to direct Staff to reconfigure the current Blue Ridge Park parking lot design to keep the open space as is. The motion carried by the following vote, with Commissioner Hanks absent:

Yes: 4 - Mayor Carusone, Vice-Mayor Yates, Commissioner McDowell and Commissioner Luke

Discussion continued: (1) it was explained that SWFWMD is concerned about drainage when dirt is moved or property is improved especially when dealing with vehicles and the impact on water levels; (2) it was explained that the parking lots will be connected based on Commission direction; (3) it was noted that creating a thoroughfare is not a good idea because of safety issues; (4) it was explained that the front door is only used for mail; (5) it was suggested that the circle drive can be relocated to the front end; (6) it was noted that a design for the new circle drive would cost \$5,000; (7) Staff shared concerns with the circle drive being located at the front: [a] the entrance and exit would be a one-way semi-circle on Pan American Boulevard; [b] space for improvements are limited; [c] there are concerns about safety for pedestrians and the sidewalks; [d] existing trees would need to be removed; (8) it was noted that there will still be access to the grass parking; (9) it was explained that this project is a proposed design from Sarasota County and that they have not responded to an invitation to present the Plan to the Commission; (10) it was explained that the understanding of this project is: [a] create additional parking spaces by utilizing the grass area; [b] provide an expansion of the parking lots by inter-connection; [c] Sarasota County's participation would provide additional funding for the project; (11) it was explained that the shuffle board and large gazebo will stay; (12)

the small gazebo is deteriorating and will be removed; (13) it was suggested that stamped concrete not be used because it is slippery when wet; (14) it was noted that when the Social Services building was built, they were given the land for the building and 17 parking spots; (15) it was explained that the design was prepared by a company for the County and that there may be a cost to change the design; (16) it was stated that the light grey area on the design is the County's plan for parking; (17) it was noted that consideration was given that should the County move forward with their project the City would coordinate improvements being made to save on cost; (18) Sarasota County is not responding to the City regarding this project and that the City should proceed with the parking lot improvement; (19) parking spaces would be taken away if the road extended between the Community Center and Family Service Center for an exit on Pan American Boulevard; (20) stamped concrete cost less and that real pavers are not as slippery; (21) it was stated that stamped concrete laid for the crosswalk where walkers and canes are used is unacceptable; (22) it was explained that there are options for stamped concrete and real pavers that are slip resistant; (23) it was suggested to keep the circle because it is used by the Senior Center and would be better for shuffle board; (24) it was suggested to create parking in the grey shaded area on the Plan; (25) it was suggested that improvements provide for connectivity to the Social Services Building; (26) Seniors have asked for additional handicap parking and that current parking is not enough; (27) it was noted that when the Salvation Army conducts food distribution there isn't enough parking; (28) it was clarified that the circle is not Code compliant and to leave the circle intact will not provide space for additional handicap and other parking spaces; (29) it was suggested to expand the circle making it a one-way to pull-in, drop-off, and then exit through the new parking area; (30) it was suggested that different concept Plans with options that keep the circle be brought back to the Commission; (31) it was clarified that one of the new concept Plans is to include connectivity for the Social Services Building; (32) concerns were shared that if the parking lots are connected, consumers of Social Services will dominate the parking areas and the Senior Center will still be lacking adequate parking space; (33) it was suggested to post designated parking signs. There was no public comment.

A motion was made by Commissioner McDowell, seconded by Commissioner Luke, to direct Staff to redesign the Senior Center parking lot, utilizing the grassy area as much as possible, keeping the circle that currently exists, relocate the shuffle board and gazebo and come back with design costs and estimates. The motion carried by the following vote, with Commissioner Hanks absent:

Yes: 4 - Mayor Carusone, Vice-Mayor Yates, Commissioner McDowell and Commissioner Luke

Recess 9:24 p.m. - 9:40 p.m.

D. [18-057](#)

Signature Events and Sponsor Opportunities

City Manager Lear and Commissioner McDowell provided an overview of the item.

Discussion ensued: (1) it was noted that marketing is typically an administrative function; (2) it was explained that Parks and Recreation developed the Sponsorship Program and that legal had reviewed it; (3) it was clarified that based on standard practice: [a] only one Presenting Sponsor for an event is permitted; [b] the Presenting Sponsor is granted exclusivity rights for the event; [c] a Presenting Sponsor is given the first right of renewal for the next year; (4) it was suggested more Sponsors would participate if exclusivity was eliminated for Presenting Sponsors; (5) a suggestion was made to replace the description of Presenting Sponsor to Platinum Sponsor; (6) it was suggested that exclusivity could be transitioned out and replaced with another type of benefit; (7) it was suggested to start changes next year to honor the right of renewals given last year; (8) the cost for a

Presenting Sponsor is \$2,000 per event; (9) it was noted that the right of renewal may prevent another business or organization from becoming a Presenting Sponsor; (10) it was clarified that there can be an unlimited number of lower Sponsors; (11) it was stated that organizations and businesses may apply for sponsorship and that organizations typically participate as vendors; (12) it was clarified that exclusivity is based on the event and may also be limiting to vendor participation; (13) it was suggested that businesses similar to the Presenting Sponsor be allowed as a lower Sponsor; (14) it was suggested that exclusivity could apply to Presenting Sponsorship status only; (15) a suggestion was made to increase the Sponsorship value; (16) it was noted that signature Events usually have more than 1,000 attendees; (17) the Road-E-O, Egg-normous Egg Hunt and Flashlight Egg Hunt have been added to signature Events; (18) the Firecracker 5k run is not considered a signature Event; (19) it was suggested a three-year time limit be applied to the right of renewal; (20) it was noted that Staff may offer additional alternatives for sponsorships. There was no public comment.

There was a consensus to have staff come back with different ideas on signature events and sponsorship opportunities that allow more than a single source business to participate. Commissioner Hanks absent.

9. CONSENT AGENDA:

There are no items on the Consent Agenda.

10. PUBLIC COMMENT:

There was no public comment.

11. COMMISSION COMMUNICATIONS:

Commissioner Luke: (1) reported working on connectivity between the school system, principals and counselors for Homeless to Home; (2) attended the School Choice Fair; (3) reported attending the Community Health Action Team meeting; (4) was present for the State of the City Address; (5) noted that the Tourism Development Board will be rescheduled for February; (6) attended a presentation by Harvey Vengroff about the Live Learn and Earn Program in Sarasota County; (7) attended the Sarasota Art and Design Show benefiting Designing Women; (8) reported attending the 2018 Argus Annual Meeting; (9) toured Ringling College; (10) attended the Keiser University 40th Anniversary Celebration; (11) reported meeting with the Education Foundation; (12) attended the Florida League of Cities Legislative Action Days; (13) provided a reminder of fundraising activities tomorrow for Back Pack Angels and the Art Center.

Vice-Mayor Yates: (1) reported attending the Florida League of Cities Legislative Conference; (2) suggested to invite Senator Steube and Representative Gonzalez back to North Port for updates; (3) attended the Manasota League of Cities meeting; (4) spoke at Cranberry Elementary; (5) was present for the State of the City Address; (6) attended the Convocation of Governments; (7) attended the Metropolitan Planning Organization Joint Meeting with Charlotte County; (8) suggested attending the Sarasota and Charlotte County Joint Meeting March 21, 2018 at 2:00 p.m. to discuss the I-75 interchange possibly located at Raintree Boulevard or Yorkshire Street; (9) following a concern, it was noted that the Charter Review Meeting will be held March 19th and 20th 9:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m.

Commissioner McDowell: (1) reported attending the State of the City Address; (2) attended the Charlotte Harbor National Estuary Program meeting; (3) attended the Florida League of Cities Legislative Action Days; (4) noted that Representative Gonzalez is

willing to come back with an update after session and suggested Staff reach out to Senator Steube; (5) noted that North Port was not listed on the website for VisitFlorida.com; (6) it was clarified that Staff is reviewing the Release of Liability and photos that are required by VisitFlorida.com; (6) it was noted that the Communications Team will research popular websites to ensure that North Port is included.

There was a consensus for Staff to invite Senator Steube to provide an update. Commissioner Hanks absent.

Mayor Carusone: reported attending the same as other Commissioners.

Commissioner Hanks: was not present.

12. ADMINISTRATIVE AND LEGAL REPORTS:

City Clerk Adkins: nothing to report.

City Attorney Slayton: nothing to report.

City Manager Lear: (1) Press Release posted this evening that the Police Department Chief search will not be taking place next week because the search is down from 6 to 2; (2) over 70 applications had been received for the Police Chief position; (3) the Meet and Greet will not take place on Tuesday.

13. ADJOURNMENT:

Mayor Carusone adjourned the North Port City Commission Special Meeting at 10:37 p.m.

City of North Port, Florida

By: _____
Vanessa Carusone, Mayor

Attest: _____
Patsy C. Adkins, MMC, City Clerk

Minutes approved at the City Commission Regular Meeting this ____ day of _____, 2018.