

City Commission Meeting Minutes, as amended
March 9, 2026
6:00 p.m.

ELECTED OFFICIALS PRESENT:

Adrian Petrilu, 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	Luke Curtis, Building Official
Kathleen Murray, Management Analyst	Brandon Berry, Senior Planner

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

1. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Commissioner Maldonado added a discussion item about Country Thunder as item 7a.

Motion: **Commissioner Robinson moved, Vice Mayor Marriott seconded, and the motion carried 5-0 to approve the March 9, 2026 City Commission Agenda, as amended.**

2. PRESENTATIONS

a. Ordinance 2026-03: Communication and Small Wireless Facilities Design Standards

Telecommunications attorney W. Scott McCollough addressed the Commission on behalf of local residents regarding the proposed wireless facilities ordinance. He provided a presentation that was made part of the meeting record. He stated that residents had requested assistance reviewing the ordinance and noted that discussions with City staff and the City Attorney had resolved most issues, leaving three primary points of disagreement: the setback distance from residential dwellings, whether state law prohibits separation requirements between wireless facilities, and whether ordinance provisions should be mandatory or encouraged. Mr. McCollough explained that residents support a mandatory 40-foot setback from residential dwellings rather than the staff-recommended 30-foot setback, stating that wireless poles are typically about 40 feet tall and that a greater setback is necessary to reduce potential safety risks if a structure were to fall during severe weather. He also advocated for a 500-foot separation between wireless facilities, arguing that such a provision could be justified under state law through location-based regulations, aesthetic considerations, and concealment measures. He stated that the proposed negotiation process included in the ordinance could allow flexibility if a facility could not meet the separation requirement. Mr. McCollough acknowledged concerns about potential litigation but expressed the view that a facial legal challenge to the ordinance would be unlikely unless a permit were ultimately denied after negotiation failed. He concluded by thanking staff and the Commission for their consideration and offered to answer questions.

Commissioners asked questions regarding federal and state regulatory authority over wireless facilities. Mr. McCollough explained that there are ongoing efforts at the federal level, including proposed legislation in Congress and a rulemaking by the FCC, that could further limit local government authority over wireless infrastructure. He noted that many state and local government organizations are opposing those efforts. He also stated that while Florida is not the only state with statutes preempting local regulation of wireless facilities, many other states provide local governments with greater authority than Florida currently allows. In response to questions about setback standards, Mr. McCollough explained that the proposed 40-foot setback represented a compromise from earlier proposals that sought greater distances measured from the property line. It was also asked whether Florida case law supports separation or setback requirements under the current statute. Mr. McCollough stated that he was not aware of any case law specifically addressing separation requirements under the current law. Additional questions addressed whether a 40-foot setback could constitute an effective prohibition

under federal law. Mr. McCollough stated that under federal law the burden would be on the wireless provider to prove that a regulation effectively prohibits service by demonstrating that no feasible alternative locations exist. Questions were asked whether there is data showing that wireless poles have fallen and caused damage. Mr. McCollough noted that while utility poles have historically fallen during storms or accidents, small wireless facilities are relatively new technology and there is limited long-term data specific to those installations. However, he stated that the additional equipment mounted on the poles could increase potential impacts if a structure were to fail.

Matt Mucci, AT&T representative, addressed the Commission and stated that the company had participated in discussions with residents, staff, and the Commission regarding the proposed ordinance language. He expressed concern that the changes being considered in the current ordinance would conflict with state statutes governing the use of public rights-of-way. As a result, AT&T stated its opposition to the ordinance as proposed. Mr. Mucci also noted that AT&T has made efforts to work with residents, including voluntarily relocating a previously installed small cell facility, and indicated a willingness to remain available to answer questions.

b. Seawalls – Potential Code Updates

Luke Curtis, Building Official, presented an overview of the City’s seawall ordinance and requested Commission direction on potential modifications. His presentation was made part of the meeting record. He explained that seawalls are primarily intended to protect against tidal flooding, while stormwater from rainfall events must be addressed through separate drainage or retention measures. He reviewed the history of the ordinance, noting that the seawall elevation requirement of 5 feet NAVD (approximately 5 feet above sea level) was clarified in 2021. In September 2024, the ordinance was amended to create an administrative variance process allowing seawalls to be constructed at a lower elevation when justified by site conditions. He also reported that the number of seawall permit applications increased significantly following recent storm events, with more than double the number of permits submitted compared to the year prior to the storms. Mr. Curtis explained that variance requests typically fall into two general categories: properties with older, non-conforming homes built at grade prior to flood insurance rate maps, and newer homes constructed in compliance with elevation requirements. He outlined the five criteria currently used to evaluate administrative variance requests, including hardship considerations, potential impacts to neighboring properties, stormwater mitigation capability, and ensuring that any variance represents the minimum adjustment necessary. He requested Commission guidance on potential ordinance adjustments, including:

- requiring seawall designs that allow future elevation increases,
- establishing a possible cost threshold for stormwater mitigation measures,
- modifying the variance criteria to simplify approvals,
- reconsidering the required seawall elevation standard, and
- evaluating whether new construction should be required to bring seawalls into compliance with the current height requirement.

Discussion followed regarding how the current seawall ordinance functions in practice and potential challenges property owners face when seeking administrative variances. There were concerns about how the ordinance distinguishes between tidal flooding, which seawalls address, and rainwater flooding, which are managed through other measures such as swales, retention areas, infiltration systems, or similar drainage solutions. Mr. Curtis confirmed that the seawall ordinance primarily addresses tidal flooding and does not currently mandate rainwater mitigation measures for seawall construction. Discussion also raised concerns about using pre-FIRM and post-FIRM classifications when evaluating properties, noting that some homes built during transitional periods may not conform to modern flood standards despite technically being categorized as post-FIRM. Additional concerns were raised regarding how stormwater management requirements, such as accommodating a 25-year, 24-hour storm event, could be difficult for some low-lying properties to achieve due to limited site space or groundwater conditions. Questions were raised about how engineers determine the recommended seawall elevation when applying for a variance. Mr. Curtis explained that the determination is typically based on professional engineering analysis of site conditions and potential impacts to the property. It was noted that contractors often default to the

5-foot NAVD standard established in the ordinance when designing seawalls. Further discussion addressed potential future options such as allowing additional methods to increase flood protection beyond seawall caps, including grading adjustments or stepped elevations behind seawalls. Questions were asked about the potential cost threshold for stormwater mitigation measures, with staff explaining that the suggested 20% value guideline could be applied to the value of the structure or other metrics depending on Commission direction. Mr. Curtis reported that approximately 83 seawall permits have been issued since October 2024, with less than 10 administrative variance requests, indicating that variance cases represent a small portion of total permits. He noted that recent variance decisions highlighted the difficulty of applying the existing criteria consistently and prompted the request for Commission guidance. There was support for exploring modifications to the ordinance, including requiring seawalls approved at lower elevations to be designed for future height increases, evaluating stormwater mitigation expectations, and considering whether an appeal process should be added for administrative variance decisions. Commissioners also expressed interest in requiring seawalls to meet elevation standards for new construction where feasible.

c. Parking Rate Study

Assistant City Manager Adam Poirrier presented revenue options from the 2025 parking study and related parking action plan. He explained that the study produced recommendations involving technology, signage, enforcement, ordinance changes, and revenue. He also noted that the City has established a parking enterprise fund to better manage parking revenues and expenses. He presented several standalone revenue options based on 2025 parking transaction data. These included increasing the citywide hourly parking rate by \$0.50; passing credit card processing fees on to users; adding a \$1 hourly “sunset pricing” surcharge from 4:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.; increasing rates by \$1 per hour during the peak season from February through April; aligning the County Park parking rate with the City’s standard rate; reducing morning rates by \$1 per hour until noon; treating Friday as part of the weekend rate schedule; and increasing the holiday flat rate from \$25 to \$40 per day. Mr. Poirrier explained that each revenue estimate was calculated individually and did not assume adoption of the full package, though staff also provided a combined estimate if all options were implemented. He noted that parking demand is strongest on Fridays, weekends, holidays, evenings, and during peak season. He also reported that the Finance and Budget Review Committee had reviewed the options and generally supported most of them, but did not support passing credit card fees on to users or reducing morning rates. The presentation concluded with a summary of possible next steps, including final adoption of the ordinance allowing parking fee changes by resolution, return of a resolution reflecting Commission direction, and continued work on related parking system improvements such as enforcement technology, financial reporting, signage, parking fines, and resident parking enhancements.

Discussion focused on the proposed parking rate options and clarifying questions were asked regarding enforcement hours, revenue impacts, and potential effects on residents and businesses. Mr. Poirrier confirmed that City parking is generally enforced from 8:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m., while the County Park lot operates under 24-hour enforcement. Concerns were noted that higher parking rates could push more vehicles into nearby residential neighborhoods. It was suggested to adjust weekday enforcement hours rather than lower the morning rate. Commissioners discussed the potential revenue impacts of the options and acknowledged that changes could affect user behavior and parking demand. Commissioners expressed general support for most of the committee’s recommendations and generally favored implementing the proposed revenue adjustments. There was also discussion about the holiday flat parking rate currently in place during major holiday weekends. It was suggested that staff review the impacts of the flat daily fee, particularly in Pass-a-Grille, where local businesses have expressed concerns that the daily rate may discourage short visits. Staff indicated that they could analyze available transaction data and consult with local businesses to better evaluate potential alternatives, such as hourly pricing during those periods. Commissioners also briefly discussed the possibility of establishing a special event parking rate for large events in the future, but it was noted that current technology limitations may make location-specific or event-specific pricing difficult to implement immediately. There was consensus, based on the discussion, staff would prepare a draft resolution reflecting the FBRC’s recommendations and bring it back to the Commission for consideration, along with additional data regarding holiday parking usage and potential alternatives.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

John Rondolino, Maritana Dr., raised concerns about proposed seawall requirements, noting the six-foot elevation standard would also apply to Gulf-front properties. He questioned tying seawall variances to stormwater retention studies and suggested that, if flood protection is the goal, property owners should be allowed to raise lot elevations to higher flood standards.

Deborah Schechner, Boca Ciega Isle Dr., noted that some neighborhoods have areas without seawalls due to historical requirements for adjacent property owner agreement and asked how those situations would be addressed under proposed regulations. She commented on low awareness of the upcoming election and encouraged greater voter participation. She expressed support for passing through credit card fees on parking.

John Kurzman, Bahia Honda Way, offered suggestions on several topics, including considering design options for seawalls and the need for backfilling when raising them to prevent drainage issues. He commented on FEMA flood insurance rating changes and suggested advocating for policy updates. On parking, he suggested adjusting rates rather than adding credit card fees when no cash option exists and recommended reviewing demand data when setting pricing. Regarding small cell facilities, he supported a setback standard based on the greater of 30 feet or the pole height and cautioned about potential unintended placement impacts from a 500-foot separation requirement.

Kelly Lee McFrederick, Maritana Dr., raised concerns about seawall requirements affecting historic docks and asked how permits for modifications would be handled. She also questioned whether commercial properties, including nearby hotels, would be required to meet the same seawall standards and expressed interest in having input on the design and engineering of any required improvements.

4. CONSENT

- a. Approval of the February 24, 2026 City Commission Meeting Minutes.
- b. Approval of an amended Fiscal Year 2026 Compensation Pay Plan.
- c. Authorize the City Manager to execute the fourth services agreement with Cotton Global Disaster Solutions, in the amount of \$36,777.99 for the Don Vista Art Center second level flooring repairs damaged by Hurricanes Helene and Milton.

Motion: Vice Mayor Marriott moved, Commissioner Rzewnicki seconded, and the motion carried 5-0 to approve the March 9, 2026 City Commission Consent Agenda, as presented.

5. ORDINANCES

a. Final 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 ERRORS; CONSTRUCTION; PUBLICATION; AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

Attorney Brookes read Ordinance 2026-02 in title only.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No members of the public came forward.

Motion: Commissioner Maldonado moved, Commissioner Rzewnicki seconded, and the motion carried 5-0 to approve the final reading of Ordinance 2026-02.

b. Final 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 reported that since first reading, meetings were held with the residents' attorney and representatives for Verizon and AT&T to discuss potential revisions to the proposed wireless facilities ordinance. Updated language reflecting those discussions was included in the Commission's meeting materials. Key areas of discussion included setback requirements. Staff continues to recommend a 30-foot setback from an existing dwelling unit, while residents proposed a 40-foot setback. Residents also proposed separation distances of 10 feet from driveway aprons and 30 feet from fire hydrants. Staff agreed with the intent but recommended referencing existing requirements in the Land Development Code and fire safety codes rather than specifying new distances in the ordinance. Both parties agreed on language encouraging placement of wireless facilities and supporting structures near interior side lot lines rather than directly in front of dwellings, subject to driveway and hydrant limitations. Residents also agreed with staff's recommendation to use a negotiation process for alternative locations rather than a variance process. Regarding the proposed 500-foot separation distance between facilities, staff maintained its recommendation not to include a specific minimum distance. Instead, the ordinance would encourage maximum separation to the extent possible and technically feasible without limiting communications service, with determinations made on a case-by-case basis. Additional language was also agreed upon to require compliance with applicable codes, including any rules or restrictions related to historic districts. Staff noted that additional technical input on setback feasibility would be provided.

Senior Planner Brandon Berry presented an overview of the two setback proposals under consideration for wireless facilities. The staff alternative recommends a 30-foot setback from an existing residential dwelling where technically feasible, measured from the structure rather than the property line. The citizen proposal requests a 40-foot setback from the nearest existing residential dwelling or permitted structure. Mr. Berry explained that typical right-of-way widths and building setbacks in most areas of the City leave approximately 32 to 38 feet between the curb and residential structures, though conditions vary by neighborhood. Older neighborhoods may have larger setbacks, while newer homes are often built closer to the property line. Based on these conditions, staff indicated that a 30-foot setback would be easier to accommodate citywide, where a 40-foot setback could be more challenging in certain areas, though it would not necessarily prohibit placement of facilities.

Discussion continued regarding the proposed setback distances for wireless facilities. Commissioner Maldonado illustrated the distance difference and noted that since some poles can reach approximately 40 feet in height, a 30-foot setback does not provide sufficient safety buffer if a structure were to fall. He supported increasing the setback to 40 feet. There were questions about the typical height of wireless facility poles and antennas. Staff explained that antennas are usually mounted above the pole and often extend five to seven feet higher, with some installations reaching heights of approximately 51 to 53 feet. Further discussion addressed the proposed 500-foot separation concept. There were concerns about the visual and aesthetic impacts of multiple poles in close proximity and it was asked whether aesthetic considerations could be highlighted if numerical separation limits are restricted by state law. Existing clusters of poles near City Hall were used as an example of potential visual impacts if placement is not managed carefully.

PUBLIC COMMENT

The following spoke in opposition of the staff proposed draft, and in support of the resident draft:

Roger Houde, Pass-a-Grille
Ron Vignault, Pass-a-Grille
Lauren Mones, Pass-a-Grille
Dean Lurker, Pass-a-Grille
Nancy Lurker, Pass-a-Grille

Kelly Lee McFrederick, Maritana Dr.

Jack Rice, Maritana Dr.

Kathy Garchow, Casablanca Dr.

Deborah Schechner, Boca Ciega Isle Dr.

Discussion included legal considerations related to the proposed wireless facility ordinance. It was asked whether the residents' proposal, particularly the 500-foot separation requirement, would withstand legal challenge. Attorney Brookes advised that while increasing the setback from 30 to 40 feet could potentially be incorporated within the staff language as an encouraged standard, the proposed 500-foot minimum separation distance would likely conflict with state law, which prohibits municipalities from imposing minimum separation requirements for small wireless facilities. He noted that adoption of language preempted by state statute could expose the City to legal challenges and potential liability for attorney's fees. Discussion continued, noting the importance of adopting an ordinance that can withstand legal scrutiny and support for the 40-foot setback while opposing the 500-foot separation requirement due to the associated legal risks. It was acknowledged that improvements in the ordinance related to safety considerations such as fire hydrant and driveway clearances were included. Concerns were raised about the aesthetic impacts of wireless facilities and the overall appearance of utility infrastructure within the City. Staff explained that the City's regulatory authority over aesthetics is limited primarily to design elements such as color, paint, or concealment treatments. Attorney Brookes noted that pending state legislation could further restrict landscaping requirements. As a potential compromise, he suggested including the residents' proposed 500-foot separation provision as a separate subsection with a severability clause, allowing the remainder of the ordinance to remain in effect if that provision were later invalidated. Commissioners also explored whether a density-based limitation could be used as an alternative to a separation distance; however, staff advised that this approach could also be interpreted as a prohibited limitation under state law.

Motion: Commissioner Maldonado moved, Mayor Petrila seconded, and the motion carried 4-1 to approve the final reading of Ordinance 2026-03, as amended to include a 40 ft setback from dwellings and 500 ft. separation distance where technically feasible and a negotiation period. Vice Mayor Marriott voted no. as amended at the March 24, 2026 Commission Meeting to state a 40 ft setback from dwellings unless a negotiation period and a 500 ft separation requirement where possible and technically feasible without limiting communication services.

6. ACTION ITEMS

a. Resolution 2026-06: Grant an Easement to Duke Energy Florida for City property at 8665 Boca Ciega Dr. (Pump Station 1).

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF ST. PETE BEACH GRANTING A TEN FOOT BY TEN FOOT LIMITED PURPOSE UTILITY EASEMENT TO DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC; AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

Attorney Brookes read Resolution 2026-06 in title only.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No members of the public came forward.

Motion: Commissioner Robinson moved, Commissioner Rzewnicki seconded, and the motion carried 5-0 to adopt Resolution 2026-06.

b. Resolution 2026-05: Waive permit fees for seawall repairs in rights-of-way

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF ST. PETE BEACH TO TEMPORARILY WAIVE BUILDING PERMIT AND PLANS EXAMINATION FEES FOR PRIVATE SEAWALL PERMITS ADJOINING CITY RIGHTS OF WAY BEGINNING MARCH 10, 2026, THROUGH AND INCLUDING MARCH 10, 2028; AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

Attorney Brookes read Resolution 2026-05 in title only.

Luke Curtis, Building Official, presented a brief analysis of the potential fiscal impact of waiving permitting fees for seawalls adjacent to the public right-of-way. Approximately 4,575 linear feet of seawall fall within this category. Based on permits issued since the recent storms, the average construction cost was estimated at \$1,118 per linear foot, representing roughly \$5 million in total project value. The associated permitting fees for that work were estimated at approximately \$83,000, which would represent the potential revenue waived.

Discussion focused on the potential scope and equity of waiving seawall permit fees. It was asked how many properties would be affected, with staff estimating roughly 40–60 properties. It was suggested the program could potentially be expanded citywide for a limited period, allowing any property owner wanting to replace or improve a seawall to receive a fee waiver to encourage broader resiliency efforts. Staff noted a citywide analysis has not yet been completed and that a comprehensive seawall study is underway, with more detailed information coming. It was also noted that expanding the waiver citywide could represent a significantly larger fiscal impact, potentially reducing permit revenue by several hundred thousand dollars. Commissioners noted the importance of equitable opportunities for property owners but emphasized that the current proposal focuses specifically on seawalls adjacent to City rights-of-way because those structures also protect public infrastructure such as roads, utilities, drainage systems, and sidewalks. Improving these seawalls was described as helping safeguard upcoming public capital investments in those areas.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Kathy Garchow, Casablanca Dr., on behalf of DCPOC, spoke in support of the resolution. She also noted illegal parking on empty lots in neighborhoods and asked if the city can partner with a towing company. She thanked Mayor Petrila and Commissioner Rzewnicki on the eve of the election.

John Rondolino, Don Cesar Place, spoke in support of the resolution.

Commissioner Rzewnicki supports a retroactive waiver back to Hurricane Helene.

Motion: Commissioner Rzewnicki moved, Vice Mayor Marriott seconded, and the motion carried 5-0 to adopt Resolution 2026-05, as amended to retroactively waive fees back to Hurricane Helene.

7. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

a. Discussion on Country Thunder (Added)

Commissioner Maldonado raised a discussion regarding the proposed Country Thunder event, noting increased public attention and questions about the festival. While expressing support for large events that promote tourism and economic activity, concerns were raised about hosting the event on the beach during sea turtle and black skimmer nesting season. The Commissioner suggested the event could potentially be held in parking areas rather than directly on the beach and requested a cost estimate of City resources required, including public safety, emergency operations, and crowd control. Commissioners discussed environmental concerns, potential impacts on wildlife, parking and crowd management, and the need for transparency regarding costs and logistics. It was noted that the event would require permits from state agencies, including the Florida Department of Environmental Protection and Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission, and that the City currently does not have a formal role in that permitting process, but concerns have been communicated. Commissioners shared interest in obtaining additional information from the organizers and potentially receiving a presentation outlining event logistics, safety planning, and resource impacts. Concerns were also raised regarding ticketing, parking overflow in residential areas, and the overall scale of the event. City Manager Robustelli noted it's an administrative special permit.

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

Renee Rose, City Clerk – As a reminder, the municipal election is tomorrow, 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 Building. Polls will be open from 7am-7pm.

Frances Robustelli, City Manager – She acknowledged Senior Planner Brandon Barry for his work supporting City policy review, interpretation, and recommendations. She noted the complexity of his role and expressed appreciation for Mr. Barry’s contributions to the organization.

City Attorney Brookes – He shared similar appreciation for Mr. Berry. He reported that the City received a pro se petition for writ of certiorari filed by a resident related to the Board of Adjustment variance approval for 702 Pass-a-Grille Way. He noted that the matter is covered under the City’s insurance defense coverage and explained that the case will proceed as an appellate review based on the record and transcript of the Board of Adjustment proceedings, with no trial expected.

Commissioner Maldonado – He is hosting a community meeting Monday, March 16th at 6pm at the Warren Webster building. He echoed the comments regarding Mr. Berry.

Commissioner Rzewnicki – She shared support for Mr. Berry and stated that attacks directed at staff during the meeting was inappropriate.

Commissioner Robinson – She reminded residents to participate in the upcoming election and confirmed polling locations. She shared support for prior comments recognizing Mr. Berry and highlighted the importance of maintaining order during public meetings.

Vice Mayor Marriott – She reminded the public of upcoming community events, including the first Spring Concert in the Park and the Corey Avenue St. Patrick’s Day street party. She recognized the Corey Avenue Business Association for organizing successful events and contributing to the vibrancy of the Corey Avenue district.

Mayor Petrila – no report

Mayor Petrila adjourned the meeting at 9:16pm.

MINUTES APPROVED: MARCH 24, 2026



RENEE ROSE
CITY CLERK



ADRIAN PETRILA
MAYOR