

City Commission Meeting
February 24, 2026
6:00 p.m.

ELECTED OFFICIALS PRESENT:

Adrian Petrila, Mayor
Karen Marriott, Vice Mayor, Commissioner, District 1
Lisa Robinson, Commissioner, District 2
Betty Rzewnicki, Commissioner, District 3
Jon Maldonado, Commissioner, District 4

STAFF PRESENT:

Frances Robustelli, City Manager	Adam Poirrier, Assistant City Manager
Ralf Brookes, City Attorney	Laura Canary, Community Development Director
Renee Rose, City Clerk	Candyce Galloway, Innovation and Technology Director
Mandy Edmunds, Resident Services Director	Kristin Coman, Planning Manager
Devon Schmidt, Finance Director (via Zoom)	

Mayor Petrila called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m., followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

1. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Commissioner Rzewnicki added a discussion item about public/private seawall partnership. Commissioner Robinson added a discussion item about an SOP for permitting. These items were added as 7a and 7b.

Motion: **Commissioner Robinson moved, Commissioner Maldonado seconded, and the motion carried 5-0 to approve the February 24, 2026 City Commission Agenda, as amended.**

2. PRESENTATIONS

a. Mike Twitty, Pinellas County Property Appraiser

Mike Twitty shared a presentation on Post-Storm Valuation Resources. His presentation was made a part of the meeting record. He explained that January 1 serves as the statutory assessment date each year and represents a snapshot of a property's condition as of that date. Properties are valued based on whether they remain damaged, have been repaired, or have demolition permits in place. Mr. Twitty highlighted several storm-related resources available on the Property Appraiser's website, including storm FAQs, FEMA/WLM letters (with access to both 2024 pre-storm and 2025 letters), the Building Value Reconsideration (BVR) process, and guidance on the calamity provision and homestead portability. He reviewed the storm damage survey mailed to affected property owners to help ensure accurate 2026 assessments and determine whether owners intend to use the calamity provision. He explained that many properties were temporarily depreciated due to storm damage and that the BVR process allows owners to submit pre-storm documentation, including photographs and invoices, to restore building value where appropriate. He also discussed trust ownership verification letters to assist property owners seeking owner-builder permits when properties are held in trust. He provided an overview of recent legislative changes to the calamity provision. Homesteaded properties may now rebuild up to 130 percent of the original square footage, or up to 2,000 square feet, whichever is greater, without losing the Save Our Homes cap, provided a permit is pulled within five years of January 1 following the storm and the homestead exemption is maintained. Non-homestead properties may rebuild up to 110 percent, or 1,500 square feet, whichever is greater, within a three-year window. He highlighted the importance of not removing homestead status during the rebuilding process. He introduced a new online calamity calculator to help single-family homeowners estimate potential tax impacts of repairs or rebuilding based on square footage and current legislative limits. He also reviewed portability provisions for homesteaded properties significantly damaged by a named storm, noting that affected owners may elect special treatment and retain a three-year window to port their Save Our Homes benefit. He referenced the Pinellas County "People First" Hurricane Recovery Programs, funded through HUD grants, which provide financial assistance to eligible homeowners, renters, landlords, and small businesses. He closed by promoting the Property Appraiser's public education programs, newsletters, and the Clerk of Court's free Property Fraud Alert service, which notifies subscribers of documents recorded in their name.

Discussion included asking about acceptable documentation for the Building Value Reconsideration (BVR) process, particularly for residents who lost records or photographs in the storms. Mr. Twitty advised that any available pre-storm documentation, including family pictures or MLS listing photos, may be used, and highlighted the importance of providing some form of visual evidence. Clarification was requested on the calamity provision as it applies to commercial and multi-unit properties. Mr. Twitty confirmed that homesteaded portions of duplexes may qualify for the 130% cap, while non-homestead and commercial properties fall under the 110% limitation. Commissioners also sought clarification on which FEMA letter year should be used if additional storm damage occurs before repairs are completed. Mr. Twitty advised that the pre-storm 2024 letter would generally be appropriate in that scenario. Additional discussion addressed prior storm events, including Idalia, and Mr. Twitty confirmed that earlier storm damage had been considered in valuation adjustments and the development of the BVR process. Questions were raised about the storm damage property condition status letters sent by the Property Appraiser's Office and why some residents received them while others did not. Mr. Twitty explained that letters were sent to properties identified as having potential storm damage based on available data and that properties with permits already pulled or prior communication with the office were removed from the mailing list. He noted the purpose of the letter was to confirm property condition as of January 1 and ensure accurate valuation and FEMA letter information.

PUBLIC COMMENT

John Kurzman, Bahia Honda Way, thanked the Property Appraiser and questioned how beachfront properties and sandy beach areas are classified and taxed. He raised concerns about hotels marking off beach areas for rentals and limiting public access, while paying relatively low business tax receipts. He asked how the City can ensure fair taxation, protect public access, and provide equitable representation for residents.

Mr. Twitty said that beachfront taxation and ownership issues are complex and often addressed case by case due to varying legal descriptions, erosion control lines, and beach nourishment status. He noted that much of the property value is driven by building density rather than ancillary beach amenities, and that those revenues are considered in income-based appraisals for hotels. He acknowledged concerns about public use and customary use but stated that these issues are outside his authority.

b. Dune Savers 2025 Recap

Mandy Edmunds introduced Nancy Stevens with Dune Savers. Dune Savers is volunteer group that has dedicated time and effort to restoring and maintaining the City's dunes and vegetation. Ms. Stevens shared a presentation on the Dune Savers 2025 Review and 2026 Vision. Her presentation was made a part of the meeting record. She explained that dunes serve as natural infrastructure, stabilizing sand, supporting wildlife, and strengthening storm resiliency. Established in 2024, Dune Savers meets twice weekly and conducts all work by hand, led by trained volunteers including Master Gardeners and advanced plant identification leaders. In 2025, 55 volunteers contributed 835 hours working directly in the dunes and an additional 155 hours behind the scenes. The group removed 546 large containers of invasive plants and debris, approximately 7,000 cubic feet, including Brazilian pepper trees, carrotwood, lead trees, and other invasive species. Work occurred across Pass-a-Grille Beach, County Beach, Upham Beach, and the Don CeSar property beaches, with approximately 14 acres cleared. More than 500 native plants were installed, including sea oats, dune sunflower, sea grape, railroad vine, and other native species. She highlighted positive ecological indicators following the 2024 storms, including the return of native vegetation, natural dune reformation, removal of vehicle traffic impacts, and 28 recorded sea turtle nests (unofficial count). She emphasized strong partnerships with the City of St. Pete Beach, beachfront neighbors, and the Don CeSar Hotel, which donated removal of more than 50 Brazilian pepper trees. Looking ahead to 2026, the organization plans to continue large-scale invasive removal, complete a full pass of accessible dune areas island-wide, expand native plantings as donations allow, maintain access paths, and begin a citywide invasive removal initiative. She encouraged residents to stay on designated paths, report invasive species, avoid disposing of yard waste in dune areas, and support ongoing restoration efforts. Dune Savers meets every Monday and Friday from

7:30-8:30am.

c. Permit Process Brief Update

Laura Canary, Community Development Director, shared an update on the permit process. Her presentation was made a part of the meeting record. Ms. Canary outlined completed actions since the January update, including conducting volunteer exit interviews to identify trends and inform process improvements, implementing Community Development customer service standards, and assigning a dedicated permit technician to each application as a single point of contact. Same-day or express permits are currently available for select permit types (such as water heaters, panel upgrades, electric meters, and certain mechanical change-outs), with improved website communication coming soon. Appointments with the Building Official and Deputy Building Official are now available, and extended Wednesday hours have been implemented and are being monitored for effectiveness. Staff has refined review status terminology to improve clarity for applicants and are evaluating consolidated review processes to balance efficiency with timely comment delivery. To provide clearer timelines, staff will publish statutory review requirements, expand project checklists, and begin reporting actual average review times by permit type rather than estimated timelines.

Candyce Galloway, Innovation and Technology Director, provided an update on the 91 Days to June 1 roadmap, focusing on development of an operational blueprint that includes a permit service map, a pain point register identifying recurring operational challenges including manual processes, intake bottlenecks, fragmented communication, and limited automation, and a permit matrix defining permit types, review disciplines, documentation requirements, sequencing dependencies, and compliance triggers. A future-state service map is being developed to incorporate automation, defined workflow triggers, improved notifications, and performance standards. Staff are also evaluating emerging AI tools to assist with intake, notifications, and plan review functions, with targeted vendor demonstrations coming soon and potential recommendations or an RFP by June.

Next steps include continued cross-disciplinary coordination, additional Commission updates in March and June, and a Building and Permitting Open House on March 26 from 8 a.m. to 6 p.m. The overall goal is to implement strategic operational enhancements that improve efficiency, enhance customer experience, and strengthen regulatory compliance.

Discussion included an acknowledgment of the significant work being done to improve the permitting process. It was asked when it is most beneficial for applicants to schedule appointments with the Building Official or Deputy Building Official. Ms. Canary explained that meetings are especially helpful for complex projects, such as new construction, or when applicants are in early planning stages and want guidance before submitting plans. Appointments are also encouraged when applicants have received unclear or conflicting information and would benefit from direct discussion. A need was expressed for clearer status visibility within the permit portal. The current “in review” label can be frustrating and does not provide enough detail for homeowners or contractors. Suggestions included adding a checklist, progress bar, status indicators, or clearer descriptions, such as identifying which review stage is pending or whether additional information is needed from the contractor. Improved transparency could reduce confusion, limit unnecessary calls to staff, and help applicants better understand their role in the process. There was also discussion about maintaining a human touch, including phone calls before issuing denials where appropriate. Ms. Canary provided an update on mobile permitting and post-storm response. Technology infrastructure is in place to support field-based permitting, including mobile devices and printing capabilities. As part of the substantial damage administrative procedures plan, staff have developed a placard system that could be deployed immediately after a storm. Damage assessment teams would place permit placards on properties in the field, allowing tracking within the system and helping property owners begin recovery steps more quickly. This approach is intended to reduce the need for after-the-fact permits. It was suggested that allowing applicants to submit photos with permit applications may help clarify scope and reduce misunderstandings. Storm preparedness was discussed, highlighting the need for clear, easily accessible recovery guidance on the City’s website in the event of another storm. Ms. Canary confirmed that website updates are

being structured so recovery-related information can be quickly reactivated and displayed as needed.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

No members of the public came forward.

4. CONSENT

- a. Approval of the February 10, 2026 City Commission Meeting Minutes.
- b. Authorize the City Manager to execute the Continuing Contract for Professional Design Services with George F Young of Florida, Inc. for three years.
- c. Ratification of Reappointment of the Fifth Trustee to the Firefighter's Pension Board.

Motion: Vice Mayor Marriot moved, Commissioner Robinson seconded, and the motion carried 5-0 to approve the February 24, 2026 City Commission Consent Agenda, as presented.

5. ORDINANCES

a. Final Reading of Ordinance 2025-24: Revising Code of Ordinances Chapters 131 & 132 Pertaining to Communication and Small Wireless Facilities

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF ST. PETE BEACH, FLORIDA PROVIDING FOR AMENDMENTS TO THE CODE OF ORDINANCES CHAPTER 131 WIRELESS COMMUNICATION TOWERS AND ANTENNAS AND CHAPTER 132 COMMUNICATION FACILITIES IN THE PUBLIC RIGHTS-OF-WAY; RENAMING CHAPTER 132 TO COMMUNICATION FACILITIES IN THE CITY RIGHTS-OF-WAY; PROVIDING FOR CODIFICATION, CONFLICTS, SEVERABILITY, CORRECTION OF SCRIVENER'S ERRORS, CONSTRUCTION, PUBLICATION, AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

Attorney Brookes read Ordinance 2025-24 in title only.

PUBLIC COMMENT

The following spoke in support of Ordinance 2025-24, and support for Ordinance 2026-03 only if it includes a 30 ft setback and 500 ft separation:

Lauren Mones, Pass-a-Grille

Ronald Vigneault, Pass-a-Gille

Jim DiMartino, Pass-a-Grille, read letter on behalf of Scott McCollough, McCollough Law Firm. The letter was made a part of the meeting record.

KellyLee McFrederick, Maritana Dr.

Jack Rice, Maritana Dr.

Vincent Tormenia, Casablanca Ave.

Matt Mucci, AT&T representative, stated support for the ordinance on second reading. He clarified that AT&T has installed no more than 10 small cell facilities in the City to date, noting these are antennas on existing utility poles, not traditional towers.

Discussion focused on liability and insurance protections included in the ordinance. Attorney Brookes confirmed that hold harmless, defense, and insurance provisions are incorporated, requiring providers to defend and indemnify the City, and to provide certificates of insurance, construction bonds, removal bonds, and removal plans. There was a question regarding the list of specifically named landmarks and locations in the purpose section of the ordinance. Concern was expressed that identifying certain properties could unintentionally exclude other historic or significant community resources now or in the future. It was suggested that the language be revised to include "including but not limited to" to allow flexibility as additional sites may be designated. There was consensus to incorporate this as a recommended change.

Motion: Vice Mayor Marriott moved, Commissioner Rzewnicki seconded, and the motion carried 5-0 to approve the final reading of Ordinance 2025-24, as amended.

b. First Reading Ordinance 2026-03: Amending Code of Ordinances Chapter 132 Pertaining to Communication and Small Wireless Facilities Design Standards

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF ST. PETE BEACH, FLORIDA PROVIDING FOR AMENDMENTS TO THE CODE OF ORDINANCES CHAPTER 132 COMMUNICATION FACILITIES IN THE CITY RIGHTS-OF-WAY, SEC. 132-16 DESIGN STANDARDS; PROVIDING FOR CODIFICATION, CONFLICTS, SEVERABILITY, CORRECTION OF SCRIVENER'S ERRORS, CONSTRUCTION, PUBLICATION, AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

Attorney Brookes read Ordinance 2026-03 in title only. He presented a citizen proposal to amend Chapters 131 and 132 to add numerical distance requirements for small wireless facilities in the public right of way. The proposal included a minimum 30-foot setback from private property lines and a 500-foot minimum separation between new ground-mounted small wireless facilities. He explained that a 30-foot setback from the property line would likely make placement within the City's rights of way impossible and could be considered a de facto prohibition under state law. The proposal had previously shifted between measuring from property lines and structures, but the latest version returned to measurement from the property line. Regarding the proposed 500-foot separation requirement, he noted that most facilities in the City are not ground-mounted and that state statute limits the City's ability to impose minimum separation distances. He highlighted concern that adopting fixed numerical spacing requirements could conflict with state preemption under Section 337.401, Florida Statutes. As an alternative, he prepared revised language retaining the 30-foot and 500-foot distances but qualifying them with "whenever possible and technically feasible," and incorporating the statutory negotiation process rather than a variance requirement, since state law prohibits requiring public meetings for such applications. He advised that if a setback were adopted, measuring from structures rather than property lines could provide a stronger public safety justification. The Commission was advised of potential litigation risks and attorney's fee exposure if the ordinance were challenged and found inconsistent with state law.

Discussion included the proposed 500-foot separation requirement and alternative solutions. It was asked whether, instead of imposing a minimum separation distance of 500 feet between facilities, the City could consider limiting the total number of small wireless facilities within a defined area, such as a maximum number per square mile. The intent would be to address concerns about overconcentration or density of facilities within neighborhoods, while potentially avoiding conflict with state preemption language that prohibits minimum separation distances. Attorney Brookes explained that this idea would require additional legal analysis. He explained that wireless facility placement depends on technical factors such as signal radius, spectrum band, and line-of-sight conditions, and that coverage needs vary based on surrounding development and physical obstructions, applying traditional land-use density standards to wireless infrastructure presents challenges. He also noted that Section 337.401, Florida Statutes, contains significant limitations on a municipality's ability to restrict placement, including restrictions related to separation distances, and potentially limits on numerical caps. He will evaluate the issue prior to second reading. Commissioners also discussed whether any numerical limitation would apply per carrier or in total across all providers. Concerns were raised about ensuring the Commission had input from multiple carriers. Attorney Brookes confirmed receipt of correspondence from Verizon, which objected to vagueness in portions of the ordinance language but did not assert that the ordinance adopted earlier that evening was preempted by state law. He explained that some of the broader language was drafted in response to state preemption constraints that limit the City's ability to impose specific numerical standards. Additional review and discussion can occur prior to second reading.

PUBLIC COMMENT

The following spoke in opposition of the staff proposed draft:

Lauren Mones, Pass-a-Grille, adding that the proposed language has consistently been a 30-foot setback from residential property lines and stated that the use of the term "structures" was described as a legal term of art, not a substantive change to the setback distance.

Ronald Vigneault, Pass-a-Gille

KellyLee McFrederick, Maritana Dr., clarified that the intent of the proposed setback has always been 30 feet from the residential property line within the right-of-way, not 30 feet from a structure.

Jack Rice, Maritana Dr.

Discussion focused on the difficulty of “threading the needle” between resident concerns and state and federal preemption. It was noted that a 30-foot setback is not feasible in some areas, particularly Pass-a-Grille, and discussed the need for enforceable standards that would not be easily challenged. Ordinance language reinforcing ties to public safety, especially sight lines, pedestrian safety, and ADA access, while also considering whether density concepts could be explored as an alternative to prohibited minimum separation distances. Transparency and process limitations under the Sunshine Law were discussed, noting that commissioners cannot speak to one another outside the dais, and that this meeting is the primary forum for collective discussion. It was discussed if the ordinance, as drafted, has sufficient “teeth,” and acknowledged the need to avoid adopting provisions that would likely trigger costly litigation. There was concern about committing taxpayer funds to defend an ordinance that would likely be preempted, and concerns about the continued use of staff time on the issue. The Commission has a responsibility to pursue reasonable safeguards for health, safety, aesthetics, and property impacts, even within constraints. Attorney Brookes clarified the evolving citizen proposals, including differences between setbacks measured from property lines versus structures, and explained why a variance process is problematic under the statute. He summarized the staff-recommended approach using “whenever possible and technically feasible” language and negotiation of alternative locations and noted that the proposed 500-foot spacing relates to ground-mounted equipment (not poles), which is not common in St. Pete Beach installations. He explained that, if adopted on first reading, the ordinance would be transmitted to the Florida Department of Legal Affairs, which delays the effective date for 30 days after receipt, and that staff is reviewing whether state law allows any limits based on overall counts or density. There was support for pursuing legislative advocacy at the state and federal levels, including engaging the City’s lobbyists and coordinating with the Florida League of Cities. Discussion concluded with the direction to consider moving forward with staff’s recommended language on first reading while continuing research before second reading.

Motion: Vice Mayor Marriott moved, Commissioner Maldonado seconded, and the motion carried 5-0 to approve the first reading of Ordinance 2026-03, with the staff language version.

c. First Reading Ordinance 2026-02: Parking Fees Established by Resolution

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF ST. PETE BEACH, FLORIDA, AMENDING APPENDIX A OF THE CITY’S CODE OF ORDINANCES RELATING TO PARKING FEES; REMOVING PARKING FEES FROM APPENDIX A; PROVIDING THAT PARKING FEES SHALL BE ESTABLISHED AND AMENDED BY RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COMMISSION; PROVIDING FOR CODIFICATION; CONFLICTS; SEVERABILITY; SCRIVENER’S ERROR; CONSTRUCTION; PUBLICATION; AND EFFECTIVE DATE.

Attorney Brookes read Ordinance 2026-02 in title only.

Adam Poirrier, Assistant City Manager, said staff has been working on a parking action plan for the last several months based on consultant recommendations. It is a multi-tier and a long-term process to get all the recommendations in line and to get the parking program to where it where it should be. Currently, parking fees are established by ordinance within the City’s adopted fee schedule appendix, which requires two readings and a public hearing for any adjustment. The proposed ordinance would remove parking fees from the ordinance appendix and allow future updates to be adopted by resolution. This change would maintain legal compliance while providing greater administrative flexibility, allowing the City to adjust fees more efficiently, both upward or downward, as needed. Any future fee changes would still require Commission approval and public input. Staff has presented preliminary fee options to the Finance and Budget Review Committee and incorporated their feedback. A similar presentation will be brought to the Commission for policy direction.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No members of the public came forward.

Motion: Mayor Petrila moved, Vice Mayor Marriot seconded, and the motion carried 5-0 to approve the first reading of Ordinance 2026-02.

6. ACTION ITEMS

a. Acceptance of the Capital Projects Prioritization Tool for Fiscal year 2027 Budget

Devon Schmidt, Finance Director, presented a proposed Capital Improvement Projects (CIP) Prioritization tool. Her presentation was made a part of the public record. The tool provides a transparent and repeatable framework to ensure capital investments align with the City's strategic roadmap, community priorities, resiliency goals, regulatory obligations, and responsible financial stewardship. It allows departments, management, and the Commission to consistently evaluate which projects should be advanced, deferred, or funded through specific revenue sources. The matrix operates by assigning weights, totaling 100, to defined evaluation criteria, reflecting the City's relative priorities. Projects are scored on a standardized scale across categories such as health and safety, regulatory mandates, asset condition and risk, recovery and resiliency, community prosperity, economic and smart growth, lifecycle and operations impacts, funding leverage, project readiness, and bundling/coordination opportunities. Weighted scores are calculated to generate overall rankings, and the tool allows scenario analysis by department, funding source, or project type. The proposed framework places the greatest emphasis on life safety, legal compliance, asset protection, and resiliency, with growth and prosperity as secondary considerations and operational factors serving as refinements rather than primary decision drivers. The Finance & Budget Review Committee recommended adjustments to increase the weighting of health and safety, regulatory mandates, and bundling/coordination. The Commission was asked to accept the use of the CIP Prioritization Tool beginning with development of the Fiscal Year 2027 budget.

Discussion focused on clarifying how the funding component of the matrix operates and addressing public misconceptions regarding capital funding. It was asked whether the tool distinguishes between funded and unfunded projects, specifically referencing the funding criterion in the matrix. Ms. Schmidt explained that the funding category evaluates whether external funding has been secured. Projects with more than 50% secured external funding would receive the highest score in that category, while projects funded primarily through City funds or with unknown funding would score lower. Further clarification was provided that the prioritization tool ranks projects based on policy criteria but does not establish funding. The CIP identifies projects and currently allocated funding for the present fiscal year. Out-year funding is largely unfunded except for recurring or projected revenue sources, such as Penny for Pinellas. Deficits in future years reflect funding that has not yet been allocated. The matrix will assist in allocating available resources during the annual budget process once operational needs are addressed.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No members of the public came forward.

Motion: Commissioner Rzewnicki moved, Commissioner Maldonado seconded, and the motion carried 5-0 to accept the proposed Capital Projects Prioritization Tool for FY2027 Budget.

7. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

a. Discussion on Public/Private Seawall Partnership (Added)

Commissioner Rzewnicki added a discussion about public/private seawall partnership in the Don Cesar neighborhood, citing several years of work and the unique conditions of that area. It was noted that the Don Cesar subdivision is the only neighborhood in the City where privately owned seawalls directly adjoin a City right-of-way. Because the right-of-way is heavily used by City services, including waste collection vehicles and post-storm operations, the associated wear and deterioration of the seawalls are impacted by public use. A recent neighborhood meeting with seawall owners explored funding options for repairs. The request is for Commission

support to bring back an action item evaluating the feasibility of temporarily waiving or reducing permit fees for qualifying seawall owners as a resiliency incentive. Attorney Brookes indicated that, if properly framed in relation to the public right-of-way and public benefit, fee waivers could be considered. Discussion included potential cost savings through bundling private projects for competitive pricing. City Manager Robustelli will return with additional information. There was consensus to bring an action item for consideration.

b. Discussion on an SOP for Permitting (Added)

Commissioner Robinson added a discussion about an SOP for permitting that a phone call is required prior to issuing a permit denial. This would allow the applicant an opportunity to understand the issues and potentially make corrections before a formal denial is issued. City Manager Robustelli indicated the request could be reviewed in coordination with the ongoing permit process mapping efforts. There was general agreement among the Commission to have staff evaluate incorporating this practice into the permit process.

8. CITY CLERK, CITY MANAGER, CITY ATTORNEY, AND CITY COMMISSION REPORTS

Renee Rose, City Clerk – As a reminder, the next Commission meeting will be on Monday, March 9 due to the municipal election being held on Tuesday, March 10. The polling location for Districts 1 & 2 is City Hall, and the polling location for Districts 3 & 4 is the Warren Webster. Polls will be open from 7am-7pm.

Frances Robustelli, City Manager – no report

City Attorney Brookes – no report

Commissioner Maldonado – He reported his next community meeting will be March 16.

Commissioner Rzewnicki – no report

Commissioner Robinson – no report

Vice Mayor Marriott – no report

Mayor Petrila – no report

Mayor Petrila adjourned the meeting at 9:26pm.

MINUTES APPROVED: MARCH 9, 2026



RENEE ROSE
CITY CLERK



ADRIAN PETRILA
MAYOR