AGENDA FOR REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF INVERNESS, FLORIDA, CITY HALL, 212 WEST MAIN STREET
November 15, 2016 - 5:30 PM

NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC

Any person who decides to appeal any decision of the Governing Body with respect to any matter considered at this meeting will need a record of the proceedings and, for such purpose, may need to provide that a verbatim record of the proceeding is made, which record includes testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is to be based (Section 286.0105, Florida Statutes).

Accommodation for the disabled (hearing or visually impaired, etc.) may be arranged with advance notice of seven (7) days before the scheduled meeting, by dialing (352) 726-2611 weekdays from 8 AM to 4 PM.

ENCLOSURES*

1) INVOCATION, PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE AND ROLL CALL

2) PLEASE SILENCE ELECTRONIC DEVICES

3) ACCEPTANCE OF AGENDA

4) PUBLIC HEARINGS

4 - 13	a)	CDBG Public Hearing*
14 - 26	b)	Fair Housing Workshop*
27 - 34	c)	2017 Budget ICRA Projects Amendments (Infantry Memorial & Downtown Streetscape) - Resolution*

5) OPEN PUBLIC MEETING

The public is invited to express opinion on any item for this meeting or pending action at a future meeting of City Council. (Speaking time limit: Individual - 3 minutes; Group/Organization - 5 minutes)

AGENDA FOR REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF INVERNESS, FLORIDA, CITY HALL, 212 WEST MAIN STREET
November 15, 2016 - 5:30 PM

6) PRE-SCHEDULED PUBLIC APPEARANCES

35 - 40 a) Andy Houston - Sheriff Services Funding

7) MAYOR'S LOCAL ACHIEVEMENT AWARDS

8) CITY ATTORNEY REPORT

9) CONSENT AGENDA

41 a) Bill Listing *

Recommendation - Approval

42 - 45 b) Council Minutes - 11/01/16 *

Recommendation - Approval

10) CITY MANAGER'S REPORT Correspondence/Reports/Recommendations

46 - 47 a) Zoning Board of Adjustment Appointment - Sue Newman*

48 b) Charter Referendum Vote Tally*

c) Grants Update *(Verbal)*

d) Other

11) COUNCIL/MAYOR SUBJECTS

12) NON-SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT

(Speaking time limit: Individual - 3 minutes; Group/Organization - 5 minutes)

13) ADJOURNMENT

a)

DATES TO REMEMBER

Inverness Grand Prix & Friday Night Thunder
Friday, November 18 & Saturday, November 19, 2016
Courthouse Square & Downtown Inverness

Inverness City Council Regular Meeting
Tuesday, December 6, 2016 at 5:30pm
Inverness Government Center

Agenda Memorandum – ***City of Inverness***

DATE: **November 15, 2016**

ISSUE: **1st Public Hearing for CDBG Grant**

FROM: **City Manager (Prepared by Bruce Day)**

CC: **Interim City Clerk**

A requirement of the City's upcoming community development block grant (CDBG) application is to hold a Fair Housing Workshop to ensure that the city is aware of Federal policy regarding Fair Housing. The workshop is especially important when related to a CDBG housing grant. Presentation will be made by David Fox of Fred Fox Enterprises.

The Fair Housing Act – 1968, 1988 and 1995 prohibits discrimination due to: Race, Color, Religion, National Origin, Sex, Familial status (including children under the age of 18 living with parents or legal custodians; pregnant women and people securing custody of children under 18), Disability.

To facilitate the process of the City's upcoming community development block grant (CDBG) grant, public input is needed. The public hearing is also for City Council to finalize the CDBG grant category that is most applicable to the project, and direct the consultant (Fred Fox Enterprises) to pursue.

The project being nominated by staff includes: Street and streetscape improvements for Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Ave. from SR 41/44 to Old Main Street, and similar improvements for West Dampier St. between Apopka Ave. and Seminole Ave. The CDBG commercial revitalization category relates best to streetscape, building façade work, etc. to the downtown commercial Area. The maximum amount of the request is $700,000. The consultant (David Fox) will be prepared to discuss the probability of funding for various categories during the hearing and will assist Council in making a determination within the prescribed process.

In addition to the public hearing process, the established Citizens Advisory Task Force (CATF) is required to review the grant project and make a recommendation on moving forward with the application. The CATF meets at 4 PM on November 15th, at 4:30pm, in the Inverness Government Center Chambers. Their recommendation will be carried verbally to the Council meeting that is scheduled later that day.

Below is an outline of steps needed for the CDBG 1st Public Hearing.

Presentation on the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program application process including the four program categories.

(Continued on Next Page)

Open A Public Hearing

1. Call for public discussion and/or comments on eligible projects/activities that individuals would like to see included in the CDBG application.
2. Close the Public Hearing
3. Call forward the Citizens Advisory Task Force (CATF) recommendation on project/activities
4. Call forward staff recommendations on project/activities
5. City Manager requests authorization for staff to prepare a Small Cities CDBG Grant application for a specific project (See Motion)

Recommended Action –

If City Council wishes to proceed with the identified project, motion, 2nd and vote to move forward with the preparation of the CDBG application and conceptual plans.

Thanking you in advance for your attention to this matter.

Frank DiGiovanni

CITY OF INVERNESS

CDBG FIRST PUBLIC HEARING AGENDA

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 2016 @ 5:30 P. M.

A. Presentation on the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program application process including the four program categories.

B. Open public hearing.

C. Public discussion or comments on eligible projects/activities individuals would like to see included in the application.

D. Close public hearing.

E. Staff recommendations on project/activities.

F. Citizens Advisory Task Force (CATF) recommendation on project/activities.

G. Request authorization for staff to prepare a Small Cities CDBG Grant application for a specific project.

CITY OF INVERNESS
FFY 2016 CDBG GRANT CYCLE
PROGRAM SYNOPSIS

CDBG
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
BLOCK GRANT

City of Inverness

Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)
Program Categories

Maximum CDBG Grant Amount: $ 700,000.00

CDBG Categories:

1. Housing Rehabilitation – Rehab/replacement of owner occupied Low to Moderate Income (LMI) homes.

2. Commercial Revitalization – Streetscape, Building Façade work, etc. to the Downtown Commercial Area. City Wide/Service Area needs to be a minimum of 51% LMI. The City of Inverness is 48.82% LMI by Census. Therefore a City wide door to door survey will need to be carried out.

3. Neighborhood Revitalization- Infrastructure items in residential LMI areas. Examples – water line repair/replacement, sewer line repair/replacement, water system improvements, sewer system improvements, paving, drainage, community center, etc. Beneficiaries must be at minimum 51% LMI in each Service Area to meet Application Threshold Requirements

4. Economic Development – Provide infrastructure on City easement/property to a new business or expansion of existing business. Business must create new long term jobs and be included as the developer in the application. Can apply for up to $1,500,000.00 under this category only.

FY 2016 Income Limits Documentation System

FY 2016 Income Limits Summary

FY 2016 Income Limit Area	Median Income	FY 2016 Income Limit Category	1 Person	2 Person	3 Person	4 Person	5 Person	6 Person	7 Person	8 Person
Citrus County	$52,300	Extremely Low (30%) Income Limits	$11,880	$16,020	$20,160	***$24,300***	$27,450	$29,500	$31,500	$33,550
		Very Low (50%) Income Limits	$17,800	$20,350	$22,900	***$25,400***	$27,450	$29,500	$31,500	$33,550
		Low (80%) Income Limits	$28,450	$32,500	$36,550	***$40,600***	$43,850	$47,100	$50,350	$53,600

Additional Points in Application:

- **Leverage Points:**

  Each $ 2,000.00 of leverage results in 1 extra point in final score of the application. Maximum of 25 points or $ 50,000.00. Local community can exceed $50,000.00 towards projects but will not receive additional points for leverage over the 25 point maximum.

- **Neighborhood Revitalization and Commercial Revitalization Projects Only:**

  Engineer stamped biddable construction plans and specifications submitted with the application will receive an additional 100 points for being shovel ready. All permit applications must be submitted to permitting agencies prior to application submittal to obtain these points.

- Local Government will not be reimbursed for shovel ready design cost with CDBG funds, even if application is funded.

CDBG

Steps Required in CDBG Application Process

1.) City Council appoint a Citizens Advisory Task Force (CATF).

2.) Advertise and hold a CATF meeting discuss possible projects.

3.) Advertise and hold a 1st Public Hearing. Obtain public comment and direction by City Council to move forward on developing an application for a project.

4.) Advertised and hold a Fair Housing Workshop at City Council Meeting.

5.) Advertised and hold a 2nd Public Hearing, in front of City Council finalize and submit application

Open for Public Comment

3007-1106 SUCRN

FIRST PUBLIC HEARING NOTICE

The City of Inverness is considering applying to the Florida Department of Economic Opportunity (DEO) for a FFY 2016 Small Cities Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) of up to Seven Hundred Thousand Dollars ($700,000.00). These funds must be used for one of the following purposes:

1. To benefit low and moderate income persons;
2. To aid in the prevention or elimination of slums or blight; or
3. To meet other community development needs of recent origin having a particular urgency because existing conditions pose a serious and immediate threat to the health or welfare of the community and where other financial resources are not available to meet such needs.

The categories of activities for which these funds may be used are in the areas of housing, neighborhood revitalization, commercial revitalization or economic development and include such improvement activities as acquisition of real property, loans to private-for-profit business, purchase of machinery and equipment, construction of infrastructure, rehabilitation of houses and commercial buildings and energy conservation. Additional information regarding the range of activities that may be undertaken will be provided at the public hearing. For each activity that is proposed, at least 70% of the funds must benefit low and moderate income persons.

In developing an application for submission to DEO, the City of Inverness must plan to minimize displacement of persons as a result of planned CDBG activities. In addition, the City of Inverness is required to develop a plan to assist displaced persons.

A public hearing to receive citizen views concerning the community's economic and community development needs will be held at the City of Inverness City Hall on Tuesday, November 15, 2016 at 5:30 p.m. For information concerning the public hearing contact Susan Jackson, Interim City Clerk, City of Inverness, 212 W. Main Street, Inverness, Florida 34450, (352) 726-2611.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act, any person requiring special accommodations to participate in this workshop is asked to advise the agency at least 48 hours-before the workshop by contacting: Susan Jackson, Interim City Clerk at (352) 726-2611or by e-mail at cityclerk@inverness-fl.gov. If you are hearing or speech impaired, please contact the agency using the Florida Relay Service, 1(800)955-8771 (TDD) or 1(800)955-8770 (Voice).

A Fair Housing/Equal Opportunity/Handicap Accessible Jurisdiction.

000PMDX

11/6/16

3006-1106 SUCRN

CITIZENS ADVISORY TASK FORCE MEETING NOTICE

The City of Inverness' Citizen's Advisory Task Force will hold a public meeting on Tuesday, November 15, 2016 at 4:00 p.m. The purpose of this meeting will be to discuss the City applying for a grant under the Florida Department of Economic Opportunity's Small Cities Community Development Block Grant Program for the FFY 2016 funding cycle.

The Citizen's Advisory Task Force will hold the meeting at the City Hall Council Chambers, City of Inverness, located at 212 W. Main Street, Inverness, Florida. The public is invited to attend.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act, any person requiring special accommodations to participate in this workshop is asked to advise the agency at least 48 hours-before the workshop by contacting: Susan Jackson, Interim City Clerk at (352) 726-2611or by e-mail at cityclerk@inverness-fl.gov. If you are hearing or speech impaired, please contact the agency using the Florida Relay Service, 1(800)955-8771 (TDD) or 1(800)955-8770 (Voice).

000PMDQ

11/6/16

3008-1106 SUCRN

FAIR HOUSING WORKSHOP

The City of Inverness is a fair housing advocate. The City is holding a workshop to explain the Fair Housing Ordinance for all of the protected classes (race, color, familial status, handicap, national origin, religion and sex). The public is invited to attend.

The workshop is scheduled for Tuesday, November 15, 2016 at 5:45 p.m., or as soon thereafter as possible, at the City of Inverness City Hall located at 212 W. Main Street, Inverness, Florida.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act, any person requiring special accommodations to participate in this workshop is asked to advise the agency at least 48 hours-before the workshop by contacting: Susan Jackson, Interim City Clerk at (352) 726-2611or by e-mail at cityclerk@inverness-fl.gov. If you are hearing or speech impaired, please contact the agency using the Florida Relay Service, 1(800)955-8771 (TDD) or 1(800)955-8770 (Voice).

000PME1

11/6/16

Agenda Memorandum – ***City of Inverness***

DATE: **November 15, 2016**

ISSUE: **Fair Housing Workshop for CDBG Grant**

FROM: **City Manager (Prepared by Bruce Day)**

CC: **Interim City Clerk**

A requirement of the City's upcoming community development block grant (CDBG) is to hold a Fair Housing Workshop to ensure that the city is aware of Federal policy regarding Fair Housing. The workshop is especially important when related to a CDBG housing grant. Presentation will be made by David Fox of Fred Fox Enterprises.

The Fair Housing Act – 1968, 1988 and 1995 prohibits discrimination due to: Race, Color, Religion, National Origin, Sex, Familial status (including children under the age of 18 living with parents or legal custodians; pregnant women and people securing custody of children under 18), Disability

Informational item no action required-

Thanking you in advance for your attention to this matter.

Frank DiGiovanni

FAIR HOUSING

Equal Opportunity for All

The Fair Housing Act – 1968, 1988 and 1995

The Fair Housing Act prohibits discrimination due to:

- **Race**
- **Color**
- **Religion**
- **National Origin**
- **Sex**
- **Familial status (including children under the age of 18 living with parents or legal custodians; pregnant women and people securing custody of children under 18)**
- **Disability**

The Fair Housing Act

Prohibits discrimination and the intimidation of people in their homes, apartments and condominium developments – in nearly all housing transactions, including the rental and sale of housing and the provision of mortgage loans.

What Housing is Exempt?

The Act exempts owner-occupied buildings with no more than four units and single-family housing sold or rented without the use of a broker.

Senior Housing Exemption- exempts some senior housing facilities and communities from liability for familial status discrimination.

Provided under any State or Federal program that HUD has determined to be specifically designed and operated to assist elderly persons or

Intended for, and solely occupied by persons 55 or 62 years of age or older.

What is Prohibited?

No one may take any of the following actions based on race, color, religion, sex, disability, familial status, or national origin:

- **Refuse to rent or sell housing**
- **Refuse to negotiate for housing**
- **Set different terms, conditions or privileges for sale or rental of a dwelling**
- **Falsely deny that housing is available for inspection, sale or rental**
- **For profit, persuade, or try to persuade homeowners to sell or rent dwellings by suggesting that people of a particular race, age, sex, etc. have moved, or are about to move into the neighborhood or**
- **Deny any person access to, membership or participation in, any organization, facility or service related to the sale or rental of dwellings**

Housing Protection for Families with Children

It is unlawful to discriminate against a person whose household includes one or more children who are under 18 years of age "Familial Status" in which one or minor children live with a parent or legal custodian.

Additional Protection If You Have a Disability

• Have a physical or mental disability (including hearing, mobility and visual impairments, cancer, chronic mental illness or HIV/ AIDS) that substantially limits one or more major life activities

• Are regarded as having such a disability, a housing provider may not:

- Refuse to let you make reasonable modifications to your dwelling at your expense (a landlord may permit changes only if you agree to restore the property to its original condition when you move.)

Example: A building with a "no pets" policy must allow a visually impaired tenant to keep a guide dog.

<u>However, the Fair Housing Act does not protect a person who is a direct threat to the health or safety of others or who currently uses illegal drugs.</u>

If You Think Your Rights Have Been Violated
What to Tell HUD:

- Your name and address

- The name and address of the person your complaint is against (the respondent)

- The address or other identification of the housing involved

- A short description of the alleged violation (the event that caused you to believe your rights were violated)

- The date(s) of the alleged violation.

Your local ordinance includes steps and time limits in which complaints must be submitted and responses must be provided.

Where to Write or Call

THE SOUTHEAST REGIONAL OFFICE:
ATLANTA REGIONAL OFFICE
(Complaints_office_04@hud.gov)
U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
Five Points Plaza
40 Marietta Street, 16th Floor
Atlanta, GA 30303-2808
Telephone (404) 331-5140 or 1-800-440-8091 x2493
Fax (404) 331-1021 * TTY (404) 730-2654

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity
451 7th Street, S.W., Room 5204, Washington, DC 20410-2000

Telephone 1-800-669-9777 Fax (202) 708-1425
* TTY 1-800-927-9275
www.hud.gov/fairhousing

What Happens When You File A Complaint?

• Notify the person filing the complaint and the alleged violator (respondent) of the filing of your complaint, and allow the respondent time to submit a written answer to the complaint.

• Investigate your complaint, and determine whether or not there is reasonable cause to believe that the respondent violated the Fair Housing Act.

• Notify you and the respondent if HUD cannot complete its investigation within 100 days of filing your complaint, and provide reason for the delay.

Fair Housing Act Conciliation: During the complaint investigation, HUD is required to offer you and the respondent the opportunity to voluntarily resolve your complaint with a Conciliation Agreement.

FLORIDA COMMISSION ON HUMAN RELATIONS

- **Phone:** (850) 488-7082
- **Toll-Free:** 1-800-342-8170
- **Web Site:** http://fchr.state.fl.us

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

DEO
FLORIDA DEPARTMENT of ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

FRED FOX ENTERPRISES, INC.

Agenda Memorandum – *City of Inverness*

DATE: **November 10, 2016**

ISSUE: **Public Hearing**
ICRA Budget Project Budget Adjustment
Infantry Memorial
Downtown Streetscape Upgrades

FROM: **City Manager**

CC: **Sheri Chiodo, Bruce Day, Susan Jackson**

ATTACHED: **Memo by Sheri Chiodo**
Resolution
Print Ad Notice

We have finalized anticipated project costs for the Military Memorial and Downtown Streetscape improvement projects. Following detailed diligence (construction costs to project drawings) cost estimates have increased and require additional support. The Inverness Community Redevelopment Agency (ICRA) met in public session to discuss these projects and adopted a Resolution in support of the projects.

These projects are budgeted using bond financing to support construction. The matter is presented for City Council to recognize the budget change, conduct a Public Hearing and adopt a supportive Resolution.

The Downtown Streetscape Project was originally appropriated at $315,191, and will increase by $175,029 to $490,220. The Military Memorial was budgeted at $469,504, and will increase by $30,496 to $500,000. The two projects are projected to be fully funded by bond proceeds.

The Inverness Community Redevelopment Agency adopted resolution 2016-ICRA-4 on Thursday, November 3, 2016 to recommended that City Council amend the budget by passage of the Resolution to continue the projects. The resolution is included.

Recommended Action –

1. Motion, second and vote to read the Resolution by title
    a. Interim City Clerk reads Resolution title
2. Open a Public Hearing on the proposed Budget Change to support ICRA projects
    a. Those For; Those Against
3. Close the Public Hearing to deliberate
4. To proceed: Motion and second to adopt the Resolution by roll-call

Frank DiGiovanni

Administrative Offices
212 West Main Street, Inverness Florida 34450
www.Inverness-Fl.gov

FINANCE DEPARTMENT

212 W. Main Street
Inverness, FL 34450
(352) 726-5016 Phone
(352) 726-5534 Fax

Memorandum

To: Frank DiGiovanni, City Manager

From: Sheri Chiodo, Director of Finance

CC: Susan Jackson, Interim City Clerk
Paula Carnevale, Assistant Finance Director
Bruce Day, Community Development Director

Date: November 8, 2016

Reference: Fiscal Year 2017 Recommendation to City Council to Amend the 2017 CRA Project Budget Amendments

---

Project estimates have been updated for the Downtown Streetscape Project and the Infantry Memorial. The Downtown Streetscape Project was originally appropriated in the FY 2017 budget at an amount of $315,191; the project estimate has increased by $175,029 to $490,220. The Infantry Memorial Project was originally appropriated in the FY 2017 budget at an amount of $469,504; the project estimate has increased by $30,496 to $500,000. The two projects are projected to be fully funded by bond proceeds.

The Inverness Community Redevelopment Agency adopted resolution 2016-ICRA-4 on Thursday, November 4, 2016 recommending City Council amends the budget as referenced above. The resolution has been included for your reference.

RESOLUTION 2016-23

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF INVERNESS, FLORIDA AMENDING THE ADOPTED BUDGET FOR THE FISCAL YEAR COMMENCING OCTOBER 1, 2016 AND ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2017, AMENDING ICRA CAPITAL PROJECTS FUND, REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the Inverness Community Redevelopment Agency of the City of Inverness adopted resolution ICRA 2016-4 amending the Fiscal Year 2016-2017 budget to recognize funding from debt proceeds to fund project increases as estimated ; and

WHEREAS, the Inverness Community Redevelopment Agency adopted resolution ICRA 2016-4 to appropriate debt proceeds for estimate cost increases for authorized capital project expenses appropriated in Fiscal Year 2017;

WHEREAS, The City Council of the City of Inverness desires to amend the Fiscal Year 2017 budget as recommended by the Inverness Community Redevelopment Agency, and

WHEREAS, Resolution Number 2016-20, Section 5, authorizes amendments to the final adopted budget by resolution approved by the City Council of the City of Inverness, Florida; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ENACTED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF INVERNESS AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. That revenue accounts in the Capital Projects Fund shall be amended as follows:

Revenues	**Original Budget**	**Revised Budget**	**Adjustment**
Debt Proceeds	$3,497,659	$3,703,184	$ 205,525

Section 2. That expenditure accounts in the Capital Projects Fund shall be amended as follows:

Expenditures	**Original Budget**	**Revised Budget**	**Adjustment**
Downtown Streetscape	$ 315,191	$490.220	$ 175,029
Infantry Memorial Project	$469,504	$500,000	$ 30,496

Section 9. That this resolution shall be effective immediately upon adoption.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this _____ day of _____, 2016.

CITY OF INVERNESS

By: _____
David Ryan
Council Chairman

ATTEST:

_____
Susan Jackson
Interim City Clerk

CITY OF INVERNESS
2016/2017 FISCAL YEAR
THE PROPOSED OPERATING BUDGET EXPENDITURES OF THE CITY OF INVERNESS ARE 4.5% MORE THAN LAST YEAR'S TOTAL OPERATING EXPENDITURES

GENERAL FUND 7.5729

ESTIMATED REVENUES	GENERAL FUND	WHISPERING PINES PARK	ROAD IMPROVEMENT FUND	CAPITAL PROJECTS FUND	WATER & SEWER	CEMETERY	IMPACT FEE FUND	PENSION FUNDS	TOTAL BEFORE COMPONENT UNIT	I.C.R.A. TRUST FUND	TOTAL ALL FUNDS
TAXES:											
AD-VALOREM MILLAGE PER $1000 -7.5729	**3,231,427**								**3,231,427**	**-**	**3,231,427**
AD-VALOREM Delinquent Taxes	**80,000**								**80,000**		**80,000**
SALES AND USE TAXES	335,817								335,817		335,817
FRANCHISE FEES	745,320								745,320		745,320
UTILITY SERVICE TAXES	783,826								783,826		783,826
COMMUNICATIONS SERVICE TAX	285,000								285,000		285,000
LOCAL BUSINESS TAX	49,000								49,000		49,000
LICENSES AND PERMITS	172,000								172,000		172,000
GRANTS/SHARED REVENUE	110,119			922,250	620,000				1,652,369	612,023	2,264,392
STATE SHARED REVENUES	778,500								778,500		778,500
CHARGES FOR SERVICES	1,050,275	87,300			3,608,931				4,746,506		4,746,506
FINES AND FORFEITURES	22,500								22,500		22,500
INTEREST EARNINGS	38,500	1,500	300		29,000	9,300	700	23,500	102,800	31,600	134,400
RENTS & ROYALTIES	312,276				250				312,526		312,526
SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS/IMPACT FEES				338,000	337,631		31,000		706,631		706,631
CONTRIBUTIONS/DONATIONS		300							300		300
SALE OF FIXED ASSETS	5,000					7,600			12,600		12,600
PENSION CONTRIBUTIONS								1,500	1,500		1,500
MISCELLANEOUS REVENUES	25,400	6,000			14,000	300			45,700		45,700
DEBT PROCEEDS				3,703,184		100,000			3,803,184		3,803,184
TOTAL SOURCES	**8,024,960**	**95,100**	**300**	**4,963,434**	**4,609,812**	**117,200**	**31,700**	**25,000**	**17,867,506**	**643,623**	**18,511,129**
TRANSFERS IN	740,000	474,014		2,076,941	3,778,030				7,068,985	603,812	7,672,797
FUND BALANCES/RESERVES/NET ASSETS	6,688,352	347,480	13,699	3,626,570	6,971,509	673,320	619,585	401,545	19,342,060	70,156	19,412,216
TOTAL REVENUES, TRANSFERS & BALANCES	**15,453,312**	**916,594**	**13,999**	**10,666,945**	**15,359,351**	**790,520**	**651,285**	**426,545**	**44,278,551**	**1,317,591**	**45,596,142**
EXPENDITURES											
GENERAL GOVERNMENTAL	2,450,306			1,135,263				17,500	3,603,069		3,603,069
PUBLIC SAFETY	1,339,157			272,000					1,611,157		1,611,157
PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT	1,074,760				5,071,669	236,375			6,382,804		6,382,804
TRANSPORTATION	768,623			1,359,847			125,640		2,254,110		2,254,110
ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT	266,320			5,882,775					6,149,095	461,385	6,610,480
CULTURE & RECREATION	826,773	569,114		584,704					1,980,591	-	1,980,591
DEBT SERVICES	-				875,609				875,609	-	875,609
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	**6,725,939**	**569,114**		**9,234,589**	**5,947,278**	**236,375**	**125,640**	**17,500**	**22,856,435**	**461,385**	**23,317,820**
TRANSFERS - OUT	2,373,976	-		-	4,499,271	3,500			6,876,747	796,050	7,672,797
FUND BALANCES/RESERVES/NET ASSETS	6,353,397	347,480	13,999	1,432,356	4,912,802	550,645	525,645	409,045	14,545,369	60,156	14,605,525
TOTAL APPROPRIATED EXPENDITURES, TRANSFERS, RESERVES & BALANCES	**15,453,312**	**916,594**	**13,999**	**10,666,945**	**15,359,351**	**790,520**	**651,285**	**426,545**	**44,278,551**	**1,317,591**	**45,596,142**

THE TENTATIVE, ADOPTED, ADN/OR FINAL BUDGETS ARE ON FILE IN THE OFFICE OF THE ABOVE REFERENCED TAXING AUTHORITY AS A PUBLIC RECORD

RESOLUTION ICRA 2016- 4

A RESOLUTION OF THE INVERNESS COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF THE CITY OF INVERNESS, FLORIDA AMENDING THE ADOPTED BUDGET FOR THE FISCAL YEAR COMMENCING OCTOBER 1, 2016 AND ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2017, AMENDING ICRA CAPITAL PROJECTS FUND, REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the Inverness Community Redevelopment Agency of the City of Inverness desires to amend the Fiscal Year 2016-2017 budget to recognize funding from debt proceeds to fund project increases as estimated ; and

WHEREAS, the Inverness Community Redevelopment Agency desires to appropriate debt proceeds for estimate cost increases for authorized capital project expenses appropriated in Fiscal Year 2017;

WHEREAS, Resolution Number 2016-20, Section 5, authorizes amendments to the final adopted budget by resolution approved by the City Council of the City of Inverness, Florida; and

WHEREAS, the Inverness Community Redevelopment Agency is authorized to recommend budget amendments to the City Council of the City Inverness;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE INVERNESS COMMUNITY REDEVEOPMENT AGENCY OF THE CITY OF INVERNESS AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. Recommend City Council amends revenue accounts in the Capital Projects Fund as follows:

Revenues	**Original Budget**	**Revised Budget**	**Adjustment**
Debt Proceeds	$3,497,659	$3,703,184	$ 205,525

Section 2. Recommend City Council amends expenditure accounts in the Capital Projects Fund as follows:

Expenditures	**Original Budget**	**Revised Budget**	**Adjustment**
Downtown Streetscape	$ 315,191	$490,220	$ 175,029
Infantry Memorial Project	$469,504	$500,000	$ 30,496

Section 9. That this resolution shall be effective immediately upon adoption.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 3rd day of November, 2016.

CITY OF INVERNESS

By: _____
Tom Slaymaker
Chairman

ATTEST:

Debra Schramm
Community Development Staff Assistant

NOTICE OF BUDGET HEARING

The City Council of the City of Inverness will hold a public hearing on Tuesday, November 15, 2016 at 5:30 p.m. at the Inverness Government Center, 212 W. Main Street, Inverness, FL to consider and finalize a resolution amending the adopted budget for the Capital Projects Fund for the fiscal year commencing October 1, 2016 and ending September 30, 2017.

Agenda Memorandum – ***City of Inverness***

DATE: **November 10, 2016**

ISSUE: **Presentation by Andy Houston**

FROM: **City Manager**

CC: **N/A**

ATTACHED: **Comments to BOCC**

Andy Houston is the former City Manager of Crystal River who retired and successfully ran to serve as a Council Member. He opted to not run for another term, and will present information to City Council on local issues of funding law enforcement services by a municipality. Mr. Houston brings familiarity to this matter during his tenure with the City of Saint Petersburg. That City and others in Pinellas County engaged a relationship for law enforcement funding that differs from what is practiced in Citrus.

Resident and commercial properties in the City of Inverness (municipality) are levied the full-charge by the BOCC for Sheriff Services. There is no differential in taxation. While this may not lead to change, there is benefit to know the options that exist.

Recommended Action –
This is informational Only. No formal action is necessary.

Frank DiGiovanni

Administrative Offices
212 West Main Street, Inverness Florida 34450
www.Inverness-Fl.gov

August 18th Budget Workshop

1. cities call it "double taxation" - don't realize the services they get

* not what the cities are saying, and the paper submitted to both the Board and the Sheriff clearly states that – this is an issue of equity, not double taxation

2. Sheriff's Office is providing a base level of service – cities are paying for "extra services"

* this is misleading – would seem to indicate that county-funded road deputies provide basic response to calls for service in the cities, as they do in the unincorporated area, while contract-funded deputies do other, "extra" things – not the case – cities believe that the great majority of call for service within their jurisdictions are handled by the deputies funded through their contracts, while recognizing that county-funded deputies do respond to some calls – that break-out is unknown, which is why a study has been proposed – that contrasts sharply with the unincorporated area, where 100% of the responses to calls for service are provided by county-funded deputies. In the eyes of the cities, the contract-funded deputies are the primary providers of road patrol service within their jurisdictions, while the county-funded deputies are the secondary source of such service. We thus see an inequity in the fact that our residents are required to pay as much for what we perceive as a secondary source of road patrol services as do the residents in the unincorporated area, who get 100% of their road patrol services from county-funded deputies. That is not said in disrespect for the services rendered by the Sheriff or the county-funded deputies, but simply in acknowledgment of the reality that, to use Crystal River as an example, the 2 deputies assigned full-time within the limited boundaries of the city should be handling the great majority of calls for service.

3. Cities shouldn't expect enhanced services unless they're willing to pay for them.

* Cities are not asking to get an enhanced level of service of road patrol services without paying a higher cost, and it is both unfair and insulting for anyone to imply differently. If the Board ultimately decided to exempt City of Crystal River residents altogether from the portion of the county ad valorem taxes levied to support road patrol services, which hasn't been proposed by the cities, city residents would still be paying more than 3 times as much for road patrol services as would be the residents of the unincorporated area. The cost of the contracts is not the issue here – the issue is clear; county-funded deputies provide 100% of road patrol services in the unincorporated area, and only a fraction of those services in the two cities, yet our residents are required to pay the same cost for those deputies.

4. If the cities don't want to pay for the enhanced services, they should just terminate their contracts & accept the service level provided in the unincorporated area.

* The cities could in fact do that, and in the case of Crystal River the city's ad valorem levy could be cut in half – but who sees that as a good scenario? The residents of the two cities, who have already indicated both a desire for a higher level of road patrol service & a willingness to pay for that higher level of service, would see a reduction in service level. The CCSO, absent other budget adjustments, would presumably be required to eliminate the 16 deputy positions funded through the contracts, thereby reducing its overall service delivery capacity. Residents of the unincorporated area would see their service diminished as the resources currently deployed in that area would be stretched to provide services in the two cities as well. Who wins in such a scenario, and does anyone here truly think that's a better alternative for our community than simply reaching a reasonable agreement on some adjustment to what the city residents are paying for road patrol services beyond their contracts?

Equitable Funding of First-Response Deputy Services Within the Cities of Crystal River & Inverness

Background

The cities of Crystal River and Inverness both contract with the Citrus County Sheriff's Office (CCSO) for primary law enforcement services within their boundaries. Both cities previously operated their own Police Departments, but ultimately disbanded those departments and contracted with the CCSO. The contracts basically provide for first-response deputy services, with some investigative services as well.

As a result of those contracts, **the great majority of first-response deputy calls within each city are handled by deputies funded in full through the contracts. Conversely, first-response deputy calls elsewhere in Citrus County are handled by deputies funded by the general County ad valorem tax levy. Despite this distinction, residents in both cities are assessed the same general County ad valorem tax levy as residents in the unincorporated areas.** This has resulted in a belief on the part of City officials and residents that they are being taxed unfairly. Relief has been sought but denied, with the County Commission previously saying that it is an issue over which the Sheriff has authority and the Sheriff advising the cities that it falls within the authority of the County Commission.

During a meeting held January 28th between elected officials representing the County, the School Board, and both cities to discuss issues of mutual concern, this issue was again raised as a concern by representatives of both cities. Chairman Kitchen, who had called the meeting, invited the city representatives to pull together information on this issue and to bring it forward to the County Commission for discussion. This document has been prepared in response to that invitation.

Areas Where Agreement Should Not Be An Issue

1. This issue falls within the authority of the Board of County Commissioners, not the Sheriff. Where other counties in Florida have agreed to address similar concerns raised by their cities, or have refused to do so, it has been through action taken by their respective County Commissions. The Sheriff has no authority to set millage rates or establish taxing authorities.

2. There is ***no legal basis for the cities to demand relief based on the concept of double-taxation,*** based on a previous challenge in another part of the state that was ultimately decided by the Florida Supreme Court. **Deciding to address the concern, or refusing to address it, is at the discretion of the Board of County Commissioner**s.

3. Some counties have in fact addressed this concern in one fashion or another, and some have not. A regional survey of counties revealed that Alachua County, Marion County, Hillsborough County, and Pinellas County have each put municipal services taxing units (MSTU) in place to address the concerns of the cities within their jurisdiction, while Levy County, Sumter County, Hernando County, and Pasco County have declined to do so.

4. Not all of the costs associated with the operation of the Sheriff's Office are impacted by this issue. The cities do not dispute that their residents should be subject to the portion of the tax levy required to fund such services as the jail, tactical units, emergency management, and the command staff, which are not provided through the terms of current contracts for law enforcement services. Road patrol services, and to a limited degree investigative services, are the crux of the dispute inasmuch as those services within the cities are provided through the contracts in place.

5. This issue is not affected by whether or not the cities choose to have their primary law enforcement services provided by a stand-alone city police department or through a contract with the Sheriff's Office. The cities did not receive any "credit" against the County ad valorem levy for providing those services directly when they had their own departments, so the lack of equity already existed before the current contracts were put in place.

Discussion

1. An argument heard against the cities being given some relief on this issue is that they are simply paying more for a higher level of service. There is no argument that the cities are getting a higher level of service than generally provided in the unincorporated area, and there is an awareness that a higher overall cost is expected to be paid as a result. What this argument fails to recognize, however, is that the cities are not merely providing for a higher level of service – they are providing the basic service itself through the contracts with the CCSO that they fund. To illustrate, assume that calls for a patrol response originate in Citrus Springs, Homosassa, Floral City, and Crystal River. In the first three cases, that call will be handled by a deputy funded through the general county ad valorem tax levy within a range of times applicable to priority calls throughout the county. For the purposes of this illustration, a response time of 7 minutes will be assumed (note: the CCSO may be able to provide a documented range of response times, but the actual number is not particularly significant to this example). In Crystal River, that call would be handled by a deputy funded by the contract for law enforcement services, presumably within a response time significantly lower than 7 minutes inasmuch as the City is paying for two deputies to be on duty within a relatively small area. City residents, however are paying the same county ad valorem levy as are the residents in Citrus Springs, Homosassa, and Floral City. If a second deputy, funded by the general county ad valorem tax levy, subsequently showed up at the 7-minute mark for calls within the cities, the "higher level of service" argument would have some basis since City residents would be getting service from both providers they are funding. As a matter of practice, that does not, and should not, happen since that would reduce the coverage in the unincorporated area and be an inefficient use of resources as well. In reality, residents in both cities are being taxed for a service that they are generally not receiving, therefore in effect subsidizing a portion of the cost of first-response deputy services in the unincorporated areas.

2. A second argument raised against the cities being given relief on this issue is that they could simply terminate their current agreements and accept the level of service provided in the unincorporated areas of the county. This is in fact true, and for the City of Crystal River such an action would allow for a reduction of its current City millage levy by half given the annual contract cost of $960,580 and a one-mill value of $426,490 in Crystal River. It is hard, however, to see who would benefit from such an action. City residents, who have shown both a desire for a higher level of service and a willingness to pay a higher (but fair) amount for such coverage, would suffer a reduction of service level. The CCSO, absent other changes to their budget either in terms of increased tax revenue or reductions elsewhere in their budget, would presumably be required to eliminate those deputy positions funded by the two contracts (a total of 16 deputies), therefore reducing its overall service delivery capacity. Residents of the county in the unincorporated areas would see their service diminished as the current resources deployed in the unincorporated area would be stretched to provide services within the two cities as well. Who wins in such a scenario?

3. It would be reasonable to ask the question of just how significant this issue in terms of impact on the residents of the two cities. It is not possible to answer that question with specificity at this

point inasmuch as the amount of any cost reduction to be provided to city residents (and presumably shifted to residents of the unincorporated areas who benefit from road patrol services in those areas, absent other budgetary changes) would need to be determined by an analysis that would look at the actual costs attributable to road patrol and an equitable way to allocate those costs between the two cities and the unincorporated areas; this allocation will vary by county based on such factors as staffing, percentage of unincorporated area vs. incorporated area within the county, and calls for service. In those previously-mentioned counties that agreed to address what the cities see as an inequity, that analysis has either been conducted by the County or overseen by the County if provided by outside parties, given that the County has the ultimate authority over implementing the findings. The results, however, can be significant for city residents, as shown below:

1) In Alachua County, a non-countywide MSTU for Law Enforcement was levied a millage rate of 2.3283 for FY 16, with the majority of costs associated with road patrol allocated to the unincorporated area.

2) In Marion County, a non-countywide MSTU for Law Enforcement was levied a millage rate of 3.47 mills in FY 16, with the majority of road patrol costs and some investigative services expenses allocated to the unincorporated area.

3) In Hillsborough County, law enforcement costs are included within a non-countywide MSTU tax levy that includes other services provided within the unincorporated area; that overall millage rate is shown as 4.3745 mills for FY 17 (2-year budget cycle). Law enforcement costs are shown as accounting for approximately 28.2% of that levy, representing roughly 1.23 mills.

4) In Pinellas County, law enforcement costs are included in a non-countywide MSTU along with other services provided within the unincorporated area; that overall MSTU tax levy was 2.0857 mills for FY 16. While no break-down of costs for the non-countywide MSTU millage was found in the on-line budget material, there was a statement that "historically, approximately 1/3 of the road patrol budget is dedicated to the MSTU" (note: roughly 25% of Pinellas County is unincorporated).

A different way to try to get at least an order of magnitude for this issue is to run rough numbers based on the County's current General Fund budget. An on-line review of the County's 2015/16 General Fund budget shows a total figure of $90,045,366; of this amount, the Sheriff's Office appears to account for $24,865,299, or 27.6% of the total. Within the posted version of the Sheriff's 2015/16 budget, there is a total of $9,833,200 attributed to Patrol. Patrol thus represents 39.5% of the Sheriff's General Fund budget and 10.9% of the County's total General Fund budget. Based on the County's General Fund levy of 6.6738 mills and the value of a mill within the City of Crystal River ($426,490), it can be roughly approximated that City residents paid a total of $310,058 (based on 6.6738 x .109 = .727 mills & .727 mills applied against $426,490) in county taxes for Patrol services provided for the most part in the unincorporated area. This is admittedly a rough calculation, but serves to show a significant impact on City of Crystal River residents. Obviously a similar calculation could be run for City of Inverness residents.

Conclusion

The County has the legal authority simply to reject the concerns of the two cities and maintain the status quo. It should be of concern to the Commissioners, however, that analysis conducted by those counties who agreed to give this matter a fair review showed that there was a solid basis to support the

contention of the two cities that they should not be charged for road patrol services that are not rendered within their boundaries, and that the cost impact on city residents is not insignificant. The residents of the two cities can only hope that the Board of County Commissioners wants to be fair to all county residents on this matter.

It is too late to consider any change of this significance for the budget year currently under development. It would be timely, however, to start the process of determining an equitable way to allocate the applicable costs next year. It is recommended that a task force with representatives from the County, the CCSO, and both cities begin meeting to work out a fair methodology for such an allocation, with a goal of having a recommendation ready for Board consideration before next year's budget development process gets too far along. Options for such a methodology would include establishment of a formal MSTU to allocate costs related to providing road patrol services in the unincorporated area, or providing for a partial "rebate" of city taxes paid for county-wide road patrol services to the cities to reflect that the cities pay for the bulk of such services within their boundaries through the contracts in place with the CCSO. This would allow the cities to reduce their respective millages in a corresponding fashion and mitigate the current issue of city residents in effect subsidizing the funding of road patrol service within the unincorporated areas. A key component of the second option would be devising some manner of keeping the CCSO budget "whole" so that service capability is not diminished in the unincorporated area as a consequence of treating city residents more equitably.

The Board's willingness to consider this matter is genuinely appreciated.

VENDOR DOCUMENT	INVOICE	VOUCHER	DESCRIPTION	DUE DATE	DUE 11/30/16
	TOTALS FOR FLORIDA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMPANY				251.58
	TOTALS FOR GAI CONSULTANTS, INC				20,085.11
	TOTALS FOR H&B CONSULTING ENGINEERS, INC.				618.40
	TOTALS FOR HD SUPPLY WATERWORKS, LTD				1,959.19
	TOTALS FOR JOHN FRENCH				600.00
	TOTALS FOR OFFICE DEPOT INC				71.97
	TOTALS FOR PAVE-RITE				27,591.79
	TOTALS FOR PIGEON-ROBERTS & ASSOCIATES, LLC				2,337.00
	TOTALS FOR UNIFIRST CORPORATION				15.84
			REPORT TOTALS		53,530.88

** END OF REPORT - Generated by Stacey Iddings **

November 1, 2016
5:30 PM

The City Council of the City of Inverness met on the above date in Regular Session at the Valerie Theatre 207 Courthouse Square with the following members present:

President Ryan
Vice President McBride
Councilwoman Hepfer – *Not Present*
Councilwoman Bega
Councilman Hinkle
Mayor Plaisted

Also present were City Manager DiGiovanni, City Attorney Williams, Asst. City Manager Williams, Community Development Director Day, and Interim City Clerk Jackson.

The Invocation was given by Mayor Plaisted and the Pledge of Allegiance was led by the City Council.

ACCEPTANCE OF AGENDA

Councilman Hinkle motioned to accept the Agenda as presented. Seconded by Councilwoman Bega. The motioned carried.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

4)a) Voluntary Contractor Registration – Ordinance* (2nd Reading) with City Manager noting effective July 1, 2016, the City's Building Division eliminated the contractor registration program for contractors located outside the City. New 2016 state legislation (HB535) prohibits cities and counties from requiring a registration fee associated with providing proof of licensure as a contractor, recording a contractor license, or providing or recording evidence of workers' compensation insurance covered by a contractor. Registration for contractors located in Inverness is through the business tax receipt program at no additional charge. The contractor registration program will maintain a database of permit documentation and will serve citizens by documenting licensure and insurance.

Councilman Hinkle motioned to have the Clerk read Ordinance 2016-722 by Title only. Seconded by Councilman McBride. The motion carried.

ORDINANCE NO. 2016- 722

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF INVERNESS, FLORIDA, AMENDING CHAPTER 12 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES, ENTITLED "LICENSES, BUSINESS TAXES AND MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS REGULATIONS", BY AMENDING SECTION, 12-1, ESTABLISHING A VOLUNTARY CONTRACTOR REGISTRATION PROGRAM; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY; PROVIDING FOR INCLUSION IN THE CODE; PROVIDING FOR MODIFICATION AND, PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

Councilman McBride motioned to adopt Ordinance 2016-722 on the 2nd reading by roll-call vote. Seconded by Councilman Hinkle. Roll call vote was as follows:

Councilwoman Bega, yes; Councilman Hinkle, yes; Councilman McBride, yes; President Ryan, yes. The motion carried.

OPEN PUBLIC MEETING
None

SCHEDULED APPEARANCES
None

MAYOR'S LOCAL ACHIEVEMENT AWARDS
7)a) Proclamation Presentation – "National American Indian Heritage Month" - Mayor Plaisted presented the proclamation to 4 members of the Daughters of the American Revolution, and explained various community efforts they are involved in.

CITY ATTORNEY REPORT
None

CONSENT AGENDA

a) Bill Listing*
   - Recommendation – Approval
b) Council Minutes – 10/18/16*
   - Recommendation – Approval
c) AARC Board Reappointment – Kathy Thrumston*
   - Recommendation – Approval

Councilman Hinkle motioned to accept the Consent Agenda. Seconded by Councilman McBride. The motion carried.

CITY MANAGER'S REPORT
10)a) Christmas Parade – FDOT Permit* was addressed with City Manager DiGiovanni explaining that FDOT must approve the temporary closing of Hwy 41/44 (FDOT roadway) to accommodate the 2016 Chamber of Commerce Christmas Parade. City Council must authorize the City's hosting of the parade and accommodation of the parade to be held on Saturday December 10, 2016. This action is taken by FDOT confirming that the elected officials support the closing of the road. **Councilman McBride motioned to acknowledge and support that FDOT Highways 41/44 will be temporarily closed to accommodate the annual Christmas Parade on Saturday, December 10, 2016, from approximately 11:30am until 2:00pm. Seconded by Councilman Hinkle. The motion carried unanimously.**

10)b) Bank of America Purchasing Card Renewal Contract* with City Manager stating in September 2011, we entered into an Agreement with Bank of America for purchasing card program services. This is a single source arrangement that may be renewed in a five-year period with expiration date of January 5, 2021, (five years from the date of the State executing the documents). Under this arrangement, Bank of America will continue providing Visa purchasing cards for authorized city employees, and additionally will furnish desktop software, training and technical support at no added cost.

Councilman McBride motioned to renew the purchasing card program contract with the Bank of America Corporation, utilizing the State of Florida Purchasing Card Services Contract No. 973-120-97-1, and authorize the Council President to execute all documents to complete this transaction. Seconded by Councilman Hinkle. The motion carried.

10)c) Local Leadership Summit* was announced that the Board of County Commissioners discussed and agreed to organize a second Community Elected Leadership Summit. The selected date will be Friday, January 20, 2017, from 9:00 AM to 3:00 PM, at the College of Central Florida. The School District confirmed their attendance, and City Council is asked to comment on who may wish to attend. The County asks that we reply by November 4th. No formal vote is necessary. President Ryan, Councilwoman Bega, and Councilwoman Hepfer plan to attend.

10)d) Fire Department Grant – Informational Only* with City Manager DiGiovanni noting the Inverness Fire Department (IFD) had success in securing Federal Grant monies to purchase equipment and educational/training materials, with an award of over $60,000 for equipment purchases with no match from the City. The Assistance to Firefighters Grant Program (AFG) has issued a Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) with a deadline for submittal being November 11, 2016. The IFD will be submitting two applications for a new specialized Quint Type Truck (hybrid fire apparatus that is a combination of ladder, rescue, and class A pumper), and for equipment and training. Below is a breakdown:
Application 1 – Aerial apparatus $660,000; Personnel training $2,000; Fringe est. $400; Travel est. $600; Construction $5,000. TOTAL = $668,000. **Federal Share = $636,191** and **City Share 5% = $31,809.**
Application 2 – 2 IDLH monitor $3,000; Thermal camera $6,000; 2 RIT pack/cylinder $12,026; Portable radios $30,000; Haz-Mat decon/clean-up $5,000; Vehicle Extrication Eq. $30,000; Monitor/Defibrillator $13,000; Modify facility $49,490; PPE SCBA units $85,800. TOTAL = $234,316. **Federal Share = $223,159** and **City Share 5% = $11,157.**
This AFG program requires a 5% local match on awarded items. If both grants are awarded, the total budget impact will be $31,809, to secure $869,350.00 for equipment/training purposes. This grant cycle will not affect this year's budget and will be factored as part of the Fiscal Year 2017-18 appropriation. This is informational and does not require formal action by City Council. Councilman McBride noted that the total of the 5% match should be $42,966 for both applications.

City Manager DiGiovanni additionally reported on the following:

- Cooter Fest this past weekend was amazing. Also mentioned upcoming events including Festival of the Arts, Farm City, Grand Prix, etc.
- Citrus County School Board is considering pulling from the solid waste franchise agreement causing the City to look to modify our program and also look at fully automated collection in the future.
- Sweetwater Pointe project is continuing and should come back to Council at the beginning of December.
- Spoke to the BOCC's recognizing their responsibility for the roads in Inverness Acres.

- After the November 8 Election, medical marijuana will need to be addressed again, if it does pass.

COUNCIL/MAYOR SUBJECTS

Mayor Plaisted agreed that the Cooter Festival was a great time with great music, and what a wonderful team of City staff work together to make these events happen. He noted the various upcoming events in the City to include the Festival of the Arts and the Veteran's Day Parade.

Councilwoman Bega stated she thoroughly enjoyed the Cooter Festival and is very happy with the Board of County Commissioners recognizing that the roads in Inverness Acres are the board's responsibility.

Councilman Hinkle noted that he missed this year's Cooter Festival as he was in North Carolina attending the League of Municipalities conference, and noted a variety of sessions he attended, to include the subject of "blue zones" and community gardens.

Councilman McBride spoke of how well the Cooter Festival was organized. Looking forward to the Festival of the Arts, and we should be proud of where we are and what we are doing.

President Ryan noted he recently attended the Joint Government meeting and funding for Whispering Pines Park was discussed. It was announced that there will be a meet and greet for the incoming commissioners. The Cooter Festival and Cooterween were great.

CITIZENS NOT ON AGENDA

None

Meeting adjourned at 6:09pm.

_____ _____

Interim City Clerk Council President

Agenda Memorandum – ***City of Inverness***

DATE: **November 15, 2016**

ISSUE: **Appoint a New Member to ZBA**

FROM: **City Manager (Prepared by Bruce Day)**

CC: **Susan Jackson**

Attached: **Board Member Application**

Ms. Erma "Sue" Newman, a long time educator for Citrus County Schools, has completed an application to express interest to serve in a volunteer capacity as a member of the Zoning Board of Adjustment. Ms. Newman retired after 32 years in the local school system having worked at Inverness Primary School and WTI. She wants to remain active and is looking for new ways to be involved in the community.

The addition of Ms. Newman will bring the Board to a workable number, but the ZBA remains in need of another member.

We continue to seek City residents that may be interested to serve on volunteer boards.

Recommended action -
If the applicant and submittal are satisfactory, please motion, second and vote to appoint Sue Newman as a volunteer member to the Inverness Zoning board of Adjustment to a three-year term.

Thanking you in advance for your attention to this matter.

Frank DiGiovanni

DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

212 West Main Street
Inverness, FL 34450-4801
(352) 726-3401

Building & Zoning Division
Fax (352) 726-5473

APPLICATION FOR SERVING ON CITY BOARDS

1. Name Erma 'Sue' Newman Home Phone 352-860-0210
2. Home Address 714 Highland Ave.
3. Business — Bus. Phone —
4. Business Address —
5. Brief resume of education and experience: Masters Degree in Education - Taught in CC Schools for 32 years.
6. Are you a registered voter? Yes ✓ No ____ Precinct# ____
7. Are you a resident of the City? Yes ✓ No ____
8. Do you own property in the City? Yes ✓ No ____
9. Do you hold a Public Office? Yes ____ No ✓
10. Are you employed by the City? Yes ____ No ✓
11. At present, do you serve on a board or committee of either the city or county? Yes ____ No ✓
    If "yes", name: ____
12. Please check the boards and/or committees you are interested to serve on:

    ____ Planning & Zoning Commission
    ✓ Zoning Board of Adjustment
    ____ Code Enforcement Board (must be a resident of the City)
    ____ Community Redevelopment Agency
    ____ Architectural/Aesthetic Review Committee
    ____ Law Enforcement Pension Board

13. Committee or Boards you have served in the past: none
14. Why do you believe you are qualified to serve on this board/committee? I'm quite interested in the city of Inverness functions.
15. Would you consider serving on another board or committee other than the one(s) you selected above? Yes ____ No ✓
16. Until such time you are selected for the board or committee of your choice, may we submit your application when vacancies occur rather than phone you? Yes ____ No ✓

NOTE: (1) Application will remain active for one (1) year from submittal date.
(2) If appointed, you are required to complete a Financial Disclosure form.

SIGNATURE Erma 'Sue' Newman DATE Oct. 31, 2016

*APPLICATIONS REMAIN ON FILE FOR 6 MONTHS

Agenda Memorandum – ***City of Inverness***

DATE: **November 10, 2016**

ISSUE: **Charter Referendum Vote Tabulation**

FROM: **City Manager**

CC: **Interim City Clerk**

ATTACHED: **N/A**

Two City Charter Referendums were presented to the electorate, and both were approved.

Charter Amendment 1: Sale, Leasing, Subleasing of real property passed by a vote of:

- Yes – 454
- No – 329

Charter Amendment 2: Purchase of Real Property passed by a vote of:

- Yes – 488
- No – 298

These will be read into the record by the Interim City Clerk, and forwarded to Municode (municode.com) for incorporation into the City Charter.

Recommended Action –
Interim City Clerk reads vote results.

This is a vote by City Electors that will be made part of the City Charter. City Council is asked to motion, second and vote to accept the vote tally for Charter Amendment One and Charter Amendment Two, and direct that the changes are incorporated into the City Charter.

Frank DiGiovanni