City Council of Peachtree City
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, May 7, 2024
6:30 PM

Call to Order

The Mayor and Council of Peachtree City met at the workshop on Tuesday, May 7, 2024. Mayor Pro Tem Frank Destadio called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. Council members attending: Laura Johnson, Suzanne Brown, and Clinton Holland. Mayor Kim Learnard was not present.

Discussion Items

A. Fee Schedule Update

Interim City Manager Justin Strickland said this workshop was dedicated to updating the City's fee schedule, which had been neglected in Peachtree City. Not all fees would increase, but they should be examined as a soft opening to the budget process.

Destadio suggested they recite the Pledge of Allegiance. After that, Strickland reviewed the budget policy, which was to maintain existing service levels in all divisions and departments. A baseline was agreed upon by staff and Council through the budget process, and anything added or removed had to be justified. Anything added had to have some type of revenue associated with it to pay for it.

They were required by law to have a balanced budget, and Strickland noted that everything had a cost in at least one of the four M's: manpower, money, machines, materials. They would see as they reviewed the fees that the proposed changes were related to one of those four things.

The City's mission statement said they wanted to ensure a safe and healthy environment for citizens, provide consistency in delivery of services, respond in a courteous, timely, and effective manner, and promote a sense of community.

Finally, they needed to keep in mind the vision and values adopted last year. The vision statement of Uncompromised Excellence had been helpful for not just staff, but Council and even citizens, Strickland observed. The values of Professionalism, Accountability, Teamwork, Honesty, Sustainability, and Safety (PATHSS) tied back into the vision statement.

He said his goal would be to review the fee schedule with staff and Council every year at the start of the budget preparation process. The last time it was looked at was in 2019. Holland asked if changes were made then, and Strickland said they were. There had been considerable increases and changes in a lot of things since 2019, so it was past time to review this, he stated. The fee schedule covered charges for services, which made up 4.2% of this year's budget, and fees for licenses and permits, which was 3.5%.

Fire Chief Clint Murphy said he would talk about emergency medical services (EMS) transport fees, then the Fire Marshal would talk about construction fees.

EMS fees were charged mostly to patients who were transported to the hospital, but one service that did not involve transport was a facility lift assist in which the medics went to an assisted living facility and physically picked up a person who had fallen and put them back in their bed or chair. Even though the facility where they lived was called "assisted living," the facility's policies did not allow staff to pick up the residents. The Fire/Rescue Department is currently doing this for free, Murphy observed, although it required manpower and money. He proposed they charge the facility $125 per call, an amount recommended by their billing company based on what other agencies charged. In fact, other jurisdictions usually had higher fees than what he was suggesting.

The next services were based on Medicare labels. Basic Life 1 would go from $750 to $888. Advanced Life 1 would jump from $825 to $1,054, and Advanced Life 2 would be increased from $900 to $1,803. The difference between those latter two were the amount of drugs needed and the skill level used. He said they might break even on their costs with these increases.

What service was provided by Basic Life 1? Holland asked, and Murphy said it was very basic treatment, such as blood pressure monitoring. No drugs were administered. Advanced cardiac life support was not needed; the patient was just sick or hurt and needed transport to the hospital. The level of care required went up at the next two levels, with Advanced Life 2 being a cardiac arrest, for instance.

Destadio asked about saline, and Murphy said he believed that was covered in Basic Life 1. Advanced care was related to the level of skill of the provider and procedures, as well as the drugs and materials needed. Destadio said they should at least provide saline to someone who had fainted, and Murphy assured him these fees had nothing to do with how they treated a patient at the time of the call; it was all on the back end.

Another common call was treatment/no transport, and Murphy gave the example of a diabetic with low blood sugar. The EMTs administered D-50, the patient snapped out of it, and signed a form saying they did not want to be transported because they could handle the condition at home. The drug still cost money, so this was a way to recoup the cost. They had left this at the same rate of $125.

Mileage charges were set by Medicare, then the Department added a percentage to it, the Chief said. The current charge was $10, and he proposed raising it to $17.88.

He again said all of these proposed changes came from the billing company. That company looked at what other jurisdictions were charging.

Strickland said the facility lift assist was named that because it applied only to residential facilities. It did not apply to people who lived in private homes. Murphy said that was correct; people paid taxes for them to come to their houses and assist them. But these assisted living facilities had staff and charged residents to live there, so they should have to cover the cost of Peachtree City being used as their staff.

Were these fees paid by Medicare or private insurance? Holland asked. Murphy said Medicare had a flat billing rate that was not this. If someone had Medicare and supplemental insurance, this was the amount they would be charged. The billing company put out a list of fees every six months, and they could choose to up the fees every six months if they desired, the Chief reported. He thought it was better to look at it annually and make incremental changes to stay somewhat level with the field.

Holland commented on the figures proposed, and Murphy said he had rounded them up to the next whole dollar, except for the mileage. These were based on the fee analysis from the billing company based on what everyone in the area charged. Murphy said these fees probably would not cover their costs; they never had. This was just a supplement to taxes.

Murphy said he had rescinded all CAMs and CARs except 20-1. Council could rescind the current CAM and do a fee schedule all in one. Previously, Strickland explained, they had fees in multiple places that were approved as different documents. They wanted to wrap all their fees into one master document in order to eliminate having so many policies that not everyone had access to, that were hard to find, or even forgotten about.

Once this workshop was over, Council would get a copy of all the proposed master fee schedule. When that appeared for a vote on an agenda, probably the item after it would be to rescind this CAM, Strickland remarked.

Fire Marshal Jeff Felmet said he did not believe many changes were made to these fees during the 2019 review. He looked at many metro Atlanta jurisdictions to get an idea of comparable fees and also considered what Safebuilt charged on the Building Department side for similar inspections, as well as what his time was worth.

There were several types of inspections and plan reviews that they had been doing without charging. One was the site plan review, which was the first thing that came through to them for new construction or renovation projects. Felmet proposed a $100 fee.

Felmet proposed that fire plan reviews of buildings more than 10,000 square feet should go from the current 1.5 cents per square foot to 2 cents per square foot, which equaled an increase from a minimum of $150 to a minimum of $200. They were looking at adding $25 to fire sprinkler plan reviews for a new cost of $175. The same changes were proposed for automatic fire extinguishment system reviews, which were for hoods in restaurant kitchens. An inspection for special suppression systems, such as those in computer rooms, would carry a fee of $175; currently there was no charge.

If a site plan did not pass the first inspection, was there another charge for the second review? Destadio wondered, and Felmet said there were revision fees, but they were added in at the Building Department level. It would depend on the magnitude of the change, he stated.

These fees seemed low to Holland based on the amount of Felmet's time each inspection would take. Felmet again said he based the figures on what other jurisdictions charged. He would be open to charging more if that is what Council wanted. He thought this would cover costs and would be fair. While an inspection of a 10,000 square foot-plus building might take awhile, the developers were paying for it through all the other inspection and review fees required of them.

Destadio said that was a good answer; they were not trying to make money, just cover the costs as best they could. The key word was "fair," Holland added. Felmet also noted these numbers were from 2022, but most other cities had not increased their fees since then.

Fire alarm plan review was also moving from $150 to $175. Another item they had never charged a fee for was prefabricated paint booths, which State law required to the permitted and certified. That fee would be $175.

Another new fee was $150 for an 80% inspection. Felmet explained that when a building was under construction, there had to be an inspection before the ceiling was installed. He would check for things such as that the electrical junctions were closed up, that the sprinkler heads were positioned correctly, and that any fire-rated walls or assemblies were intact. When the building was finished, he did a final inspection to make sure it was up to fire codes, and was asking to raise the fee from $100 to $150.

If a new fire alarm system was installed, a fire alarm acceptance test was required in which they set off the alarm to make sure everything was working. That fee, too, would jump from $100 to $150. If only minor changes to the fire alarm system had been made, he suggested an inspection cost $50 instead of the current $25.

Holland questioned charging the same fee for the final certification of occupancy (CO) inspection regardless of the building's size. Felmet said that was a valid point, but he was unable to find a jurisdiction that charged per square foot for either the

CO or the 80% inspection. He believed they could make up the cost when they did the plan review, which would be significantly higher on a larger building.

Both the kitchen hood acceptance test and the fire extinguishing system acceptance test were proposed to go from $50 to $100. He was asking to increase the costs for water line pressure tests of sprinklers, both above and below ground, from $25 to $100, and raise the fire sprinkler acceptance test from $50 to $100 and the sprinkler certificate from $25 to $50.

Larger buildings with sprinkler systems often needed supplemental pumps. Felmet was seeking to charge a fee of $175 for the installation permit and plan review. The cost of the fire pump acceptance test would be $100, but he suggested eliminating the fee for a fire base CO inspection.

Destadio had asked earlier about the costs of having to re-inspect a building that failed a first inspection. Felmet here noted that he was proposing initiating a $150 charge for both 80% and CO re-inspections. Currently, there was no charge.

Brown asked why there had never been fees for some of these inspections. Did the Fire Department not ask for them or did a Council decide not to put them in place? Felmet said he was told at the start of his career that fees were based on the State Fire Marshal's fees. Maybe the State Fire Marshal was not charging those fees at the time? The fee schedule as it was now was in place before he had this position, but he did not know how they arrived at it.

Interim Assistant City Manager Yasmin Julio noted that many times the State would pass a new requirement, but the City did not go back and attach a fee to that service. They would be shown examples of that later. Brown remarked that the only fee schedule discussions she had been involved in were for short-term rentals. Like that, here they needed to charge enough to not be a drain on the budget, but also not to make a profit. Citizen taxpayers who had no need for these inspections should not be paying for them. Julio again stated that she felt the fee schedule just had not been updated as new regulations were passed.

Felmet then talked about International Fire Code (IFC) 510, which was new. It required that buildings of more than 10,000 square feet be tested to see how responder radio signals performed in them. If a booster system was needed, the Fire Marshal would have to conduct a review, and Felmet was proposing a $175 fee.

They currently conducted annual inspections of all businesses in the city at no cost and that would continue, Felmet said. No fee would be charged for a first re-inspection, but if a second follow-up inspection was needed, the fee would go from the current $50 to $100.

He thought the fee should remain at $100 for inspections on new occupancy tax permits. They always did a walk-through before a business opened. Most things were caught during inspections during the building process, but sometimes there were issues. That fee should remain at $100, Felmet stated. He was asking that blasting permit fees at construction sites be raised from $100 to $200 for a 30-day permit.

The Recreation Department had a lot of fees, Recreation and Special Events Director Cathy Wilder remarked, and its fee schedule was being evaluated as part of the ongoing Master Plan development process. Strickland added that the consultants working on the Master Plan would come to Council and present their recommendations in a few months, then Council would have to decide if they wanted to update the Recreation fee schedule at this point or wait until next year's cycle.

Wilder had pulled a couple of things regarding special events that she thought Council should consider now. Event organizers often hired the Rec Department maintenance techs to help with things like equipment setup, trash pickup, or electrical systems monitoring. Currently, the fee was $25 an hour, and Wilder proposed raising it to $35, which would be the equivalent of an overtime rate. That would be paid directly from the organizer to the tech. Sometimes, the organizer requested a supervisor, and that fee had also been $25, but that was less than they were paid from the City. To compensate them more fairly, Wilder proposed setting the fee at $45 an hour. This would also apply to contracting with a facility coordinator if the Amphitheater was rented out. Destadio asked about that, and Wilder said it was not for concerts, it was if the Amphitheater was rented out for a private event, which was not common, but did happen.

The Rec Department had a lot of equipment that could be rented. They had recently rebuilt their portable light poles and were proposing a rental fee of $5 per pole. There was a lot of setup involved, both for safety and to prevent harm to the poles, so they were asking to require an installation fee of $140 to have the City staff do it.

Planning and Development Director Robin Cailloux said a lot of the recommended development fee increases were simply an attempt at catching up to what they were paying contractors for these inspections. Right now, all of the plat reviews required when creating a new subdivision carried a fee of $300 plus $5 per lot. They were asking for an 11% increase to $330 plus $15 per unit or lot, whichever was greater. The word "unit" was added because condominiums did not have individual lots. The 11% was reflective of the cost they were being charged, along with inflation.

The City had always charged a different fee for the first re-submittal, the second re-submittal, and so on, but were charged the same amount from the consultants and contractors. Cailloux proposed eliminating the different fees and making them all the same every time the plan had to be re-submitted. Right now they were charging

$400 minimum or the amount charged by a consultant, with a lot of other clarifying language. She said they should look at a $500 minimum fee.

Destadio asked what consultant she meant? Cailloux said they used engineering consulting firms; right now, it was Abbott. Abbott charged a flat hourly rate. The City charged the property owner the minimum, then got an invoice from Abbott. If Abbott's bill was higher, they went back to the developer to cover it.

How did they get Abbott? Destadio inquired, and Cailloux said they were professional services through the Engineering Department. There had been problems recently, Destadio said, and Cailloux said they were thinking about bringing it in-house. Should that not be approved, they would issue a request for proposal (RFP) for these services.

What about when they did a survey, and the survey was wrong? Destadio continued, and Cailloux said that was regulated by the State Licensing Department. If a survey was wrong, the only recourse was for the property owner who bought that service to complain to the Georgia Secretary of State and follow through with the review process to determine if that license should be revoked. Destadio told Strickland that qualified people needed to evaluate that RFP if one was issued.

Holland asked if these recommended fee increases would cover the actual costs incurred by the City? State law was very specific that they could not make money, Cailloux noted. Some of these processes were totally in-house, so the 11% increase was just for staff time. They made sure they were compensated for the amount of time spent, so she felt the annual review process would be helpful. The consulting fees were written so that they charged the minimum, and if the final cost was more than that, it was passed right on to the developer or the property owner.

Would it not be easier to continue in this way and have a solid amount to pass on to a developer? Brown asked. If the situation changed, and they went in-house, Cailloux replied, they would need time to compare the actual salary costs with what they were recouping so that next year when they came to Council, they would know what needed to be changed and why. So, they would do a self-analysis of every job, Brown said, and Cailloux agreed, saying she ran those numbers every month.

Non-residential development would see similar increase for conceptual site plans. Final site plans would increase from $500 to $625 plus $15 an acre. These fees covered initial reviews such as erosion and soil control. Charging the same fee for each resubmittal should encourage the submittal of good plans initially.

A land disturbance permit (LDP) was an all-encompassing, one-time fee that covered the initial inspection. Inspections were outsourced to a third-party engineering firm, and the fees charged to property owners were not even close to what this firm was charging the City. Cailloux proposed a 66% increase from $240 to $400, with the statement that $400 was probably lower than what they were being charged. Again, they currently had multiple fees for resubmittals of erosion control plans; she proposed a $400 minimum fee.

Before the LDP could be issued, an initial inspection was required. The City was being charged $100, but was charging the developer only $60, so Cailloux suggested an increase to $100, with the re-inspection fee jumping to $165.

Cailloux moved to fees for the other work. Not all of the fees would be changed, she noted, but she would go over the ones that she recommended. She thought the fee for a Step Two annexation should be raised from the current $750 plus the rezoning fee for both the Step One and Step Two. Step One was a general evaluation of the project and its impact on the Comprehensive Plan, while Step Two involved a lot more work, such as examining things such as how schools would be affected and how would Public Safety be impacted. She was asking for an increase to $840 plus the rezoning fees to account for the increased costs of staff time.

Cailloux said she had tried for awhile to get a tree removal fee passed, but previous City Councils had denied it. Cailloux pointed out that a Safebuilt employee worked in the Zoning Department. The City paid Safebuilt $90,000 for this, and about 40% to 50% of that worker's time was spent dealing with tree removal permits. Charging a fee would help them recoup the costs. She said she had looked at what other jurisdictions charged to arrive at a fee of $15 per permit. Some charged more, others less, some charged only for tree removal for commercial projects; $15 was comparable to Newnan, she stated.

They did not track the number of trees per permit, but issued 240 permits last year, Cailloux continued. Charging $15 per tree would enable them to track it per tree, so next year she would have a way to evaluate what they were charging and see if it needed to be changed.

Holland said he had about 75 pine trees removed from his property about four years ago. He assumed the tree removal company would pass the cost on to homeowners. Cailloux said the tree companies made the homeowners obtain the permits.

She also explained that the fee would be charged only for trees that required permits, which were trees of more than 16 in circumference inches or larger, along with a few others of nine inches or larger. Some jurisdictions issued timbering permits if the site was more than one acre.

Was the condition of the tree taken into account? Destadio asked. The ordinance said if a tree was dead or dying, a permit was not needed. This could mean visibly dead or attested to through a letter from an arborist. The did ask that the homeowner notify them that they were having trees cut in this case.

Destadio said he hated to see people take down trees and wished they had an arborist on staff. Cailloux said they did have one now, but they only looked at trees on public property.

They were seeking to increase utility right-of-way permits from $200 to $300 to account for staff time. Another new fee would be for a path encroachment permit. Cailloux used the example of a property owner who was having a tree removed, and it would be easier and cheaper to access the tree from a nearby path rather that through the homeowner’s yard. She proposed initiating a fee of $50 to cover path wear and tear from the heavy equipment, as well as staff time.

Holland asked if that fee should be higher, but noted there were few other cities to compare this with. Cailloux commented that there had been a few cases where they had taken someone to court over actual damage done to the paths, and they had been charged the cost of repairs. Of course, that was much more than $50, but $50 was an aggregate spread out over the number of permits they issued each year, which was more than 40, but less than 100.

She said they could get rid of the fee for a special exception variance application since those variances no longer existed.

Moving on to building permit fees, Cailloux proposed increasing the demolition re-inspection fee from $75 to $100 to reflect increase costs from Safebuilt.

A major change was coming in how they charged for building permits. Currently, there were four ways to figure out how much to charge. One was to base it on the construction value, but a law passed this year by the Georgia General Assembly would remove that option. Cailloux said she had not been able to find any jurisdiction in the State of Georgia that did not use the construction value to determine permit fees, although some places assessed costs by square footage for small projects. The International Code Council (ICC) used the construction cost method to charge jurisdictions for plan reviews.

Since this method would no longer be an option, Cailloux said she was working with the Georgia Municipal Association (GMA) and Safebuilt, which had experience in other states where a per square foot method was used in some jurisdictions and would be returning to Council with a new method because it had to be changed to comply with the law.

In response to a question from Destadio, she explained that they currented used a permit fee schedule. Anything from $0 to $2,500 was .013 cents per construction value. The range decreased as the project got more expensive, but it was all based on the value of the project. Cailloux said she did not disagree with this change, considering that the cost of construction had gone through the roof. For example, a 2,000-square-foot basic single-family home would have a much lower construction value than a million-dollar luxury dwelling of the same size. However, the amount of work that went into a plan review was the same, so it was not equitable to ask the builders of the million-dollar home to pay more.

Holland asked about a timeframe for the new law. Cailloux replied that it would take effect July 1 of this year. She said the Governor had not signed it as of last week. Holland said he believed it would automatically become law if the Governor did not sign it after a certain number of days.

Interim City Clerk Stacey Collins said the ordinance stipulated that fees for new alcohol licenses issued after July 1 should be 50% of the yearly fee, but the fee schedule did not reflect that. She was asking that the fee schedule show that between July 1 and December 31, new licenses would be half price. A malt beverage license would be reduced to $387.50; wine to $287.50; a package license at 50% would be $2,500; Sunday sales would be $250.

Massage regulatory fee certificates were adopted in Ordinance 1201 in September 2022. Fees were decided at the time of passage, but not included in the fee schedule. Initial certificates should be included at $250, and yearly renewals would be $200.

Collins also mentioned something discussed at the last Council meeting. The Alcohol Ordinance was being amended to include alcohol broker licenses, and fees would be added when this was approved.

The fee for storm water had not been reviewed or revised since 2012, Strickland remarked, but they were in the process of a cost of service and utility rate study. A firm had been engaged to do the study, and it would come back with recommendations. There were needed capital projects that could not be paid for given the current status of the fund, and this study would determine what rate changes were needed to preserve the fund's solvency.

Also, they were talking with a firm about possibly issuing a storm water bond. They had to dredge Lake Peachtree at some point, and, right now, there were no funds identified for that project. There was an agreement with the County to cover some of the costs, but Peachtree City would also be responsible for a portion. The firm also was considering streambank restoration projects, such as erosion at Luther Glass Park and at some creeks.

They also had to continue the storm pipe replacement and rehabilitation program. There were staffing needs in the storm water utility, Strickland continued, noting there were seven employees before COVID, but now there were five. He said he wouldn't be comfortable having seven, considering the status of the fund if rates remained unchanged.

Holland said they would need to know what the cost of the dredging and streambank restoration would be and noted these would be ongoing projects. Strickland stated they had to state specific projects that a bond would fund, but Holland was correct that the needs would be ongoing. He said he hoped they wouldn't wait as long in the future to do a study.

Destadio said he worked with the company that dredged the lake the last time and saw a document that said Peachtree City and Fayette County agreed to dredging every five years. What happened to that agreement?

Strickland said that agreement might exist, but he had not seen it. He and Julio had reviewed a 2016 agreement for a topographic survey of the lake, with the County paying for the first one and the City paying for the second. That agreement specified the end date of 2030. Destadio said County Manager Steve Rapson signed the document he saw, and Strickland said they would have to dig for it.

Julio said the 2016 document said there was an intent to dredge every couple of years but did not specify every five years.

Strickland said ordinance section 42-83 required waste haulers to pay the city a franchise fee of $1 per customer per quarter. Those dollars paid for Keep Peachtree City Beautiful (KPTCB). The ordinance was adopted in 2009 and had never been updated. Staff were recommending that the ordinance be amended to require a $2 per quarter per customer fee. This would require new agreements with the city's three waste haulers. This change was recommended because costs had increased, and the City had been subsidizing KPTC over the past few years. The fee increase would put them in the black without help from the City.

KPTCB Director Al Yougel said his organization was overwhelmed by the amount of cardboard they got thanks to the boom in home shopping. He would support cutting costs by restricting recycling to only Peachtree City residents.

The franchise fees had been $1 for a long time. That was $4 a year, Yougel remarked, and he would support raising it to $12; that would be $1 a month.

Brown said she had to show proof of residency at the recycling center when she lived in Florida or pay a fee. She thought that was appropriate. Strickland pointed out that Yougel had said that if you weren't a Peachtree City resident, you would be turned away. That was what they did already at the Rockaway facility, and Yougel was proposing they begin this at McIntosh Trail, too.

That is how the county landfill worked, Destadio noted, and Brown said they had a fee schedule that set rates according to what you were dumping. Strickland said the system they were looking at would not be pay as you go; the costs would be covered by the fees paid to the waste hauler, and only Peachtree City residents could use the facilities.

Johnson asked what other cities did? Peachtree City, with the three trash collectors, was unique; most places had a single hauler, Strickland replied. Julio added that the Keep America Beautiful program was different in every jurisdiction.

They should not compare because Peachtree City was behind, Yougel remarked. A lot of other places would collect your recyclables and yard waste from your front yard, but not Peachtree City. They tried having one waste hauler years ago. Their problem now, he continued, was all the cardboard and all the delivery trucks on the streets. They needed to handle these issues to the benefit of the residents.

Yougel also noted that most other cities mandated that every dwelling have residential trash service, but Peachtree City did not. You had to have a mailbox and storm water, but not trash service. He noted that much of the trash from those homes without trash service went into the trash cans on the paths, which KPTCB emptied.

He added that they should not be afraid to start controlling costs. He had to put up a gate, and that would take money.

Strickland said he understood from Yougel that they should ask for $12 a year for each customer and if Council had no objections, that’s how he would proceed. Destadio confirmed that they were not agreeing to raise charges but only to allow Strickland to do an analysis. He said he would get with Yougel, and it should be easy to analyze. Destadio feared it would provoke more people to use the path trash cans.

Holland asked if there was any way to charge people who did not have trash service? Everywhere he had ever lived had required trash service. Yougel noted that everyone paid for storm water. He said about 1,600 to 1,800 households did not have trash collection service, so they were losing at least $1,600 a month.

The trash collection companies were required to report how many customers they had every quarter, Strickland noted, and the City could use those numbers to calculate the number of households that weren’t paying for trash collection.

Holland wondered it the fees could be added to the tax bill? He asked Strickland to come back with a plan to make sure everyone was paying for KPTCB’s services. How could he do that? Brown wanted to know.

This was a different topic, Strickland responded, adding that the City had looked into requiring people to have trash service from a single hauler before, but that idea was shelved due to public outcry. He did not want to spend a lot of staff time looking into that unless there was actual interest from Council.

Brown said she had a plan where they stuck to the three current haulers and divided the City into jurisdictions. Charges would be through taxes.

Johnson said that would be a good topic to address in the future. She mentioned that KPTCB was operating in the red, and she wanted to see justification for $4 per quarter. As a non-profit, KPTCB could not make money, Strickland commented.

Strickland went over the workshop schedule staff had set up. There would be workshops on June 6 and 18, and a public hearing on July 18. The budget would be adopted in August.

Strickland concluded by saying his motto for this budget process would be “taking care of what we have,” carrying through with former City Manager Robert Curnow’s maintenance theme from the previous year. There would, of course, be other things, such as new personnel and filling in gaps in service, but maintenance of existing facilities, personnel, and programs was his main goal.

Johnson thanked staff for this work on this. Holland echoed that statement and said he thought they should look at fee schedules on an annual basis.

Adjourn

There being no further business, Destadio adjourned the meeting at 8:11 p.m.

________________________________ ______________________________

Martha Barksdale, Recording Secretary Kim Learnard, Mayor