

**FORT MYERS BEACH
TOWN COUNCIL MEETING
WORKSHOP
NOVEMBER 13, 2000
NationsBank, Council Chambers
2523 Estero Boulevard
FORT MYERS BEACH, FLORIDA**

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting of November 13, 2000, was opened by Mayor Daniel Hughes at 9:05 a.m.
Council members present at the meeting: Terry Cain, Anita Cereceda, Daniel Hughes, Ray Murphy and Garr Reynolds.

Members absent from meeting: None.

Town Staff present: Pam Houck, Town Attorney Richard Roosa.

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

All assembled recited the Pledge of Allegiance.

III. SWEARING IN OF NEWLY ELECTED COUNCIL MEMBERS

MOTION: Moved by Ray Murphy and seconded by Anita Cereceda to approve the resolution of the Town of Fort Myers Beach certifying the results of the election, Candidate for Seat 1 and Candidate for Seat 2, declaration and providing effective date. Adopted unanimously.

Terry Cain and Dan Hughes were sworn in as council members.

IV. PUBLIC COMMENT ON AGENDA ITEMS

None.

V. PUBLIC HEARING: CASE NO. CPA2000-00001. CAPTAIN INVESTMENTS, INC., IN REF. TO CAPTAIN'S BAY EAST. This property is located at 22676 Island Pines Way.

Ex parte communications: Councilwoman Cain had a meeting with one of the gentlemen. Vice Mayor Murphy met with several of the applicants.

a) Administrative interpretation of the Comprehensive Plan of whether Phase IV 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.

Applicant's Representative:

Grady Minor, a registered professional engineer in the state of Florida and an authorized agent for the owner and developer of the matter before us, was sworn in. Mr. Minor said that while speaking with Pam Houck they learned of an error in the Town's land use map. He handed out some aerial photos.

Pam Houck, service delivery coordinator, advised that Mr. Grady had shown us the maps that accurately reflect the wetland line. She has reviewed the property with Rick Joyce and they have found that there clearly is an error in the designation of this wetland and recommend that it be reclassified to mixed residential. Two recommended conditions are on page 204 of her staff report of April 18. Condition 1 requires that this phase must be reviewed by South Florida Water Management District before proceeding with the development; Condition 2 requires that

development approval should be amended to require stabilization of the slopes, and that would be through the development order process prior to them continuing with this project. It is Ms. Houck's understanding that the applicant is agreeable to both conditions.

Public Input:

Laverne Johnson, president of Back Bay Health & Racquet Club, advised she has been at this property since 1984. Pam Houck explained the mixed-use category for her. She advised that the developers would not be building in the wetlands.

Larry Drevous wished to know if there was water in the area if that would that make it wetlands. Pam Houck gave the definition of a wetland as it is described in our Comprehensive Plan.

MOTION: Moved by Ray Murphy and seconded by Anita Cereceda to clarify the apparent administrative error of wetlands vs. uplands.

Discussion:

Councilwoman Cain felt that this particular area was deemed an upland area since it has dry, mature Australian pines on it. She has no idea when it became designated upland but her concern was that the salt flats next to that area would be touched, and she was told that they would not. Asked if there was a way to preserve that in the motion, Mayor Hughes said he knows we have ordinances that would not allow it. It should be shown on the record that the LPA unanimously recommended that this change from wetlands to mixed residential and Mayor Hughes said he would ask Vice Mayor Murphy if he wants to incorporate the findings of the LPA into that resolution.

MOTION: Moved by Ray Murphy and seconded by Anita Cereceda to adopt the resolution to change from the wetlands category to mixed residential under the Land Development Code. Passed unanimously.

b) Determination that the building height of 80 feet (as measured from the base flood elevation to the top of the wall) in Phase IV of Captain's Bay is deemed consistent with the Comprehensive Plan as set forth in Chapter 15.

Greg Minor advised staff had been informed they would be obtaining building permits for two 8-story buildings over one floor of parking to finish out Captain's Bay. There are 64 units left. They were told that the Town's new plan limited height to two stories. (Voice becomes inaudible at this point.)

Mr. Minor stated that we have a valid development order now from Lee County and he thinks we have a vested right to this development and our next step is to apply to the county building department for a building permit for the last two buildings with 8 stories over parking.

Councilwoman Cain asked that as we page through the years -- '86, '91, '94 is she being told that the height regulations would be determined upon what the permit would say at that time for the height restrictions. Greg Minor stated that during those years this community was shown as urban in the Lee County Comp Plan and the urban community allows 95 feet of height as long as setbacks are increased from the property line, and that's always measured from the flood elevation to either the mean of a pitched roof or the top of a parapet.

Neale Montgomery suggested we look at the supplemental staff report given to the LPA on October 4 where there is a discussion about Ordinance 72-9. This was really the controlling document that said for every foot you went up you had to come in, and that really stayed in effect until the city changed its regulations. There really wasn't a varying regulation in height from '72 on. The Beach's Comp Plan recognizes that we have regulations that change, but

it recognizes that if we look at 15-2 as our Comp Plan there are circumstances where development expectations may conflict with the Plan.

Councilman Reynolds said he doesn't remember mention of a master plan that was approved by the county. Mr. Minor said a very specific site plan was approved. They didn't call it a master plan but a site plan.

County Staff Input:

Pam Houck noted that this is a very complicated issue. But what it boils down to is that this project was vested through a F0015 approval as referenced throughout her staff report. F0015 was adopted by the board of county commissioners as a site plan review policy, and that policy implemented a process whereby an applicant would submit a site plan like the one before us and it was reviewed for rezoning, engineering -- all the aspects of development -- and was adopted. It was a much simpler process than our land development code today. The F0015 plan is not in the county records. In the county files is a plan similar to it and does not reflect time. Height is confusing until you actually get to the '99 amendments.

Mayor Hughes noted that the original number of units permitted was 193 and that was vested back in the 1980s. He was told that there were 64 units remaining to be built. It was ascertained that in 1992 for Phase III there were five stories over parking. The two actions in March and December of '99 just covered Phase IV. and that's when the developer went from the five stories to eight stories but with no change in the maximum height. Height was not an issue because there was plenty of land to provide the setback for the height, nor was height an issue in the vesting determination that was done by the county when they adopted their Comprehensive Plan What actually became the real issues of this case was after the Town adopted its height limitation in '97 and when the county in error in '99 amended the two site plans to 5 stories over two stories of parking and then the increase in stories within the same height. At the LPA it was determined based on information that Mr. Minor brought before them that 5 stories over parking or 79.1 feet was the correct height for the buildings. Ms. Houck's recommendation had been that it was inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan. Mayor Hughes asked Ms. Houck what she considered the height limitation to be. Her reply was 25 feet above flood elevation, allowing them about two stories or 41 feet. The 79.1 feet was the allowed height prior to the adoption of county's code. The LPA felt that due to the vesting and the monies expended that they were entitled to that. This would give them 5 or 6 stories.

Public Input:

Laverne Johnson, president of Back Bay, said that 5 stories over parking are what they have now and that was developed in Phase III. She asked how tall the building would be. She was told that if there were 10-ft. ceilings, then they go up 10 feet per floor; if 8-ft. ceilings, then 8 feet per floor. They should calculate from the flood elevation to get the height of the building.

Mrs. Johnson wished to know if this was in compliance with the density. Mayor Hughes said he thinks the answer is if we reduce the height to the staff recommendation of only two stories over flood elevation, it would be impossible for them on the property available to build their 64 units. Then there would be an issue of deprivation of their vested rights, etc., on that.

We were told by Neale Montgomery that this has always been a mid-rise building and the question only came about when they went from 5 stories over two stories of parking and collapsed the size of the floors to the 8 stories over one story of parking. But, as pointed out, there was no change in the height. She would strongly urge us not to approve a two-story building that would deprive this property owner of its units, because that really doesn't leave them a lot of options. She would hope that the Council would look at their Comp Plan where it says that when you have situations of valid equitable estoppels that the Town can make decisions that are inconsistent with regulations that have come into effect after approval was granted. She would ask that we recognize the fact that this project has a long history of having been vested for

mid-rise units and to go ahead and uphold the approvals that have been granted.

Mayor Hughes told Neale Montgomery that her 7-page letter of opinion was excellently drafted. Equitable estoppels, however, is based on the history of what's been approved in the past. In the Bay Beach case they feel the county staff erroneously issued a development order and had already sold units in those buildings and expended considerable money and had binding contracts. Attorney Roosa didn't think the two cases could be compared because there were a lot of other issues involved. He also noted that the value of property is based on the number of units. When we adopted the Height Ordinance, there was a provision for exceptions for vested development. Because of the units involved here, this would meet that exception. He would caution against depriving them of developing the 64 units. And there is still the question of the height of those 5-story buildings which was never answered. Pam Houck said it was her understanding that 5 stories over parking is 79.1 feet. In the resolution it's 79.8 with one story of parking. There has been no clear tracking of height through the permitting process.

Councilwoman Cain disclosed that she had forgotten that she had had a phone call last year regarding this project from someone who had asked her if she knew about the development that was going to go on out there, and at that point in time she did not and they were very upset about it.

Public Input:

Nelson Pink said he didn't want to deprive these people of their right to build their 64 units, and he doesn't think that's the question before us at this time. The three buildings with five stories allow them their density. Apparently they're arguing over wanting a swimming pool. We should be thinking about what kind of island we'll be leaving our kids. None of us like the high-risers. None of us like the increased density. This developer can build his project and keep his density. We're talking about height restrictions only.

Carl Wagner is a resident of Captain's Bay South. He noted that there were no objections to height at the LPA meeting because the height wasn't really determined. It fluctuated anywhere from the 79.8, which exists now, to the statement made by Mr. Minor later on that the 8-story buildings would go 30 feet over that.

Mayor Hughes summarized that the LPA recommended a 5-story building over one-story of parking and we have the staff saying that our current height limitation of two-stories over parking should apply and to change it would be inconsistent with the plan. We also have the comments of our Town Attorney suggesting that if we adopt the latter alternative it could put us in a rather adverse situation in terms of potential litigation since it would deprive them of their right to utilize their entire 64 vested units.

Councilwoman Cereceda felt it would be helpful to determine whether or not the decisions made by Lee County Staff in March and December of '99 were valid or invalid. She personally says they were invalid, which takes her back to vesting at the previous level. By March of '99 our height ordinance had been put into place and our Comp Plan had been adopted so these particular amendments were done after the fact. Mayor Hughes and Councilwoman Cain agreed with her.

MOTION: Moved by Anita Cereceda and seconded by _____ to approve the resolution set before us that says that essentially the height will be limited to 79.8 feet and that the March and December '99 amendments were invalid.

Discussion:

Mayor Hughes asked Pam Houck what would be the distinction between the NGBD vs. the non-NGBD. Pam Houck said that that the NGBD is based on mean sea level. She would like for their engineer to give us the exact number in flood and how many feet in height. She has not seen that calculation. The 79.8 NGBD was based on the number given by the applicant. What that means in base flood elevation she doesn't know.

Mayor Hughes said he would prefer to go to the 5 stories over 1 story over parking. He thinks this is how they arrived at the 79.8. Pam said if he did that, make sure it's based on base flood elevation and not NGBD. Town Manager Segal-George asked if there wasn't also an issue on ceiling heights then. Ms. Houck said she didn't think so because they could build 8 ft., 10 ft. ceilings within that maximum height depending on what their product would be. You need to give a maximum number of feet.

Mayor Hughes asked what if we said maximum number five stories over one-story parking but in no event to exceed 79.8 feet. Pam Houck said that would be fine. He asked Councilwoman Cereceda if she would then consider amending her motion and she said she would.

MOTION: Moved by Anita Cereceda and seconded by Dan Hughes to adopt the resolution in the form presented by the staff but that we modify the LPA recommendation where the last sentence says that the LPA believes that a height of 79.8 feet NGBD is vested based on the information presented. Our finding and conclusion is that there should be a maximum height permitted to enable construction of units of five stories over one story of parking but in no event shall the height exceed 79.8 feet from the base flood elevation.

Discussion

Pam Houck said that's fine as long as we understand that it's the base flood elevation that gives them an additional 16 feet. Mayor Hughes said that if you add that 16 feet to our 79.8, we're up to the 96 feet. He thinks that what we intended is that the new buildings be the same height as the Phase III buildings and this is what he intended.

Mr. Minor explained that the flood elevation here happens to be 11 feet in GBD. That's how Lee County measures height. When he says that a building is going to be 95 or 96 feet, he means that that 95 or 96 starts at 11 feet. So really it would be 107 or 108 feet to either the top of a parapet or to the mean of the pitch. As regards parking, the first 4 feet of parking is below flood and then the next 4 feet of parking is above flood.

Councilwoman Cereceda withdrew her motion and Mayor Hughes withdrew his second.

MOTION: Moved by Anita Cereceda and seconded by Dan Hughes to approve the LPA resolution set before us that says that essentially the height will be limited to 79.8 feet and that the March and December '99 amendments were invalid.

Discussion:

Councilman Reynolds said he believed we have an ordinance that identifies the height of the building as three stories and no higher than 25 feet above flood level to the inside ceiling. And somehow we don't seem to pin ourselves down to what we spent a lot of money to have written for us. He thinks that somewhere along the way we're going to have to start looking at our ordinances and start living by them. If some of these changes indicated here have been done after our ordinances were in place, then he guesses that somehow we're going to have to say no

and we're going to have to live by our ordinance. Mayor Hughes said that he agreed that we've got ourselves in a situation of vested rights and obviously we would have a litigation situation if we tried to deprive them of the number of units. He doesn't feel we have anyone here who is really objecting to the height that's consistent with Phase III. Vice Mayor Murphy found it very insulting that someone would say we don't follow our ordinances when it's provided for in the ordinance as the vested rights and provisions that addressed that. Councilman Reynolds said there was no intent to insult anyone and that he was just reminding Council that we do have ordinances and guidelines to go by.

Motion passed with a 4-1 vote with Councilman Reynolds dissenting.

B T E A K -- 10 MINUTES

VI. EASEMENT AGREEMENT FOR LIGHTHOUSE INN

Attorney Roosa explained that this easement agreement will allow for utilities to be provided to property. It is his understanding that this will help to promote the underground electrical utilities, which is a long-range goal of the municipality. If the Town found that this was a sufficient public purpose, then it would be appropriate to approve this easement.

MOTION: Moved by Ray Murphy and seconded by Terry Cain for the approval of this easement agreement in regards to the Lighthouse Inn for the reasons stated by the Town Attorney.

Discussion:

Mayor Hughes questioned some of the language in the package. Attorney Roosa said some of that language was taken out. The language is limited to one ground-mounted transformer and two black volt preventors. Mayor Hughes asked if there was a height limitation on the size of the transformer and was advised by Attorney Roosa that there was no height limitation here and that he had no way of measuring that. Town Manager Segal-George advised we had nothing like that in our code but she could go to Bill Spikowski and see if we can find other jurisdictions that offer that.

Vice Mayor Murphy said he would amend the language to include some sort of language that says the transformers be the minimal height required by FPL with a preference toward lower

Mayor Hughes referred to the end of paragraph one where it advised that if the grantor agrees that if the rights granted be determined by the grantee to be insufficient, the grantor will grant to the grantee such further reasonable easements. It seemed to him that was unilateral if the grantee requested it and he thinks that should be mutual. He would like to see it read mutually determined by the parties before we're obligated to give up such further easements as they may request.

MOTION: Moved by Ray Murphy and seconded by Terry Cain for the approval of this easement agreement in regards to the Lighthouse Inn for the reasons stated by the Town Attorney but to see it read mutually determined by the grantor and the grantee before we're obligated to give up such further easements as they may request.

VII. DISCUSSION OF NEW YEAR'S EVE CELEBRATION: Robin Calabrese, Chamber committee chairperson.

Robin Calabrese handed us a 7-page proposal for the New Year's Eve celebration. The purpose of the proposal is to join the Town of Fort Myers Beach and the Beach Chamber of

Commerce in co hosting the sixth annual Town birthday and New Year's Eve celebration and conduct a community-based event for the residents and visitors of Fort Myers Beach on December 31 at 2:00 p.m. until 1:00 a.m. January 1. The Chamber's goal is threefold: conduct a safe and festive celebration; foster and encourage civic pride; provide for the establishment of an ongoing event by putting funds aside for the following years. The third page of the proposal has a diagram of how they would like to set up the celebration. Page 4 contains a breakdown of how they would like to make this a joint venture and the expenses. Ms. Calabrese also went over the other items in the proposal. She advised that the last page of the proposal states that if the Chamber exceeds their costs, they would like to share the profits with the Town at 10%, 25% and 65% respectively to the Chamber Foundation, the Town of Fort Myers Beach and the Greater Fort Myers Beach Chamber of Commerce.

Ms. Calabrese answered questions put to her by Council. She advised that if they did not get enough volunteer staff they would have to pay people to help out. She has no firm sponsorships yet. What they are looking for from the Town as far as taxpayer's money is \$18,000, which was taken from last year's budget. Finalized have been the sheriff's department, the fire department and Lee Tran. Vice Mayor Murphy did not care for the profit percentages given.

D. J. Petrocelli, Beach Chamber Chairman, said if we look at the expenses on the Town's side, we will have those expenses whether they are involved or not.

Asked was if other nonprofit groups would be able to come in and merchandise. The reply was that they haven't figured that out. Councilwoman Cereceda stated that last year every club and organization associated with Fort Myers Beach and any nonprofit organization outside of the Town who wanted to participate and come in and fund raise for their organization was invited to do so.

Vice Mayor Murphy felt we need to include fireworks. We also need to line up some sponsorships. Councilwoman Cereceda noted that Sun Stream had been incredibly generous. Also John Naylor at Best Western, and Sprint. She decried the fact that businesses in the area didn't donate.

Scott Gregory of the Chamber advised that they were asked as a Chamber to make this happen. If any part of the Town's expenses are taken out they cannot fund it because they don't have the money to do it. They have the time and the talent but not the cash. What they're looking for is \$18,746 to include the fireworks, the transportation and other governmental services and the cleanup. The only thing that could be negotiable is Taylor Rental and the stage if we have one.

Vice Mayor Murphy asked if we planned to have fireworks at every New Year's celebration. Fireworks costing \$10,000 are a big component of our budget. Councilman Reynolds said he didn't have a problem with this expenditure.

Profits Councilman Reynolds advised should be cut 50-50. Councilwoman Cereceda would like to see the profit sharing page eliminated. Also she's not sold on \$10,000 for fireworks. If we do this we're setting ourselves up for fireworks every year and that's a lot of money. Vice Mayor Murphy echoed this sentiment.

MOTION: Moved by Ray Murphy and seconded by _____ that we make an expenditure for New Year's Eve to include the \$1,200 for Lee Tran, the \$990 for Lee County Sheriff, \$1,200 for the Times Square cleanup, \$656 for the fire department, \$600 for waste management, \$3,000 for the band, \$1,100 for Taylor Rental if necessary.

Discussion

Robin Calabrese stated that this was the package that they were presenting and a key element was fireworks. They will be the big draw.

Motion fails for want of a second.

MOTION: Moved by Dan Hughes and seconded by that we accept the projected budget but that we request that the profit sharing be split 50-50 on the condition that the Town's expenditures be limited to those line items reflected in this projected budget.

Motion fails for want of a second.

Discussion:

Councilwoman Cereceda said she didn't believe that fireworks were the draw on New Year's Eve. New Year's Eve and the celebration of the Town's anniversary will occur with or without fireworks.

Vice Mayor Murphy advised that there would be no profit made for the Town, only a reduction in expenses. He feels as Town Manager Segal-George does -- just give the Chamber the money for what they need and avoid having to audit all these things.

Councilwoman Cain said she'd like to recommend that we could next year do a survey prior to this time of year on fireworks display and even the whole package.

MOTION: Moved by Dan Hughes and seconded by Garr Reynolds that we accept the projected budget but that we request that any profit be split 50-50 on the condition that the Town's expenditures be limited to those line items reflected in this projected budget.
Motion passes 3-2 with Anita Cereceda and Ray Murphy dissenting.

VIII. APPROVAL OF MOUND HOUSE EVENTS AND MAINTENANCE WORK.

Town Manager Segal-George advised that CELCAB is having a dedication ceremony for the Mound House on November 2 from 10:00 a.m. until about 2:00 p.m.

December 9 at 7:00 p.m. there will a presentation of Christmas carols with homemade cookies and chamber music.

December 10 at dusk the boat parade will proceed past the Mound House and the Pilot Club will feature their Luminaries.

December 12 Santa will arrive and will offer a short historical presentation on the historical Santa and will greet the island children.

December 21 -- the winter solstice -- an astronomy night is planned.

December 9, 10 and 12 parking will be restricted at the Mound House to handicapped guests.

This last Saturday Shawn Holiday had a docent-training program at the Mound House and he is planning on setting up another one.

Town Manager Segal-George advised that the house is beginning to deteriorate and that she is trying to get some basic maintenance done. She had experts from Archaeological Consultants, Inc., who are doing the Historic Structures report, come over. They said that with the wood deteriorating as it is, the best thing for them to do is to paint it the colors that it is right now. CELCAB recommended the same. When it is decided what year the house will represent, they can choose to repaint. Right now they are cleaning gutters. Ed is doing a minimal fix to the

swimming pool so that they can fill it and treat it so that it's not an eyesore. Also, both the porch area and the pool need to be rescreened. Ed is out getting bids on that right now. CELCAB has asked her to try and get information on a burglar alarm system and bring that back to them.

MOTION: Moved by Ray Murphy and seconded by Garr Reynolds for approval of the dates for events that CELCAB has brought forward and also the suggestions for the required maintenance that needs to be done on the house right now, including the screening, the painting, the pool repairs. It is also imperative that an alarm system be put in the house as discreetly as possible. Approved unanimously.

IX. APPROVAL OF BAYLAND DRAINAGE CONTRACT WITH ECT CONSULTING

Town Manager Segal-George advised that this came out of a meeting with the request that it come back to us as soon as possible. We need to know the cost to go in and study that problem as they have the same kind of drainage problems in that area that we find all over the island. This will be priority 9.

Councilman Reynolds objected to hiring an engineer to survey the job and then hiring a contractor to do the job. He felt that the contractor should hire an engineer.

Vice Mayor questioned whether Mr. Edenfield, a surveyor, had completed the jobs he had already been contracted to do and was brought up to date on his accomplishments by Pam Houck.

MOTION: Moved by Ray Murphy and seconded by Anita Cereceda to combine the two contracts: one for the engineering design for \$9,625 and \$2,750 for the surveyor.

Discussion:

Councilman Reynolds said he did not agree with the direction in which these projects are proceeding.

Motion passes 4-1 with Garr Reynolds dissenting.

Mayor Hughes said he'd like to notify the staff to send a copy of this memo to the people who were at that meeting and tell them that the Council approved the contracts at our meeting held today. Nancy Henenberger volunteered to deliver a copy of the memo to the neighborhood.

X. DISCUSSION OF TIMES SQUARE CLOCK

Pam Houck said that the clock was one of the items that was on the approved list from the Times Square Advisory Committee. They have found a clock at a cost of \$13,625. The committee wants the town crier system on the clock, which is an additional \$10,275, for a total of \$23,900 and have requested Council's approval. The money would come out of the grant.

MOTION: Moved by Ray Murphy and seconded by Anita Cereceda for the purchase of a clock at a cost of \$13,625 with a town crier for an additional \$10,275 for a total of \$23,900.

Discussion:

Councilwoman Cain asked for an explanation of the crier system. She was told it can play a tune, chime the hours. It can be programmed to do many many things. The volume can be raised and lowered. It can also be turned off.

The Advisory Committee according to Pam Houck prefers the Roman numerals.

Motion passes 4-1. Councilman Reynolds had left the meeting.

XI. PUBLIC COMMENT

A. NANCY HENENBERGER

Mrs. Henenberger thanked everyone.

Mayor Hughes said he understood that a flag had been ordered. He was told that Janeen will do a memo regarding it. The flag will be out front by the bench and will be tall with a light on it so that they won't have to take it down and put it up.

Town Manager Segal-George said that she and Shawn Holiday observed how bad the traffic was this weekend and this week they will start putting in place someone to direct on Friday, Saturday and Sunday. VOICE is not available yet and they will have to hire off-duty deputies to do it.

Asked about the status of CRAB, Town Manager Segal-George said that she heard that we had two more members who are from Bay Oaks. They may have enough members now to bring it in front of us and if so, they will bring it on the 20th.

Mayor Hughes recommended that when we have nominees for the vacancy next Monday that they be permitted to give a presentation not to exceed five minutes before the Council.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 12:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lorraine Calhoun
Transcribing Secretary

Items for Action November 13, 2000

1. Experts from Archaeological Consultants, Inc., who are doing the Historic Structures report, said that with the wood on the Mound House deteriorating as it is, the best thing to do is to paint it the colors that it is right now. CELCAB recommended the same. When it is decided what year the house will represent, they can choose to repaint. Right now they are cleaning gutters. Ed is doing a minimal fix to the swimming pool so that they can fill it and treat it so that it's not an eyesore. Also, both the porch area and the pool need to be rescreened. Ed is out getting bids on that right now. CELCAB has asked Town Manager Segal-George to try and get information on a burglar alarm system and bring that back to them.
2. Mayor Hughes said he'd like to notify the staff to send a copy of this memo to the people who were at the meeting regarding the Bayland Drainage Contract with ECT Consulting and tell them that the Council approved the contracts at our meeting held today. Nancy Henenberger volunteered to deliver a copy of the memo to the neighborhood.
3. A flag has been ordered that will be out in front of Town Hall by the bench and will be tall with a light on it so that they won't have to take it down and put it up.
4. Town Manager Segal-George said that she and Shawn Holiday observed how bad the traffic was this weekend and this week they will start putting in place someone to direct on Friday, Saturday and Sunday. VOICE is not available yet and they will have to hire off-duty deputies to do it.
5. Asked about the status of CRAB, Town Manager Segal-George said that she heard that we had two more members who are from Bay Oaks. They may have enough members now to bring it in front of us and if so, they will bring it on the 20th.