

**FORT MYERS BEACH
TOWN COUNCIL MEETING
MARCH 12, 2001
LAND USE HEARING
Town Hall - Council Chambers
2523 Estero Boulevard
FORT MYERS BEACH, FLORIDA**

I. CALL TO ORDER

The Land Use Hearing of March 12, 2001 was opened by Mayor Daniel Hughes on Monday, March 12, 2001, at 9:00 a.m.

Council members present at the meeting: Mayor Daniel Hughes, Howard Rynearson - Council, Garr Reynolds - Council, Terry Cain - Councilwoman. A quorum is present.

Excused absence from meeting: Vice Mayor Ray Murphy

Staff present at meeting: Town Manager Marsha Segal-George, Deputy Town Manager John Gucciardo, Pam Houck, Dick Roosa (Town Attorney) and Dan Folke (Lee County Planner)

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

All assembled and recited the Pledge of Allegiance.

III. PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

IV. DISCUSSION: BAY BEACH - WATERSIDE GUEST SUITES

Attorney Ciccarone is representing the Town of Fort Myers Beach regarding the case of Stardial vs. Town of Fort Myers Beach. It was to their understanding the case was settled. The development order for the construction of Waterside was issued. A dispute arose when it came time to issue the building permit, as to whether Waterside IV as designed had 58 or 60 dwelling units. There are two areas within Waterside IV, as there are in the first three buildings, which consist of two rooms approximately 12x12 with an adjoining bath. It appears that these are treated as common area amenities and are available to the guests of condominium owners. These must be reserved in advance and are charged a \$45.00 a day housekeeping fee. The question is whether the two guest suites are dwelling units or not dwelling units. The settlement allows Stardial to have up to 58 dwelling units. The plans that were on file for Waterside IV were to be approved as part of the settlement. As far as he is aware the building plans were the plans on file. The County, as the Town's staff in this case, has issued instructions to Stardial's architect to designate these two units as something else or the permit cannot be issued. Stardial takes the position that this sort of conditional approval of its building permit is not consistent with the settlement, and therefore the case is not settled.

He feels from the Town's perspective they should be aware that there are differing opinions as to how this should be treated. He has spoken with many people with the Town and Stardial. He has looked at the Stardial documents and researched the Land Development Code and it appears to him that these two guest suites are not dwelling units, because they do not have a kitchen. This is the key component of a dwelling unit. The debate centers on whether they are hotel units. In his opinion they are not hotel units, because he does not feel that they meet the definition of a hotel unit. They are not available to the public for rent and are only for use through the condominium association. It is his opinion that the Waterside IV application meets the existing code. He recommends that the Town instruct the County to issue the building permit for Waterside IV, as it has been applied for.

The more interesting question for the Town would be how they would like to handle this in the future? If they take the view that these sorts of units should be counted as a unit for density purposes they would need to amend the Land Development Code to provide for this. He feels that it is within the terms of the settlement to do this. The settlement merely says that there should be 58 dwelling units in Waterside V, VI, VII and VIII. It does not define what a dwelling unit is. The staff could be instructed to begin the necessary process of amending the Land Development Code to make these types of guest suites count as dwelling units for density purposes, if they wish to do this. He referred to a case called Smith vs. Clearwater. This states if the Town Council manifests an intention to amend its Land Development Code, even though the code has not been formally amended, the Town may deny applications for permits that would be inconsistent with the code as it is proposed to be amended. His personal recommendation is to instruct the County to issue the Waterside IV permit, as it has been applied for. A discussion needs to be held in conjunction with the Town Manager.

Councilman Reynolds asked if anyone had checked to see if Waterside I, II and III had these units? Mr. Ciccarone responded that he has not personally checked. He was told that all four buildings are alike. He commented that if any of the units contained kitchens that this would be a code violation. They would then meet the definition of a dwelling unit and would exceed what is permitted under the building plans.

Mr. Ciccarone added that he had to file a response. If they decide to issue the permit he would dismiss the appeal. If they decide not to issue the appeal the settlement is off and they are back in the Court of Appeals, under the circumstances discussed a few weeks back.

Chris Clausen, developer of Waterside, came forward to respond to Councilman Reynolds questions. He stated the building I, II and III have been turned over to the condominium associations. He does not have control over these associations. The guest suites are about 12x12 in size and are not typically what would be seen as a hotel room. There are no kitchens inside the guest rooms and there is not room even if they decided they would like one. They are specifically used for the homeowners that live there.

Mayor Hughes asked how these units are identified on the plans? Chris responded that they are common elements to the overall building.

Chris went on to comment that if they felt these were being treated as a hotel

rooms the cleaning charge could be dropped and absorbed by the homeowners.

Town Manager Segal-George commented that when this was discussed by the Council two weeks ago, Vice Mayor Murphy had brought up the issue that he believed there were not 58 but 60. At this point, she had an obligation to find out what was going on. They asked to look at the plans and the two extra units were found. She gave the word to the County not to issue the building permit. She felt that this was not as the Council had authorized it in the settlement. The other issue is that everyone is looking for ways to put extra rooms in there buildings. They have found storage rooms with bathrooms and laundry rooms with bathrooms, as some examples. She is concerned with consistency. She feels that changing the code and evoking Smith vs. Clearwater is a very good idea. She felt that it was important that the Council address this issue, and that it just not be approved as is.

Mark Ebelini feels that the one issue being overlooked is the purpose for which the building is constructed. He referred to a hotel, which is income producing, and may try to build extra rooms to exceed 100% occupancy in high season. The condominiums are not income producing facilities. He feels that they must contrast between policing the hotel issues as opposed to one that is not an income producing facilities.

Attorney Dick Roosa commented that what they have is an alternative for a motel room. If you are the owner of a condominium, instead of sending family members to a motel, they can have them stay right in the same building. This is the issue and this is the issue the Council needs to address. In regards to Waterside IV, there are so many equities in favor of the developer it is in his opinion that it would be unjust not to approve Waterside IV. The next question would be the direction Council gives to staff in regards to Waterside V, VI, VII, VIII and other properties. Does the Council want to consider these as separate bedrooms in common residential units or do they want to consider those as separate units? The staff to date, as he has perceived it, has been concerned about the community impact. When you look at it from a community impact point of view these are units.

Mayor Hughes asked for Attorney Roosa's position on the legal position in terms of obligation? Attorney Dick Roosa replied that he agreed there is a strong argument for a legal obligation. Although they had no actual notice they did have constructive notice. The County staff was aware and this was on the prints.

Mark Ebelini commented if the building permit for Waterside IV is issued they would be governed by the settlement agreement to resolve this issue by virtue that they are proceeding under the settlement agreement.

MOTION: Made by Councilman Howard Rynearson and seconded by Mayor Daniel Hughes to approve the issuance of the building permit for Waterside IV, as it has been applied for, provided that Stardial and the Town enter into an amendment to the settlement agreement. Stardial will agree that with respect to how guest suites shall be handled for density purposes, the development of guest suites within Waterside V, VI, VII and VIII and shall be controlled by the Town's general regulations as they are in effect at the time applications are made. Only with respect to density and no other issue. Mayor Hughes further amended the motion to provide that the building permit shall be issued by 5:00 p.m. on Monday, March

12, 2001. Motion passes unanimously.

Discussion: Councilman Reynolds feels that the discussion regarding Waterside V, VI, VII and VIII directly relates to the approval of Waterside IV. If the intent is to come back and state that they would like the same for V, VI, VII and VIII they will be in the same situation that they are now in.

Town Manager Segal-George clarified that it is her understanding in the settlement agreement that in Waterside V, VI, VII and VIII would be bound by they regulation at that time. If they do regulations that do not allow these types of guest suites they would not be able to have them in V, VI, VII or VIII.

Mr. Ciccarone brought up a question for Stardial and asked if they have an agreement with respect to how the guest suites shall be treated. They shall be governed by the regulations that will be in effect at the time they make application for Waterside V, VI, VII, VIII or are they taking the position that because they are interpreting the regulations today to allow the guest suites in Waterside IV they would be required to approve similar permits for V, VI, VI and VIII. He feels that the language of the settlement agreement does not address how this is to be resolved. The question still remains as to what the code means as of today. Councilman Reynolds would like to clarify if they are heading for another fight or is Stardial content to work under the Town's regulations as it relates to that particular issue at the time the application for Waterside V is made. This is a necessary question. He is hearing that a couple Council members would be uncomfortable supporting the motion to approve Waterside IV without knowing Stardial's position on this issue with respect to V, VI, VII and VIII. He suggested that they asked Stardial to clarify their position on this.

***** Mayor Hughes called for a 5-minute recess *****

Mr. Ciccarone stated that the question they would like Stardial to answer is, with respect to V, VI, VII and VIII, whether the guest suites will be treated as dwelling units for density purposes and be governed by the regulations as they exist today or whether they will be governed by the Town's regulations as they would apply at the time applications for building permits are made for V, VI, VII and VIII. Do they agree to this or not?

Mr. Ebelini clarified that there is an ordinance enacted by this Town Council in the future, prior to an application for a Development Order and Building Permit, which has island wide terms that guest suites in a building are to be dwelling units. To this extent they would agree to be governed by this ordinance.

Mr. Ciccarone commented that Stardial would like to have the building permit issued by 5:00 p.m. today. The amendment of the settlement agreement will be handled as quickly as possible.

MOTION: Made by Mayor Daniel Hughes and seconded by Councilman Howard Rynearson to direct the staff to refer to the LPA the issue of treatment of guest suites and similar type of rooms that Town Manager Segal-George referred to earlier for purposes of considering amendment to the Land Development Code. This would be to determine the difference between a residential unit, hotel unit or a dwelling unit. They are evoking Smith vs. Clearwater. **Mayor Daniel Hughes withdrew this motion.**

MOTION: Made by Mayor Daniel Hughes and seconded by Councilman Howard Rynearson to direct staff to consider guest rooms and similar type of units as a dwelling unit pending a reference of this matter to the LPA in a public hearing thereon and a reference back to the Town Council, so that the doctrine of Smith vs. Clearwater will be in effect during this interim period. Motion passes unanimously.

V. PUBLIC HEARING: CASE NUMBER ADD2000-00152. Charles F. Lieske Residential Pool Construction. An Administrative Interpretation of the Comprehensive Plan whether a portion of the subject property has been (or should have been) designated “Wetlands” on the basis of a clear factual error as set forth in Chapter 15, page 3, Section A-1. This property is located at 21491 Widgeon Terrace.

Mayor Hughes reviewed that the issue is whether or not a portion of this property has been or should have been designated a “Wetlands” on a basis of a clear factual error. He asked if any of the Council members had any ex parte communications on this matter. No Council members indicating ex parte communications.

Mayor Hughes asked for the applicant or representative of the applicant to come forward. No one was present. Mayor Hughes asked for the staff to make their presentation.

Dan Folke, Planner with Lee County Community Development, came forward and stated that he had reviewed the request before Council. Staff has recommended approval of amending the Town’s future Land Use Map. Three conditions were recommended. One is contained in the staff report and the others were recommended in the memorandum from Rick Joyce regarding his review of the property. All three conditions were included in the recommendation from the LPA, and are listed in the resolution provided in their packet.

Attachment B of the staff report clearly summarizes the issue. This is a survey of the property. The designation is incorrect. Staff has recommended that the line between the mixed residential and the wetlands portion be defined as the portion west of the top of the rip wrap and the portion east of the rip wrap should remain in the “Wetlands”. He provided some photographs that were taken. This request is simply to change the Land Use Category. The three conditions pertain to the anticipated permit for the pool. They are recommending approval.

MOTION: Made by Mayor Daniel Hughes and seconded by Councilwoman Terry Cain to adopt the resolution as set forth in the package to approve the interpretation as recommended by staff. On the second page of the resolution, strike the words modified or reversed, and it would then read “ the interpretation of the Local Planning is affirmed”. **(Side A of Tape 1 ends)** which included the conditions as set forth by the staff that prior to construction the opinion of title on building within the limited common area, and the LPA added that the silk screen be installed during the pool construction to ensure that soil will not be washed into Estero Bay, and on completion any fill slopes must be stabilized with vegetation to eliminate soil erosion. Motion passes unanimously.

VI. BEACH RENOURISHMENT PROJECT WORKSHOP

Steve Keen with Coastal Planning and Engineering came forward to state that they are putting together the permit and the design of the Estero and Lover’s Key Beach Restoration Project. He referred to some pictures and slides that were before the Council for review.

There are five components to the project. The Core of Engineers, when they had designed the project, had come up with a sand source 15 miles away. They were able to do an investigation and found two other nearby areas. They are designing and trying to get permits for three segments of the project. The main segment is the almost 5 mile stretch along north Estero Island. The other segments would be south Estero Island and another is Lover’s Key. They have extended the project by approximately 1 ½ miles, added 500,000 cubic yards and the cost has been decreased approximately 2 million dollars. The total project cost is about 8.1 million at the present time. The renourishment interval has been increased from 3 years to 8 years. If the project performs as design there will be 8 years on average between the time that more sand will need to be added to the project. This means less disruption in the long run.

He indicated that their design for the project is 40 feet. This means if they continue to erode at 3 feet per year for 8 years they will be back to the 40-foot design width at the 8-year point. When the project is initially built it will be over 100 feet wide, in some cases 150 feet. Some of the sand must slip offshore to build the foundation. They will end up with about 64 feet. This will be 40 foot for the design width plus 24 feet of sacrificial sand for erosion over the next 8 years. All of the beach will not uniformly erode at 3 feet a year. There will be several areas that will erode faster and many areas will stay very healthy throughout the time. If a renourishment is needed in 8 years it will probably be just the areas that erode at the faster rate.

They have found two new borrow areas or sand sources closer to the project. They are less than 2 miles away. They have looked into whether there is good sand at these sand sources and if there will be any effect on the shoreline. The sand is very similar to the sand on the beach today and the color is roughly the same color. Their research shows that no impact will effect the shoreline for either of the borrow areas.

He referred to the Great Lakes Dredge and Dock/ Dredge Alaska. He stated that they hope this is the type of dredge they would like to attract to the project. If this

dredge and company bids on the project they could probably finish putting sand on all three beaches in less than two to three months. He commented that if they needed to go to a 24 inch dredge it could take up to six or seven months to dredge the project. They are in a dilemma and will put together a package to address both size dredges, hoping to get the bigger dredge. They are making good progress in getting the final designs done and getting the approval from the Core of Engineers and permit agencies. They still are needing a lot of answers. The plan presented today looks to be the one that will be approved. At this point, it does not appear that the plan will have to be modified. They are targeting August 2001 as a start date for the project.

He referred to another project in Florida and showed the result of an easement not being signed. The dredging contractors know how to build around these and it would be an inconvenience, but it is a feasible task to do. He expressed, from his experience at Coastal Engineering, in regards to the Core of Engineers easement. The easement, the way it is written, is not the best language to be used. When you take the Core of Engineers easement in conjunction with the Florida Laws he feels that there is quite a few protections.

The Council took some time to ask Steve Keen to put back in various slides and ask questions. Bill Whittaker came forward and asked where the dredging starts? He assumes that sand will be put over the existing beach to build it to higher elevation? It was responded that the direction has not been fully selected. It is believed to be governed by environmental considerations. The contractor would be allowed to pick the order, unless there is a particular order the County or Town would like to direct them to use. They will be covering the existing sand.

George Repetti, a representative of Islands End Condominium Association, came forward and commented that he understands Islands End will not have any sand put on their beach. Why do they need an easement? Steve Keen responded that Islands End is included in the south segment project area. The easement will be given to the County as the local sponsor.

Mr. Repetti commented that they have not received the easements for signature. Deputy Town Manager John Gucciardo responded that they will prepare and resend out to Island End.

Ron Jones is a property owner at 5760 Estero. He referred to a profile showing 4 feet and then the beach dropping down. They have been coming to Fort Myers Beach annually since 1957 and the beach is known as the safest beach. What will be the impact, in regards to safety, after this takes place? It was responded that there is an adjustment phase. The slopes will be relatively mild during this period. It should not create any additional undertow or riptides, which do not exist now.

Ron Jones has spoken to most of the property owners on the two-block area and is present to speak for them. They request to be excluded from the project. They will not be getting easements from very many of the people from Sterling to the south. They do not want anything to do with the project. They like where the waterline is presently. He feels that they have gained 2 feet of sand over the last three years and the waterline has moved out a good 50 feet over the last 2 years. He feels that it is a waste of money and a very undesirable thing for them. He made comment regarding the loss of the rocks along the beach associated with this project? Steve Keen responded that they have not given in on the rock issue. It is an expensive item to remove.

Councilman Reynolds personally thanked Mr. Jones for enlightening them on an issue that has not come before Council. He is disappointed to hear this. To go in and undo something is not the answer.

Harry Gottlieb who lives at 50 Aberdeen commented that there has already been flexibility about the southern border of the north project. They first heard Flamingo, Lanark and now Aberdeen. He hopes that there would be the flexibility remaining in the project and he is asking the engineer if this is true? He would also like to second the recommendation that the project go no further south than Sterling.

Paul Scheenburger, President of the Island House Beach Club, is present to represent 25 owners in their condominium. He has tried to educate himself about the project and appreciates the information that has been provided. He did find other information and would like to know where they stand? He asked if they were familiar with the Florida Shore and Beach Preservation Association? He stated that there is a budget, which says proposed for 2001, and does not list this area of Florida. He is concerned about the financing of this project. He would like to be further educated on the signing of the easement. At this point in time he is not convinced that he should sign it. Steve Keen responded that the construction dollars have already been appropriated and are line item budgeted for this project, which was in fact ranked the highest in all the municipal projects for the entire State of Florida. The only place financing becomes a problem is when the easements are not signed. If they do not want the money from the Federal Government then they do not have to have the easements.

Andy Disalvo owns a property at 3068 Estero. His questions are regarding the easement. The easement is written up as perpetual, but he thought that there was some language that it could be 50 years instead? Steve Keen responded that the federal study requires them to attempt to gain perpetual. If they attempt and fail they can then request a modification to go to a 50-year easement. They have been told by the Army Core Jacksonville District that this process will take about 1 ½ years to be approved.

Andy asked for clarification that the Federal portion of the total cost of the project would be 60%? Steve Keen responded that this is initial construction. They would expect that their participation will cap out at a maximum of 50% for the periodic nourishment. Are they required to get 100% easement signature to get Fed funding or is there some type of sliding scale? Steve Keen responded that they are not sure at what point the Federal Government would decide that their interest is no longer significant to participate.

Andy commented that he feels the project is a good idea and he would love to have it in front of his property. He is concerned with the easement being perpetual. He would like some assurance that permanent structures will not be placed to change the complexion of what he presently has on his lot now. He would like it if some modifications could be made to the easement. Mayor Hughes replied that everyone would like to make some sort of modification, but this cannot be done.

Andy went on to inquire if there would be any kind of guarantee that the individual property owners will not be taxed for the ongoing 8-year renourishment? Steve Keen responded that it is strictly up to the Local Government to decide how they

will pay for their share.

Larry Albright from 3730 Estero Blvd has been on the island since 1975. He feels that the reason this project is taking place is due to someone else paying for it. Is it really needed? He does not want Federal government money if he will have to give away his property rights in the process.

Deputy Town Manager Gucciardo commented that the direction he has been given from the Council, approximately 3 ½ years ago, is that this would be a worthwhile project due to the storm protection benefits it would offer both to public and private properties. He asked if the people in support of Larry Albright would be willing to reconsider different types of easements or construction permits? This would be sacrificing Federal money and making it up with private assessments. The history of these projects are that they would be funded by these private assessments.

Mayor Hughes commented on Federal funding. He is not an advocate of having the Federal government intervene in their local affairs. The Federal government has a National Beach Renourishment Program, which is a cost sharing program, with State and Local government. It is our tax money.

Bert Lindsey at 3720 Estero came forward and expressed his concern for the uncertainty. He does not have much certainty in what is being proposed and is concerned they will end up with a worse situation than they have currently. Most people are happy with the beach as it is. He is a person who is always in favor of change and he adamantly opposes this. He is also concerned that a bar may form offshore similar to the situation that has happened on Marco Island.

Steve Keen can take a look at the Marco situation and review the reports. He does not see the likelihood that this would happen.

Jean Gottlieb who lives at 50 Aberdeen Ave. commented that they have had their home since 1955. She has watched the beach breathe. Some years it is big and some years it is small. For the last two or three years it has been big. She has a PHD in English and asked exactly what a borrow area means? They are taking sand permanently and not returning it. They are happy with what they have. It was responded that it is a construction industry name. They do expect the holes to fill in slowly over time. They are being borrowed for decades.

Mayor Hughes asked Steve for his reaction to having the southern boundary terminate at Sterling? If this is feasible he asked how many specific properties would this eliminate? He replied that he would have to count up the exact number. He is not fundamentally opposed to doing nothing. If the Town would like to change their position they should be told and will adjust accordingly. He would not be supportive of any modification in part that would create an instability in another portion of the project. If they stop at Sterling this will impact the beach further to the north. He would have to get input based on the engineering data. The Federal government would have to be notified of the change and review it to decide if this would be acceptable. This would drop them back several steps and is not a simple matter.

Bill Whitaker from 1000 Estero Blvd. came forward and commented that it took him 30 seconds to sign his easement. He expressed his concerns of a storm coming through and damaging the present beach. He feels that fishing will not be an issue if this happen. The whole purpose of this project is for storm protection. They are way overdue and a storm will happen.

Bob Young lives at 2088 Estero Blvd. and has not yet made his decision. Most concerns are not regarding the renourishment, but the easement. He disagrees with Bill because 12% of the benefit of the protection is for storm protection. 88% is recreational. He does not feel that he can sell this to other owners.

Dr. Hubank who lives at 2088 Estero Blvd. would like a clarification on one of the pictures shown today. The picture is the isolated body of water in front of the owner who did not sign an easement. He asked if this same situation would take place on their beach? Steve responded that he was not involved in making the decision. This decision would have to be made locally.

Ted Reckwerdt lives at 30 Gulf Beach Drive. He has been on the beach since 1949. He has been through quite a few storms. He referred to the aerial photo and directed their attention to the contour line. Steve responded that they have another survey and it is called the erosion control line. This will be the property line.

Ted went on to comment that as property owners they would like to know where the line that they own to is. Steve responded that the erosion control is legally described and will be recorded in the public record as part of this process.

Jim Moody at 2706 Estero Blvd. speaks on behalf for his two adjacent property owners as well. They are having issues with permanency of the easement. What guarantee do they have if they give up a permanent easement to the County that in the future they will not use if for other structures or removal of foliage? Mayor Hughes responded that they cannot go beyond the language of the easement.

Joellyn Reckwerdt referred to a map and pointed out the direction of the easement. Steve responded that the easement is everything toward the water from the pink line.

Jackie Lavalley at 8222 Estero came forward and commented that everyone has stated that the beach has improved. She has watched her next-door neighbor lose 45 feet of his property in the last 4 years. The south end needs renourishment. She asked if they would be filling in and closing the bird sanctuary and channel in front of their house. If the channel is not closed in they will not get any renourishment. Steve responded that they will not be allowed to close off the little flushing channel. It is State property and it has been designated as critical wildlife habitat, and they will make sure that it is not closed off. He would be happy to look at her area specifically.

Joan Morodow at 4100 Estero had not heard of this until they arrived back in November. She agrees with most people present today. It is not clear and they are not sure how much they will have to give up. After attending two meetings she is against giving the easement. She would like to know how many people are for or against the project? Or can this be done? Mayor Hughes responded that a survey has not been done. The Beach Renourishment Program effects the entire island. This not just for benefit for the people receiving the renourishment.

Councilman Reynolds responded that 30% of the people have signed and 70% have not. This should give her an idea to the answer to her question.

Larry Jones is not a resident, but has been coming down to Fort Myers Beach since he was 3 years old. He and his brother have purchased property and the reasons that they purchased are numerous. He feels that it is important that they do not change the way people are presently enjoying the beach. He asked if the beach environment

will be the same or even similar to what it is now? He commended the Council for trying to proceed with a worthwhile project. He asked if this type of project had been done in the 1060's would it have helped the island during Donna? Steve responded that he does not have Donna's parameters off the top of his head. This type of project provides sacrificial sand, so that when you are in a storm this sand is eaten up by the waves.

Bob Nunn from Island Shores came forward and commented that their beach is in perfect shape and they do not want any changes. He feels that they should give up the Fed funds, reduce the scope and fix only the portion of beach that needs it.

VII. PUBLIC COMMENT

Paul Sheenburger came forward and commented that he had requested about the flood drains on the roadway on Estero Blvd. He is told that this is County money. There are sewers that are blocked completely by sand and he wonders if anything can be done about this? Mayor Hughes responded that they will check into this.

Bert Lindsey commented that when he first came down he really enjoyed the beach. Since he has been here dogs are now allowed to roam the beaches. If you would like to promote tourism you do not want dogs leaving their residue behind. The owners are not being good citizens. He feels that it is a black eye on the community. Mayor Hughes feels that they are trying to address this. Deputy Town Manager Gucciardo has been working with the County. Random patrols have started to take place.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 12:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Shannon Miller
Transcribing Secretary