

MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING OF THE VALDOSTA CITY COUNCIL
5:30 P.M., THURSDAY, MARCH 5, 2009
COUNCIL CHAMBERS, CITY HALL

OPENING CEREMONIES

Mayor John J. Fretti called the regular meeting of the Valdosta City Council to order at 5:30 p.m. Council members present were: Sonny Vickers, Tim Carroll, Alvin Payton, Jr., Willie Head, Jr., and James Wright. Councilman John Eunice arrived at 5:45 p.m. and Councilman Robert Yost was absent. The invocation was given by Rev. Richard Hart, Trinity Presbyterian Church, followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

AWARDS AND PRESENTATIONS

PRESENTATION OF THE MARCH, 2009 EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH AWARD

Mayor Fretti entertained a motion for the March, 2009 Employee of the Month Award.

A **MOTION** by Councilman Carroll, seconded by Councilman Payton, was unanimously adopted (5-0) to approve the March, 2009 Employee of the Month Award.

Mayor Fretti presented the March, 2009 Employee of the Month Award to Jack Carter (Utilities Department).

Jack Carter began his employment with the City of Valdosta in June, 1974 as a Foreman in the Water Distribution Department and was promoted to the position of Superintendent in April, 1975 which is the position he currently holds. As Superintendent, Jack is responsible for supervising all aspects of the operation and maintenance of the water distribution and sewer collection systems for the Utilities Department. This year, Jack will reach a milestone with the City by celebrating 35 years of service. During this time, he has witnessed many changes too numerous to detail here; however, the one constant has been his complete dedication to the job and the citizens of Valdosta. It is not uncommon to find Jack out at night coordinating Department efforts with contractors to complete a project on time or on site during a violent storm to ensure all systems are functioning properly and handling any emergency issues as they arise. It has been said that Jack is not the type of employee you have to call in. He is always "just there." Recently, a new Utilities Director came aboard and Jack was quick to share his knowledge and expertise of our system. This was extremely helpful in ensuring a smooth transition while maintaining the high level of service expected by citizens. In reference to this, his Department Head wrote, "I am amazed at the time Jack spends after normal work hours to keep things working and get the job at hand done in the most efficient and effective manner." Throughout his career, Jack has been one of those employees who makes it happen but is many times never seen in the public limelight. His quiet devotion and dedication have ensured the citizens of Valdosta continue to receive the high standard of service they expect. For these reasons and many others, the City of Valdosta recognized Jack Carter as Employee of the Month.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the February 19, 2009 Regular Meeting of the Valdosta City Council were approved by unanimous consent (6-0) of the Council.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD

There were no citizens to be heard.

ORDINANCE NO. 2009-6, AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE VALDOSTA LAND DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS ORDINANCE

Consideration of an ordinance for a Conditional Use Permit to accommodate a small-scale used car lot within the Inner Perimeter Road Corridor Overlay District as requested by Robbie DeLoach (File No. CU-2009-01). The parcel is located at 3154 N. Oak St. Extension and consists of 1.81 acres. The Planning Commission reviewed this request at their February regular meeting and recommended approval (9-0) with the following conditions: (i) no more than 15 cars may be for sale at any one time, (ii) no sticker, signs, balloons, flags, pennants, or other items may be placed on the vehicles (as required by State law, the applicant may display the required ‘Sold As Is’ notification provided this notification is no larger than 8 ½ x 11 inches), (iii) vehicles must be situated in marked parking spaces in a traditional manner and shall not be parked in such a manner as to appear to be on display.

Anne-Marie Wolff, Planning and Zoning Administrator, stated that the applicant is requesting a Conditional Use Permit to accommodate a small-scale used car lot within the Inner Perimeter Road Corridor Overlay District. In order to limit the visual impact of a car dealership on the surrounding gateway, Staff recommended the following conditions apply to the proposed use with Item (3) changed from what was in the Transmittal Letter: (1) No more than 15 cars may be for sale at any one time, (2) No sticker, signs, balloons, flags, pennants, or other items may be placed on the vehicles. As required by State law, the applicant may display the required ‘Sold As Is’ notification, provide this notification is no larger than 8 ½ by 11 inches. (3) Vehicles must be situated in marked parking spaces in a traditional manner. There is plenty of room in the front of the property to place the cars and the adjacent properties are all commercial in nature with Highway-Commercial zoning. The area in the back of the property would be used for an existing auto maintenance or minor repair business that the applicant has. The property is located within a Community Activity Center which makes the requested use appropriate. The main reason a Conditional Use is required is so that Staff and Council has an opportunity to review the impact of the use on surrounding properties as we attempt to beautify and enhance some of the main gateway corridors. Based on the fact that the proposed use meets the Conditional Use Permit Criteria, is consistent with the surrounding zoning and land uses, consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, and provided the above three conditions are met, Staff recommended approval of a Conditional Use Permit for a small-scale auto sales business. The Planning Commission reviewed this request at their February 23, 2009 regular meeting and recommended approval (9-0) with the following conditions: (1) No more than 15 cars may be for sale at any one time (2) No sticker, signs, balloons, flags, pennants, or other items may be placed on the vehicles. As required by State law, the applicant may display the required ‘Sold As Is’ notification, provide this notification is no larger than 8 ½ by 11 inches, and (3) Vehicles must be situated in marked parking spaces in a traditional manner and shall not be parked in such a manner as to appear to be on display.

No one spoke in favor of the request.

No one spoke in opposition to the request.

A MOTION by Councilman Carroll, seconded by Councilman Payton, was unanimously adopted (6-0) to enact Ordinance No. 2009-6, an Ordinance for a Conditional Use Permit to accommodate a small-scale used car lot within the Inner Perimeter Road Corridor Overlay District as requested by Robbie DeLoach with the following three conditions: (1) No more than 15 cars may be for sale at any one time (2) No sticker, signs, balloons, flags, pennants, or other items may be placed on the vehicles. As required by State law, the applicant may display the required ‘Sold As Is’ notification, provide this notification is no larger than 8 ½ by 11 inches, and (3) Vehicles must be situated in marked parking spaces in a traditional manner, the complete text of which will be found in Ordinance Book XI.

ORDINANCE NO. 2009-7, AN ORDINANCE FOR A TEXT AMENDMENT TO THE VALDOSTA LAND DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS ORDINANCE

Consideration of an ordinance for a Text Amendment to the Land Development Regulations (LDR) for the following sections: (i) Chapter 214, Standards Applying to All Districts, Section 214.11, Outdoor Lighting of

Parking Lots, and (ii) Chapter 222, Off-Street Parking Standards, Section 222-2, Parking Space Requirements, Section 222-3, Reduction in Minimum Parking Requirements, Section 222-7, Construction and Dimensional Requirements of Parking Areas, Section 222-10, Lighting in Parking Lots, Section 222-11, Parking Vehicles in Residential Districts, and Section 222-12, Residential Parking in Overlay District as requested by the City of Valdosta (File No. VA-2009-05). The purpose of the Text Amendment is to provide clarification and eliminate redundancy. The Planning Commission reviewed this request at their February regular meeting and recommended approval (9-0 vote).

Anne-Marie Wolff, Planning and Zoning Administrator, stated that there are some minor changes to Chapter 222, Off-Street Parking Standards, Section 222-2, Parking Space Requirements, and the number of parking spaces required for primarily Multi-Family and Loft Dwelling Units will be changed from 1.5 vehicles per unit to 2. The other change on the chart is a shifting of information that was previously there in order to make it easier for the user to read. In Section 222-3, Reduction in Minimum Parking Requirements, the review authority will be changed from the City Engineer to the Director of the Community Development Department since that Department is more concerned about the number of spaces while the Engineering Department reviews the design of those spaces. They are also reducing the amount of parking required between the hours of 6:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. on weekdays for a place of worship when they are utilizing the shared parking ratio formula from 50% to 10%. In Section 222-7, Construction and Dimensional Requirements of Parking Areas, a major provision they are adding is the provision for unpaved parking which will allow those uses that are used three or fewer times throughout the week to utilize unpaved parking. This would be non-residential uses and primarily churches would be utilizing this provision. At such time the unpaved parking spaces degrade due to wear and tear and cause an impact on the stormwater system then the property owner will be required to provide either an impervious or pervious material to eliminate the impact on the storm drain system. In Section 222-10, Lighting in Parking Lots, verbiage was moved from Section 214-11 and replaced Items (a) and (b). Item (c) was clarified with verbiage from Section 214-11. In Section 222-11, Parking Vehicles in Residential Districts, they are also adding clarification for parking standards and where non-motor vehicles can be placed such as trailers associated with a lawn care business or a band. Before the provisions they could not be placed in the front yard and this will be changed so that they can be in the front yard; however, they should be on an improved surface and that surface area should not exceed 25% of the front yard area. The requirement in Item (b) should read “25% of the total square footage of the area between the front of the house and the right-of-way.” The final change was in Section 222-12, Residential Parking in Overlay District. The provision regarding the maximum number of vehicles for Single-Family detached and Single-Family attached properties was changed from four to five. When you take an average family of two adults and possibly two or three high school students that are of driving age then five would be more appropriate than four. Councilman Carroll stated that Item (c) under that same section would need to be clarified. Anne-Marie Wolff stated that was correct and should be changed to read “25% of the total square footage of the area between the front of the house and the right-of-way.”

No one spoke in favor of the request.

No one spoke in opposition to the request.

A MOTION was made by Councilman Carroll to approve the Text Amendments to the Land Development Regulations (LDR) as presented as well as the two noted changes that need to be made in regards to the maximum number of vehicles and the definition of the area for improvement. Councilman Payton seconded the motion. The motion was adopted (5-1) with Councilman Vickers voting in opposition to enact Ordinance No. 2009-7, the complete text of which will be found in Ordinance Book XI.

ORDINANCE NO. 2009-8, AN ORDINANCE FOR A TEXT AMENDMENT TO THE VALDOSTA LAND DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS ORDINANCE

Consideration of an ordinance for a Text Amendment to the Land Development Regulations (LDR) for the following sections: (i) Chapter 328, Landscape, Buffers, and Screening, Section 328-1, Location and Width of Transitional Buffers, (ii) Section 328-2, Transitional Buffers, (iii) Section 328-3, Supplemental Plantings in Transitional Buffers, (iv) Section 328-4, Non-Vegetative Screening, (v) Section 328-20, Tree Protection Standards,

(vi) Section 328-24, Vehicular Use Area Landscape Requirements, and (vii) Section 328-33, Inspections as requested by the City of Valdosta (File No. VA-2009-06). The purpose of the Text Amendment is to provide clarification to the tree planting requirements within prescribed buffers and remove redundant and unnecessary requirements. The Planning Commission reviewed this request at their February regular meeting and recommended approval (8-1 vote).

Anne-Marie Wolff, Planning and Zoning Administrator, stated that Chapter 328 of the new Land Development Regulations provides regulations for tree protection, landscaping and transitional buffers. The proposed amendments provide clarification to the tree planting requirements within prescribed buffers as well as to other provisions within the Chapter. The major change would be to add a chart for the specific number of plantings required in a transitional buffer which would remove some of the subjectivity in determining what a sufficient buffer is and instead allows it to be a quantifiable amount. The amendments also remove redundant and unnecessary requirements and also adding a requirement that prior to any tree removal or site disturbance that the developer contact the City Arborist to have a vegetative inspection completed. This is already a requirement and is nothing new but they are adding that verbiage in a separate section of the Chapter to again emphasize that the inspection needs to occur prior to tree removal or land disturbance. The other minor changes have to do with the size of shrubs when they are planted and will change it from 3 feet to 18 inches to make it easier for people to find that size shrub and also permitting light posts and underground utilities in landscaped islands rather than prohibiting it. The requirement for parking spaces have to be 50 feet from a canopy tree will be reduced and can now be 50 feet from tree. Staff found the request consistent with the goals and policies of Comprehensive Plan and recommends approval. The Planning Commission reviewed this request at their February 23, 2009 regular meeting and recommended approval (8-1) of this request.

No one spoke in favor of the request.

No one spoke in opposition to the request.

A MOTION by Councilman Payton, seconded by Councilman Carroll, was unanimously adopted (6-0) to follow the recommendation of Staff and enact Ordinance No. 2009-8, an Ordinance for a Text Amendment to the Land Development Regulations (LDR) for the following sections: (i) Chapter 328, Landscape, Buffers, and Screening, Section 328-1, Location and Width of Transitional Buffers, (ii) Section 328-2, Transitional Buffers, (iii) Section 328-3, Supplemental Plantings in Transitional Buffers, (iv) Section 328-4, Non-Vegetative Screening, (v) Section 328-20, Tree Protection Standards, (vi) Section 328-24, Vehicular Use Area Landscape Requirements, and (vii) Section 328-33, Inspections as requested by the City of Valdosta, the complete text of which will be found in Ordinance Book XI.

ORDINANCE NO. 2009-9, AN ORDINANCE FOR A TEXT AMENDMENT TO THE VALDOSTA LAND DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS ORDINANCE

Consideration of an ordinance for Text Amendments to the Land Development Regulations (LDR) for Chapter 218, Use Regulations, Section 218-1, Table of Permitted Uses as requested by the City of Valdosta (File No. VA-2009-07). The purpose of the Text Amendment is to expand the districts in which Transitional Housing Facilities and Boarding Houses could locate. The Planning Commission reviewed this request at their February regular meeting and recommended approval (9-0 vote).

Anne-Marie Wolff, Planning and Zoning Administrator, stated that this Text Amendment addresses transitional housing facilities and boarding houses. A transitional housing facility is defined as a building or buildings in which is provided long-term but not permanent living accommodations for one or more persons who have no permanent residence and are in need of long-term housing assistance, and in which may also be provided meals and social services including counseling and substance abuse recovery assistance. The other type of housing that could possibly be considered special needs would still be appropriate as a regular Single-Family use. They are not concerned with the placement of those and would be treated as a regular Single-Family Residential use. A boarding house is a building, other than a hotel or bed and breakfast, where, for compensation, meals or lodging and meals, are provided for one or more persons who are not part of the operator's family. In comparison to the old

regulations, it was Staff's recommendation that rooming and boarding houses be permitted as a matter of right in R-M which is already the case and in R-P. The reasoning for that is that R-P zoning also allows for Multi-Family development. For transitional housing facilities, Staff had originally recommended that they be permitted as a Conditional Use in R-M and a Permitted Use in R-P. There was some discussion at the Work Session about allowing transitional houses as a Conditional Use in R-6 as well; however, limiting them to R-M and R-P would be more appropriate and would eliminate some of the challenges that may come with approving transitional housing facilities. Councilman Head inquired as to why Ms. Wolff would not want them in R-6. Ms. Wolff stated that it is challenging and if they were offered as a Conditional Use in R-6 then a future Text Amendment would be recommended which added supplemental regulations that state they would still be limited to no more than three people because every other residential property in R-6 is limited to a maximum of three unrelated individuals. Council would need to have some clear reasoning as to why they would waive that requirement for a transitional housing facility rather than waive it for a regular house of three or more unrelated individuals. Also the chances of a transitional housing facility surviving with three individuals is pretty slim due to the cost associated with it based on conversations with individuals interested in having a transitional housing facility. Councilman Carroll stated, for clarification purposes, that under rooming and boarding houses, they had discussed allowing it as a Conditional Use under C-N and C-D. Anne-Marie Wolff stated that if it was added as a Conditional Use under C-N then that would be a change to take place this evening because C-D is already allowed. Mayor Fretti stated that Council would have the discretion to add that tonight.

Deborah Franklin, 3418 Ashurst Drive, stated that she was a founding member of A Better Life Experience, Inc., and their mission is to assist women who have issues with addiction. They are in the process of founding a transitional house and they are regulated to six women which makes the cost high and they are having to seek local financial support to provide these services on a sliding scale basis. Ms. Franklin stated that they have six beds and she has been contacted by 18 women so they will be looking in the near future to start a second facility. Mayor Fretti inquired as to where this type of facility would be allowed by a matter of right and where would it be conditional. Councilman Carroll stated that R-P zoning allows it as a matter of right. Ms. Franklin stated that at the current time R-P is the only zoning for placement of this facility. Anne-Marie Wolff stated that another option would be to remove the Conditional Use and make it as a matter of right in R-M which is the Multi-Family District. Ms. Wolff stated that in the LDR, R-M is a new District so there is not a lot undeveloped R-M zoning in the City right now. Councilman Vickers inquired as to how this would affect the women on Oak Street near Charlton Street. Anne-Marie Wolff stated that she was not certain as to the zoning of that property. Larry Hanson stated that was a half-way house. Anne-Marie Wolff stated that in the LDR, homeless shelters are treated the same as a transitional facility. Councilman Vickers stated that we need to remember that everyone needs somewhere to live and at times we may find ourselves in an awkward situation. There is a need for a women's shelter and it seems like we are locking them out. Anne-Mari Wolff stated that there is a significant amount of R-P zoning throughout the City and there is also a lot of R-6 zoning. With the LDR, it was the intention to lend some additional protection to R-6 Single-Family neighborhood so it does become a policy question as to how many opportunities we want for the placement of homeless shelters since they can be a larger size. The State also has provisions for a facility in which drug addiction treatment will be provided and requires an additional six-month delay between Public Hearings so having these to be located as a matter of right in R-P means that they can offer that treatment without having to go through a six-month delay. Based on the City Attorney's opinion, a Conditional Use, since it is related to the zoning of the property would trigger that six-month State law delay. Our goal was to balance the impact of these on the established neighborhoods in a place where R-P is already a mix between Single-Family, Multi-Family, and offices. Councilman Head stated that he felt the place on Charlton Street was a transitional facility rather than a homeless shelter because a homeless shelter is a place that keeps people long term and that facility is transitional. Anne-Marie Wolff stated that they may want to look at providing some better delineation between homeless shelters and transitional housing facilities in the LDR. They could add in the supplemental regulations that a transitional housing facility in these zoning districts is permitted a maximum of this many people which is what it is for residential and then look at changing it for non-residential districts and keep the reference for a homeless shelter. Councilman Vickers stated that in the past they have had boarding houses where several people had rooms and stayed there for a long period of time. These meet a need for people in the community. Mayor Fretti stated that the LDR is no more strict on this than before the LDR. Anne-Marie Wolff stated that anything pre-existing would be non-conforming and the R-6 district use to be Multi-Family, Single-Family, and was a catch all and they were trying to clean it up so those established residential Single-Family neighborhoods could have some protection.

We realize that we still need to accommodate for those other uses. There have been a lot of people take older houses and try to convert them into a boarding house and is not always the safest thing. It has had some impact on Single-Family neighborhoods and that is why they suggested moving that from R-6. Councilman Head stated that we need to make provisions for them because there is a definite need for them in the community. Councilman Eunice stated that as a matter of right the only zoning district that both of them are allowed in is R-P. Anne-Marie Wolff stated that was correct. Councilman Eunice inquired as to whether any other zoning district that a house like that was zoned in would have to come before Council for approval. Anne-Marie Wolff stated that a Conditional Use was for the transitional housing facility in R-M and a rooming and boarding house would be a permitted right in R-M also. Council will give approval for a Conditional Use. This is a fairly conservative Text Amendment and perhaps if Council could adopt this and then Staff could look at some other districts where they would be appropriate also. Councilman Vickers inquired about tabling the request. Anne-Marie Wolff stated that transitional homes were a permitted use in R-P prior to the adoption of the LDR. Ms. Franklin has been working very patiently with the City for the past several months to get a transitional home up and going and she has some things in the balance. Ms. Franklin's current zoning is R-P and if she had been before in Council in December then she would not have had to go through anything as she has now. There is still time to add this the next cycle of cases to come back before Council at the April Council meeting. Mayor Fretti encouraged Ms. Franklin to check with the Planning and Zoning Department if she was going to open another facility in the future to see where it would be allowed by permitted uses. Ms. Franklin stated that she had found the property first where the facility would be permitted and by the time she could get things approved for a business license the LDR came into effect on January 1st. For future consideration, they would like to have a transitional housing facility in a neighborhood where it is like a home. It is not a treatment program and is a short term living arrangement. They would like to have it adaptable to the environment that they will transition to. Mayor Fretti stated that Council has had that discussion and they are of differing opinions on that. Ms. Franklin stated that they have a deposit at stake and if this Text Amendment does not pass they will have a substantial impact.

No one spoke in opposition to the request.

Councilman Carroll stated that zoning was never intended to be punitive but it is by its nature restrictive and therefore it serves the community in both its life and quality of life as well as in its growth and that is the role that it plays. There are currently several good options for the types of homes that Ms. Franklin is looking to develop as well as others that are zoned appropriate for these types of developments. Most of which that have been mentioned tonight are already in districts that are zoned properly for that type of development. If we can find through Staff other zoning districts that it would be appropriate for these types of uses then we will bring it back and amend the Text Amendment to allow it in those districts as well; however, what we have before us has very good options that we can move forward with today and allow Ms. Franklin to get her project going and at the same time provide others the opportunity.

A MOTION by Councilman Carroll, seconded by Councilman Vickers, was unanimously adopted (6-0) to approve the request as presented with those corrections as noted by Staff and enact Ordinance No. 2009-9, an Ordinance for Text Amendments to the Land Development Regulations (LDR) for Chapter 218, Use Regulations, Section 218-1, Table of Permitted Uses as requested by the City of Valdosta which includes boarding houses allowed in an R-P zoning district as a matter of right and in a C-N zoning district as a Conditional Use and transitional housing facilities allowed in an R-P zoning district as a matter of right and as a Conditional Use in an R-M zoning district, the complete text of which will be found in Ordinance Book XI.

ORDINANCES AND RESOLUTIONS

ORDINANCE NO. 2009-10, AN ORDINANCE TO REDUCE THE SPEED LIMIT ON SOUTH LEE STREET FROM MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. DRIVE TO GRIFFIN AVENUE

Consideration of an Ordinance to reduce the speed limit on South Lee Street from Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive to Griffin Avenue.

Von Shipman, City Engineer, stated that South Lee Street is a collector road and the traffic counts have gone up from 600 to 1,200 cars per day. The existing radar permit from the Georgia Department of Public Safety indicates the speed limit on South Lee Street from MLK, Jr. Drive to Griffin Avenue is 35 miles per hour. Several residents on this portion of South Lee Street have complained about the speed of motorists. The traffic study prepared by the City Engineer indicates the speed limit should be lowered to 30 miles per hour. Because this street is on the radar permit the Georgia Department of Transportation requires the local government body to formally indicate their support. Von Shipman recommended that Council approve the request to reduce the speed limit on South Lee Street from Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive to Griffin Avenue.

A MOTION by Councilman Head, seconded by Councilman Wright, was unanimously adopted (6-0) to follow the recommendation of the City Engineer and enact Ordinance No. 2009-10, an Ordinance to reduce the speed limit on South Lee Street from Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive to Griffin Avenue, the complete text of which will be found in Ordinance Book XI.

RESOLUTION NO. 2009-2, A RESOLUTION TO ADOPT THE URBAN REDEVELOPMENT PLAN

Consideration of a Resolution to adopt the Urban Redevelopment Plan.

Anne-Marie Wolff, Planning and Zoning Administrator, stated that at the Mayor and City Council Retreat in February, 2008, the creation of an Urban Redevelopment Plan was established as a goal for the City. With assistance from other City Departments, the Planning & Zoning Division has completed the City's first Urban Redevelopment Plan. If adopted, this Plan will enable the City to utilize economic development tools such as Opportunity Zones and Enterprise Zones. The Plan serves as a comprehensive guide for redevelopment within the designated area by describing all redevelopment related efforts, both current and planned. All requirements of the Urban Redevelopment Law (O.C.G.A. 36-61) have been met including the adoption of a "Finding of Necessity" Resolution by the Mayor and City Council and the final Public Hearing. If in the future the Urban Redevelopment Plan will need to be amended that would occur through a Public Hearing and coming back before Council for final approval.

A MOTION by Councilman Eunice, seconded by Councilman Carroll, was unanimously adopted (6-0) to enact Resolution No. 2009-2, a Resolution to adopt the Urban Redevelopment Plan, the complete text of which will be found in Resolution Book IV.

Mayor Fretti asked that Anne-Marie Wolff present Agenda Item 6(d) before Agenda Item 6(c).

AN ORDINANCE TO DESIGNATE VALDOSTA ENTERPRISE ZONES POSTPONED

Consideration of an Ordinance to designate Valdosta Enterprise Zones.

Anne-Marie Wolff, Planning and Zoning Administrator, stated that as part of the adoption of the Urban Redevelopment Plan, the Mayor and City Council have chosen to establish Enterprise Zones in eligible areas of the City which make up the Urban Redevelopment Area. Designation of these Enterprise Zones will allow the City to offer a series of incentives to qualifying businesses locating within the areas. Incentives will be offered on a case-by-case basis, and are authorized through the Enterprise Zone Employment Act. These incentives include occupation taxes, business licenses, admin fees, building permit fees, sign permit fees, planning and zoning fees, engineering fees, property tax exemptions, regulatory fee abatements and any other fees authorized by Council as applicable. Applicants would be required to submit an application to the Urban Redevelopment Agency and incentives would be based on several factors including average hourly wage, number of jobs created, business type, capital investment, and business location. These incentives will be fine tuned as well as the incentive score sheet to ensure that the goals are met. Anne-Marie Wolff recommended that Council adopt the Ordinance to designate Valdosta Enterprise Zones which lists the incentives that the Council will offer through the redevelopment powers. Councilman Head stated that he would like to have a map of the Census tracts that make up the neighborhood revitalization areas. Councilman Wright stated that he was concerned about the Enterprise Zones and he had done some research on the State Enterprise Zones. He found a statement that in addition to the discretionary transition

base incentive model that must be reinvented for a specific project or business, a geographic base program can be created by local ordinance and provide incentives for all businesses within the zone. Councilman Wright stated that he was concerned about the scale because it would have small businesses competing against larger businesses in terms of how they get points. There was also discussion about the Agency and Commission and there were quite a few things that he was not real clear about; therefore, Councilman Wright stated that he did not want to vote on it tonight and asked Council's consideration in postponing the request until they received clarification on the issues. Mayor Fretti inquired as to what was meant by the statement from the State Enterprise Zones. Councilman Wright stated that instead of offering incentives to a business relocated in the Enterprise Zone it could be offered to a business already within the Enterprise Zone to give them more incentives to do repairs on their buildings and other things. Mayor Fretti inquired as to whether the chart that they currently have could be extended to expansions of businesses that already exist in the Enterprise Zones. Anne-Marie Wolff stated that would apply for any new or existing businesses that expand by two full time jobs and that is why it is considered redevelopment. Unless Council should choose to have something like this there are no maximum points and it is first come first serve so they would not really be competing against other businesses. Once the application and score sheet is finalized it will be a simple mathematical computation and a check list of whether they meet the State requirements and if those are met they will get the incentives. Councilman Wright stated that if he misconstrued that then he could see how a business would have some of the same problems in interpreting the procedures. Anne-Marie Wolff stated that a lot of the things that were discussed are in the Ordinance but some are policy and procedures which are still being finalized. There are still quite a few details that Staff needs to work out but these are the major hurdles that need to be adopted. Councilman Payton stated that he could see the four districts as indicated but there are also some areas that do not address the neighborhood areas. The neighborhood zones should have a higher weighting when the decisions are made to develop areas. Anne-Marie Wolff stated that they currently have two categories and based on comments made at the Work Session they may need to break this up into better categories so that those that are in the neighborhood revitalization area can get some extra incentive than those that are on the undeveloped corridors that may not need incentives as much. Mayor Fretti stated that Council could adopt the Ordinance and the instruct Staff to provide more details at a later date. Larry Hanson stated that those things would not change the Plan and were just the mechanics. Anne-Marie Wolff stated that she was comfortable with adoption of the Valdosta Enterprise Zones because the next step would be to provide more details and it was Council's discretion as to whether they wanted to adopt it tonight or postpone it. Councilman Carroll stated that for Council to meet with Anne-Marie Wolff, Ruby Riesinger, and Emily Foster to discuss the details. Councilman Head inquired as to what the impact would be if Council chose to table the request because he had concerns as well. Mayor Fretti stated that this would delay sending the entire package to the Georgia Department of Community Affairs (DCA) and have them stamp the opportunity zones. Councilman Wright stated that if he was not clear on the details then how he could relate the information to businesses. His primary concern was that some of the Census tract areas have up 52% poverty levels while others have 15% and inquired as to which one would be helped. Also, a goal was set to eliminate sub-standard housing but if you look at the chart affordable housing only gets five points. A postponement would be best because it would be easier to fix it now rather than send it to DCA.

A MOTION was made by Councilman Wright to postpone the request to adopt an Ordinance to designate Valdosta Enterprise Zones. Councilman Head seconded the motion. Mayor Fretti inquired as to the time limit for the postponement. Councilman Wright stated that he felt one month would be enough time and asked for Staff's recommendation. Anne-Marie Wolff stated that within the next month would be a reasonable time frame to address the major areas of concern and to look at offering bigger incentives for the neighborhood revitalization area. Staff cannot submit to DCA for the Opportunity Zone Designation which will take 45 days until this is adopted; therefore you would be looking at May or June which would be before July 1. Councilman Eunice stated that even if this was adopted by Council tonight Staff was still going to work on the issues so passing it or not passing it tonight the same thing is going to happen. Anne-Marie Wolff stated that passing it tonight would say that they established an Enterprise Zone and those incentives, which still have details to be worked out, would apply to this area. It is primarily designating the Enterprise Zone area to receive the incentives. Larry Hanson stated if Council adopted the Ordinance then Staff could work on the incentives and the matrix and present that at the April Work Session and adopt just that portion of it. Councilman Wright stated that Council has already adopted the Plan. Mayor Fretti stated that he needed clarification for the time that this should be postponed or it would be an indefinite postponement. Councilman Wright stated that the first Council meeting in April was acceptable. Councilman Head was also in agreement. The motion was adopted (5-1) with Councilman Eunice voting in opposition.

Consideration of a Resolution to create the Valdosta Urban Redevelopment Agency.

Anne-Marie Wolff, Planning and Zoning Administrator, stated that some of the changes that were discussed at the Work Session include changing the number of members and changing the name from Urban Redevelopment Agency to Urban Redevelopment Commission. Within the law it does refer to it as an Agency; however, for user friendly sake we could refer to it as a Commission. If a separate entity is created, then the Council would essentially be delegating the powers that would typically come through the Urban Redevelopment law to the Council to whatever that entity is. Larry Hanson, City Manager, stated that he asked Anne-Marie Wolff to contact some of the other governments who have already implemented Urban Redevelopment Plans and found that the Urban Redevelopment Agency, by law, that can administer this can be a City Council, a County Commission, a Downtown Development Authority, a Housing Authority, or some other entity that Council creates. There are only nine Agencies in Georgia and they checked with Augusta (Richmond County) and they designated their own Housing and Community Development Department Staff as the Urban Redevelopment Committee. The City of Milledgeville uses their DDA and the City itself processes the application. The DDA makes recommendations to the City Council and they have the final approval authority. In Columbus (Muscookee County) they use their Mayor and Council as the Urban Redevelopment Agency. Their Planning Staff accepts the application, reviews and evaluates them, passes it to the City Manager with a recommendation, and then a recommendation is made to the City Council. Then by resolution, only the City Council can offer a tax abatement. Some options for the Valdosta Urban Redevelopment Agency which would be called the Economic Development commission are: (1) Create an eight member Economic Development Commission to serve as the Urban Redevelopment Agency with a non-voting Chairman, follow the City's appointment process which is advertise by district, application, code of ethics, residency, etc., stagger the terms and convert to three year terms, six members would be appointed by Council district and two members would be selected at large with each district Council member selecting one name from qualified candidates for that district and then the Mayor selects one name from the qualified candidates. (2) The Mayor and Council would serve as the Urban Redevelopment Agency and have Staff bring the recommendation on cases and the Mayor and Council could act on those recommendations and take final action. George Talley, City Attorney, discovered that the reason this is done through an existing governmental entity in these other communities, and not a committee or commission, is because the law does not allow designation of certain powers to non-governmental entities. Mayor Fretti stated that this is a unique opportunity and the Urban Redevelopment Agency which is now called the Economic Development Commission could be given the powers to stay within the chart and if those powers are granted by City Council then they could not go out of the chart. In order to float a bond, it would have to come back to Council. Mayor Fretti suggested that Council may want to consider over the next 30 days if Council wants to add a section for Urban Redevelopment cases and it would come before Council or Council could appoint the Economic Development Commission and anything off of the chart would come before Council. Larry Hanson stated that if Council postpones this request for 30 days it would give him time to contact the City Managers in Columbus and Milledgeville and gather more information.

A **MOTION** was made by Councilman Head to postpone the request to create the Valdosta Urban Redevelopment Agency until the first Council meeting in April. Councilman Payton seconded the motion. The motion was adopted (5-1) with Councilman Eunice voting in opposition.

BIDS, CONTRACTS, AGREEMENTS, AND EXPENDITURES

Consideration of a non-exclusive wrecker service contract to provide wrecker service within the City Limits. Mayor/Council postponed the request at the December 11, 2008 regular meeting and at the February 19, 2009 regular meeting until the March 5, 2009 regular meeting.

Police Chief Frank Simons stated that it is frequently necessary for the Police Department to require the services of wrecker/tow companies to remove disabled or damaged vehicles from the roadway or other property and the City has entered into non-exclusive contracts with qualified towing companies to provide this service. The non-exclusive contract specifies the obligations, limitations, and responsibilities of the participating tow companies as well as documenting the guidelines for the operation of a wrecker rotation call list. The current wrecker rotation

contract has expired and has not been revised or updated for the past several years. The wrecker service companies would like to have the \$500 deductible on insurance increased to a \$1,000 deductible. Also, they have asked that no person in the wrecker business that has a spouse to be able to open up a second wrecker business on the contract with their spouse. Chief Simons stated that he felt if they are two completely separate businesses with separate business licenses, insurance, lots, and location, he was not sure how they could prevent a spouse from opening up a legitimate business. The concern is that if that is allowed there will be attempts for some of the companies to have a sham owner and they would open up multiple companies just to get on the wrecker rotation. In the past this has not been allowed and you cannot have more than one company on our contract. The way the contract is written now nothing would prohibit that from happening. George Talley, City Attorney, stated that you could not prevent them from doing that legally. Chief Simons stated that they could decide not to contract with them. Mayor Fretti stated that he understood the intent of the request but legally, based on the City Attorney's advice, we could not prohibit that. Chief Simons stated that the wrecker companies would also like for the storage fee and tow fee to go up. Mayor Fretti stated that they discussed at the Work Session a distinction in the hours of service of the wrecker company and the hours of service of the lot. The yard can closed down at any time and the wrecker services are open 24 hours; therefore, the yard could charge a \$45 opening fee. Chief Simons stated that during regular business hours from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. they could not charge an opening fee.

A MOTION by Councilman Eunice, seconded by Councilman Carroll, was unanimously adopted (6-0) to approve the non-exclusive wrecker service contract to provide wrecker service within the City Limits and change the deductible from \$500 to \$1,000.

Consideration of a Memorandum of Understanding with Lowndes County regarding the joint Industrial Authority appointment.

Larry Hanson, City Manager, stated that he met with the Mayor, the Lowndes County Board of Commissioners Chairman, and the County Manager regarding a need to have something in writing to prevent this situation from arising again in the future. A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) has been prepared addressing the joint Industrial Authority appointment. The Legislation states that it must be a joint and concurrent appointment of the two bodies but allow one to initiate the appointment on a rotating five-year term and the other body to approve that appointment. This MOU is intended to alleviate a problem that was not a problem for many years but has recently become a problem and put it on a rotating basis, but respect the constitution that created the joint appointment. Mayor Fretti stated that whoever has the joint appointment at the time and if the term is not finished then it would come back to that governing authority to fill that seat for the entire five-year term. Councilman Carroll stated that this is a fair, simple, straight-forward agreement that states this year the City will be the primary nominating body, in five years the County will be the primary nominating body, and in 2019 the City will be the primary nominating body. If something happens in the interim period to one of the appointees then whatever governing authority who appointed that person while it is still in their term will select another person. This is a clean and simple way to deal with this. Councilman Head inquired as to whether the County has reviewed the MOU. Larry Hanson stated that the County has reviewed the MOU and he asked several times for some feedback. The County Manager made one suggestion in writing and that was rather than one initiate the appointment and the other confirm that the party would initiate the appointment and in the event that the other side objected the party that initiated the appointment would then make a new recommendation. Mayor Fretti stated that the suggestion does not change anything and they would be back where they were before. Councilman Carroll stated that he spoke with County Commissioner Richard Lee today to get his interpretation of the MOU and his words were exactly what they were intending in the MOU. Larry Hanson stated that the County Manager had only suggested the change and they were not opposed to the MOU. Councilman Vickers inquired about the feedback from the Chairman and the other County Commissioners. It was his understanding that the Mayor and the Chairman gave the City Manager and the County Manager instructions to come up with a gentleman's agreement. Mayor Fretti stated that was correct but as of this morning the Chairman had a different thought. They discussed it and the Mayor was able to convince the Chairman to entertain the MOU as it was written. Councilman Vickers inquired as to whether the MOU would be approved on the condition that the County Commission approves it. Larry Hanson stated that was correct. Councilman Carroll stated that would be his motion. Councilman Wright inquired as to whether the County Commission Chairman would not have a vote. Mayor Fretti stated that he would have a vote in case of a tie. Councilman Wright stated that two of the three County Commissioners did not agree

with the way the process was going and inquired as to what would happen if they decided not to go along with it again and whether they would they be right back where they started from. Mayor Fretti stated that this was an attempt by Council to get this squared away and we should send the MOU to the County and cross that bridge when we come to it. This wraps this into another possible nomination that Councilman Carroll is thinking about and it would be very compelling if this passes tonight. By Tuesday, we go out and talk to the County and we say this is a good thing. Councilman Wright stated that he wanted to be clear about the MOU.

A MOTION was made by Councilman Carroll to adopt the Memorandum of Understanding regarding the joint Industrial Authority appointment between the Valdosta City Council and the Lowndes County Board of Commissioners as written. Councilman Eunice seconded the motion. Councilman Vickers inquired as to whether the Memorandum of Understanding would be spelled out in the minutes. Mayor Fretti stated that the Memorandum of Understanding with Lowndes County regarding the joint Industrial Authority appointment provides for a resolution of the joint appointments which will be alternating. The City and County will formalize this and Lowndes County will initiate the appointment in 2014 and Valdosta in 2019 and the rotation will continue in that manner. This is a Memorandum of Understanding that shall remain in effect for 20 years and may be extended for an additional 20 years by agreement of both parties. The motion was unanimously adopted (6-0).

BOARDS, COMMISSIONS, AUTHORITIES, AND COMMITTEES

Consideration of an amendment to the Boards, Commissions, Authorities, and Advisory Committees Policy.

Larry Hanson, City Manager, stated that there were three minor changes to be made to the Policy for Boards, Commissions, Authorities, and Advisory Committees. Those changes are as follows: (1) In the event a City appointed member resigns within the first year (12 months) of their term, the Mayor and Council shall have the right to: (a) request the seat be re-advertised or (b) choose from among the previously qualified pool of applicants for that position. In the event (b) is selected, the City Clerk shall contact all applicants from the previous pool of applicants and confirm which remain interested in serving. (2) In the event that a vacancy occurs within sixty (60) days of the completion of advertising and submittals for any position on a Board, Commission, Authority, or Advisory Committee, the Mayor and Council may choose to select from the qualified pool of applicants who submitted an application for that particular entity. (3) A person may not apply for more than three Boards, Commissions, Authorities, or Advisory Committees at one time. If an applicant does apply for three, they must indicate their order of preference on the application. Larry Hanson recommended that Council approve the changes to the Policy.

A MOTION by Councilman Eunice, seconded by Councilman Payton, was unanimously adopted (6-0) to approve the three changes as recommended by the City Manager and amend the Boards, Commissions, Authorities, and Advisory Committees Policy.

Consideration of an appointment to the Valdosta-Lowndes County Parks and Recreation Authority.

Larry Hanson, City Manager, stated that the Valdosta -Lowndes County Parks and Recreation Authority recently had a City appointee, Robert Jefferson, resign. The term for Mr. Jefferson will expire June 30, 2012. The Parks and Recreation Authority requested an immediate appointment and the following names have been submitted for consideration: (1) Paul Arambula – Political Science Instructor, Valdosta State University, (2) J. C. Cunningham – Sales Manager, MNG Construction, (3) Dan Deaver – Civil Engineer, Hunt Industries, (4) Frances Golivesky – Retired Teacher/School Administrator, (5) Marguerite Gravlee – Teacher, Valdosta City School System, (6) Robert H. Holliway – Retired/Former Executive Director of the Valdosta- Lowndes County Airport Authority, (7) C. A. “Charlie” Hartley-Oliver – Educator, Valdosta Technical College, (8) Caterina M. Orr – Teacher, Valdosta City School System, (9) Philip E. Painter – Real Estate/Mortgages, TitleTown Realty, LLC, and (10) Richard Steltenpohl – Salesman, Sysco Food Services.

Mayor Fretti asked for nominations. Councilman Vickers placed in consideration the name of Caterina Orr. There being no other nominations, Mayor Fretti closed nominations and Caterina Orr was appointed by acclamation to fill the unexpired term of Robert Jefferson on the Valdosta-Lowndes County Parks and Recreation Authority.

Consideration of an appointment to the Valdosta-Lowndes County Industrial Authority.

Mayor Fretti stated that Councilman Carroll had distributed a Memorandum to the Council and noted that he had a letter that was just delivered to him from Carolyn Eager which he would share with Council. Councilman Carroll stated that he would not read the Memorandum that went out but it sums everything up as to what he was trying to accomplish on behalf of the City and the County. He was very encouraged by conversations with our colleagues who serve on the County Commission and their willingness and desire to clean things up and make things better between the two governing bodies. One component to this was a Memorandum of Understanding. Councilman Carroll acknowledged Councilman Vickers his initial suggestion to have a Memorandum of Understanding and thanked the City Manager and City Attorney for their input.

Mayor Fretti inquired as to whether there were any questions or comments on the applications before the appointment was opened up for nominations. Councilman Head stated that he appreciated the efforts of Councilman Carroll and Councilman Vickers on this but not since the move on the Declaratory Judgment shortly after he first joined this group has he seen anything like this. Councilman Head stated that the whole process, the whole effort, and the undercurrent stunk. It was sad to see those of us get pulled into it however deep and strong the current. He had heard from A-Z on this and even as he looked at Ms. Eager's letter, she had the audacity to say that she was resigning so that Jerry Jennett could be appointed. The letter should state that she was resigning period. Councilman Head stated that many of them seemed hell bent on making Jerry Jennett the guy. Two years ago when Carolyn Eager's term expired, we said that we needed her or someone who was an advocate for her said that she was needed so bad because of her financial expertise. Now, she is being pushed out the door no matter what we might get told. It was said then that she was so good we needed her and some people said she was the only woman on the Authority so we needed to keep her. Now we are saying, and it is coming from all different fronts, that we must keep Jerry Jennett. Councilman Head stated that he had nothing against Jerry Jennett but we are saying now that the Authority cannot survive without him; however, before the Authority had him they survived and before they had Carolyn Eager they survived. The word has also been surfacing around that the Mayor guaranteed Mr. Jennett that he would bring him back. Councilman Head stated that he knew that political dues have been called in regarding that and he had nothing against Mr. Jennett. He did not think that Council would get a letter from Ms. Eager and noticed that it was dated March 4th and she must have waited until the last moment. Two and a half weeks ago it was being surfaced that Ms. Eager wanted to resign and it has taken this long for us to get a letter. Councilman Head stated that he found something wrong and cynical about that. Councilman Head personally thought that Council should send the agreement to the County and let them sign it whenever they meet so we can see that there is truly a change in the atmosphere and they want to get along. Council should then take action on an appointee the next time they meet whether it is Mr. Jennett or not. It seems like we have got to keep him. His term has expired as a County appointee and now we are saying let's get Ms. Eager out so we can make Mr. Jennett a City appointee. Councilman Head stated that if Mr. Jennett is not sent back for another term, the Industrial Authority will continue to live on and survive; however, we have gotten caught up in the fact that it has got to be him and no one else. Even the County has said that they would not confirm Roy Copeland, the City's nominee, until Mr. Jennett goes in there. The County has us against a wall and they are threatening us and saying that they are not going to do anything unless the City does something. We have an air of good faith and cooperation and we should let the County sign off on the agreement and then we make this appointment at the next meeting. Councilman Head stated that his recommendation was to not make the appointment tonight but to make it next time Council meets. The world is not going to fall in on the Industrial Authority between now and the next Council meeting but if Council is hell bent on making the appointment tonight then so be it. Councilman Head stated that his motion would be, if he could make one, would be to table this until the next meeting. This may not sit well with some of the Council but he would suggest that because of how both governments look. Up until a few minutes ago, when we got the resignation letter from Ms. Eager, Council was about to try and appoint Mr. Jennett to a slot that is not even vacant. Councilman Head inquired as to what would have happened if Ms. Eager had not submitted the letter of resignation and whether Council would still be moving to try to appoint Mr. Jennett. He felt that they probably would still do so.

Mayor Fretti stated that was a motion on the floor and I am not sure if Councilman Head realizes that he made a motion and there can be no discussion between a motion and a second. Councilman Vickers inquired as to what was the motion.

A **MOTION** was made by Councilman Head to table the appointment tonight until the next meeting and that would allow the County to show their good will and new spirit of cooperation by signing this agreement. Councilman Wright seconded the motion. Mayor Fretti stated that it was actually a postponement because tabling only tables until the end of the meeting. Councilman Carroll stated that it does concern him that his colleague refers to what he thought was a good faith, pure, wholesome effort to make something happen stinks and smacks of conspiracy because that is certainly not the case on his part. When Ms. Eager had made a decision to resign and in conversations with our colleagues serving on the County Commission at no point what so ever was he told we will approve Roy Copeland if you will approve Jerry Jennett. That never, ever was said to him and has nothing at all with what he was trying to accomplish here. Councilman Head stated that he did not say it was said to Councilman Carroll. Councilman Head said it was said to him and it came from the County. Councilman Carroll stating that he may be new to this and could perhaps be a little naïve here but it was a good faith reach out based on what he saw as an opportunity to address several things. He spoke with everyone on Council and one of the early members he spoke with was Councilman Vickers who provided some excellent advice as they went through this process, and as it stands now, he felt that at least two out of at least three votes on the County Commission will follow through with what ultimately will be his motion assuming the tabling fails is such that every component of this is conditioned upon the agreement from the County Commission. If they don't agree to any component then all bets will be off. Councilman Carroll stated that he felt this would be a good opportunity and while he appreciated Mayor Pro Tem Head's concerns and obviously he has had some comments made to him that would indicate some conspiracy, for the record and for this Council, at no point has there been any conspiracy within the actions that he has been taking. Councilman Wright stated that he was prepared to move forward but inquired as to whether the City's appointee had been approved by the County. Mayor Fretti stated that the joint appointee has not been affirmed by the County. Larry Hanson stated that it was on the County's agenda for Tuesday night. Councilman Wright inquired as to whether this would come back before Council if the County did not confirm it. Larry Hanson stated that was correct. Councilman Vickers stated that it was his understanding that we have been told that the County would not confirm Roy Copeland unless the City confirmed Carolyn Eager's resignation and appoint Jerry Jennett. He does not have a problem with Jerry Jennett but did have a problem with the County saying we must appoint Jerry Jennett in place of Carolyn Eager resigning. Councilman Carroll stated that no one from the County said that. Councilman Vickers inquired as to whether the Industrial Authority has accepted Ms. Eager's resignation. Mayor Fretti stated that he was not certain because they have not met between the time the letter was written. The motion was adopted 4-2 with Councilman Eunice and Councilman Carroll voting in opposition.

Mayor Fretti took a moment of personal privilege. Mayor Fretti thanked Councilman Head for his comments but this was not the venue for a non-diplomatic rant where the Mayor is accused of making some deal and guaranteeing some deal. This is not the venue for either of them to accuse anyone of what they heard on the street. Mayor Fretti stated that he would prefer that Councilman Head not do that. We hear a lot of things about each other on the street and in that whole rant all Councilman Head did in addition to what was said was to accuse the Mayor of making a guarantee. Nothing was said about anyone else. Mayor Fretti stated that he did not appreciate that and this was not the venue for that.

Councilman Head took a moment of personal privilege to respond. Councilman Head stated that the Mayor stated it was a non-diplomatic rant but it was not a rant. It was an opportunity for him to discuss his feelings regarding a situation and he did just that. If he had the opportunity to do it all over again he would do the very same thing. Councilman Head apologized for calling the Mayor's name but his name was mentioned to him by a very reliable source but that is the only part he apologized for. Mayor Fretti stated that when the newspaper prints something bad the apology is never written. Councilman Head stated that he had nothing to do with what the paper prints. Mayor Fretti stated that was an example. Councilman Head apologized again for calling the Mayor's name but did not apologize for all of the other expressions about this issue stands unchanged.

Larry Hanson, City Manager, thanked the Mayor and Council for a great Retreat. He has been to 15 Mayor and Council Retreats that was the best one that the City has had in those 15 years. Larry Hanson commended the Mayor and Council for their preparation and desire to see the City move forward.

COUNCIL COMMENTS

Mayor Fretti stated that he received a telephone call from Michael Bennett, Sr. and Alpha Company is being deployed in April to Afghanistan and the Best Buddies Club would like to have the City and County assist in a farewell Bar-B-Que. If there was no objection from Council, Mayor Fretti asked the City Manager to review the Contingency Fund to see if money was available to assist the County with sponsoring this event. Mayor Fretti asked that this be placed on the next Council agenda.

Councilman Payton stated that the Committee for the Harry B. Anderson Tennis Center met today and Rob Evans, IPG Architects, presented some CAD drawings for review. The Committee will meet again next Thursday and plan to have a Town Hall Meeting the latter part of March or first week of April.

Councilman Wright stated that he did not see a problem with allowing the County to proceed with doing what they said they were going to do but was concerned with the County not living up to what they said they were going to do. This is not the first time Council has had this discussion. The City has to do what is best for the City and the County has to do what is best for the County, but it is important to keep your word. Mayor Fretti stated that five years ago the County sent over the nomination for Jerry Jennett and this Council for six months threw up an alternate name. That alternate name, Gary Minchew, pulled out only when he was guaranteed another seat. For six months we were at conflict and for six months the Valdosta Daily Times reported on us being at conflict and now we are at conflict again and we began it tonight. We have just given them fodder to report on dirty laundry or some kind of sensationalism.

ADJOURNMENT

A MOTION by Councilman Eunice, seconded by Councilman Payton, was unanimously adopted (6-0) to adjourn the March 5, 2009 meeting of the Valdosta City Council at 7:42 p.m. to meet again in regular session on Thursday, March 19, 2009.

City Clerk, City of Valdosta

Mayor, City of Valdosta