

FINANCE & BUDGET REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
February 4, 2026 – 2:30 P.M.

PRESENT: Jack Samorajczyk, Chair
Col. Mike Greiger, Vice Chair
Tim Polanowski, Member
Stacy Allen, Member
Mark Kanak, Member

STAFF PRESENT: Devon Schmidt, Finance Director; Frances Robustelli, City Manager;
Renee Rose, City Clerk; Kathleen Murray, Management Analyst; Adam Poirrier, Assistant City Manager; John Taylor, Assistant Finance Director

Chair Samorajczyk called the meeting to order at 2:30 PM. He thanked former member Kathy English for her service to the Committee.

1. **Approval of the Agenda** – Member Greiger sent an email to Finance Director Devon Schmidt about the \$213M need and how it would be funded. Ms. Schmidt will cover this in item c.

2. **Audience Comments** – There were no comments.

3. **Action Items**

a. **Approval of Minutes - Finance and Budget Committee meeting November 5, 2025.**

Motion: Member Allen moved, and Vice Chair Greiger seconded to approve the minutes for the November 5, 2025 meeting minutes; the motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

b. **Opportunities to Increase Parking Revenues**

Management Analyst Kathleen Murray presented an update on parking management tied to the new parking enterprise fund, which treats parking as a standalone business so revenues and expenses can be tracked and reinvested in parking needs rather than the general budget. She noted annual metered sales are about \$6 million, with Saturdays and Sundays generating roughly as much as the other five days combined, and Fridays are also strong. The average transaction is about \$8.67, though some are under \$1 and some are over \$100 when vehicles remain for extended periods. She explained the City currently uses two pricing structures, one for the County Park and one for the rest of the City, which can create confusion and incentives to choose the lower-cost County Park. She outlined several revenue options. Passing through the 3% credit-card fee on all transactions (standard practice for many public agencies) would equate to roughly \$160,000 per year. A \$1/hour “sunset” premium from 4:00–8:00 p.m., when many visitors come for dinner and the beach, could result in about \$280,000 annually. A seasonal \$1/hour increase from February 1 to April 30 could produce approximately \$475,000. Unifying the County Park rate with the City rate would simplify pricing and is estimated at about \$300,000 in additional revenue, though the City splits fees 50/50 with the County. She also discussed potential offsets, such as lowering morning rates citywide (8 a.m.–noon), which would reduce revenue by about \$582,000. The intent is to balance financial performance with customer impact. Combining some of these measures could meet or exceed the Mayor’s \$500,000 revenue target.

Discussion included implementation and revenue options. Staff confirmed resident vehicles can be recognized with existing systems. To avoid sign clutter, rate details would be shown primarily via QR codes, pay stations, and mobile apps rather than large new signs. Staff walked through additional revenue levers: treating Fridays as weekend rates (about \$200,000 annually), raising the holiday flat rate from \$25 to \$40 (about 32,000 holiday transactions × \$15 is roughly \$480,000), and aligning County Park pricing with the City's pricing. Boat ramp parking remains open to all users, and the current \$25 rate is consistent with other county facilities. Members supported moving forward with the full set of increases: the sunset surcharge (4–8 p.m.), the in-season \$1/hour increase (Feb 1–Apr 30), Friday at weekend rates, higher holiday day rate, and County Park alignment, but not passing through the 3% credit-card fee. Staff noted the city's current technology doesn't support real-time demand-based pricing or frequent rate adjustments; an RFP for upgraded platforms, including license-plate readers and better rate controls, can be planned in the coming months.

Motion: Chair Samorajczyk moved, and Vice Chair Greiger seconded to recommend that the City Commission approve the full set of parking rate adjustments: the sunset surcharge from 4:00–8:00 p.m.; \$1/hour in-season increase from February 1 through April 30; charge Friday at weekend rates; increase the holiday day rate; and align County Park pricing with the City rate structure, but not approve the pass-through 3% credit-card fee; the motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

c. Ad Valorem Revenue House Bill Impacts

There were technical difficulties with this presentation. Finance Director Devon Schmidt presented on Item d first in the interest of time.

Ms. Schmidt presented an overview of potential state House Bill impacts to the City's ad valorem tax revenues, which currently account for approximately 40% of General Fund revenues and support core services including law enforcement, fire/EMS, public services, IT, community development, and parks and recreation. Several proposed bills were outlined, with estimated impacts ranging from approximately \$19,000 to \$4 million annually, depending on the exemption scenario (homestead, senior exemptions, valuation reductions, insurance-related exemptions, or portability changes). Public safety funding would be protected under the proposals, shifting impacts to other General Fund services. She noted that the purpose of the presentation was to highlight potential future budget risks should any of the bills pass. She outlined ongoing work on a comprehensive revenue generation strategy, including pending fee studies (parking, utilities, recreation), grant opportunities, enterprise fund adjustments, and exploration of additional revenue options such as assessments, partnerships, surcharges, and other legally permissible tools under Florida law. Staff invited feedback from the Committee on additional revenue ideas for further evaluation.

Members discussed several revenue and financing concepts raised in the presentation. Ms. Schmidt clarified that public-private partnerships would involve private entities fronting capital costs for City assets, with the City repaying costs over time, noting these are more common for high-profile projects but have been used elsewhere for infrastructure. She added that additional revenue strategies under review include tolling concepts, road ownership transfer feasibility, a commercial parking assessment (being studied with University of Florida law students), and donation or trust-based funding mechanisms, including naming rights and dedicated trusts. Discussion included

balancing the cost of public safety services, noting that a significant share of fire, EMS, and law enforcement calls serve visitors and businesses, and there was interest in revisiting commercial parking or business-related assessments. Questions were raised about economic development outreach; City Manager Robustelli noted current efforts occur through Community Development and the CRA, but no formal business recruitment program exists. Discussion also addressed funding long-term capital needs, including the \$213 million infrastructure estimate (over 10 years), bonding options, assessments, and the importance of upcoming fee studies. It was highlighted to focus on near-term project delivery while also planning for long-range needs, particularly major sewer and seawall projects. Ms. Schmidt highlighted ongoing resiliency planning, including a forthcoming citywide seawall study and potential partnerships with neighborhoods pursuing assessments. She is committed to providing additional budget detail, updating end-of-year financials on the website, and continuing development of a capital projects dashboard showing project status, expenditures, and milestones. The Committee expressed support for continued exploration of revenue options and highlighted the importance of delivering visible progress on capital projects.

Ms. Schmidt noted there is no formal recommendation needed; this presentation was for information purposes.

d. Capital Projects Prioritization Tool

Ms. Schmidt presented a capital project prioritization tool aligned with GFOA best practices, following the City's receipt of its first GFOA Distinguished Budget Award. This capital prioritization tool provides an objective, repeatable, and transparent method to score and rank capital projects annually and will be included as an appendix in the budget to enhance public transparency. Projects are evaluated using weighted criteria, totaling 100 points, that can be adjusted over time to reflect Commission priorities. The ten scoring categories include: public health and safety, regulatory mandates, asset condition and risk, community prosperity, recovery and resiliency, economic and smart growth, lifecycle operations and maintenance impacts, funding leverage and restrictions, project readiness, and project bundling/coordination. Each project is scored in each category, with weighted scores producing an overall ranking. Current proposed weightings emphasize safety, regulatory compliance, and recovery/resiliency, with supporting emphasis on operational efficiency and funding opportunities. The tool is intended to support defensible decision-making, align projects with the City's strategic roadmap, and help prioritize approximately \$213 million in identified capital needs.

Discussion included support for the revised capital project prioritization framework, noting it was similar to prior approaches but improved with added detail and clearer staff input. Members highlighted the importance of relying on staff expertise to score individual projects, with the Committee and Commission providing policy-level guidance on criteria and weights rather than reviewing all projects individually. It was agreed that staff would apply the scoring to all projects and return with results for Committee review and discussion. Members supported implementing the tool, posting it publicly for transparency, and refining it over time as part of an annual process. After discussion, the Committee reached consensus on adjusted weighting of the criteria as follows: Health and Safety – 15; Regulatory Mandate – 15; Asset Condition and Risk – 12; Recovery and Resiliency – 12; Bundling and Coordination – 11; Community Prosperity – 10; Economic and Smart Growth – 10; Lifecycle Operations and Maintenance – 5; Funding Leverage/Restrictions – 5; and Project Readiness – 5. The Committee recommended these weights

should move forward to the Commission, with the understanding that they may be revisited and adjusted in future years.

Motion: Vice Chair Greiger moved, and Chair Samorajczyk seconded to recommend the tool to the City Commission with amended weighting of the criteria; the motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.

Vice Chair Greiger excused himself from the meeting at 3:42pm; he returned at 3:45pm.

5. Adjournment

The next meeting is scheduled for March 4, 2026.

There being no further business, Chair Samorajczyk adjourned the meeting at 4:07 PM.

These minutes were approved at the April 28, 2026 Finance and Budget Review Committee meeting.