

**DUNEDIN CODE ENFORCEMENT BOARD
REGULAR MEETING OF TUESDAY, AUGUST 4, 2020
CITY HALL – 542 MAIN STREET – 2:00 PM**

Chair Bowman called the Virtual Code Enforcement Board Teleconference meeting to order at 2:05 P. M. and explained the purpose of this Board and meeting procedures to those in attendance.

ROLL CALL

Secretary to the Board Ms. McHale called the roll to which the members and staff present responded.

PRESENT: Chair Michael Bowman and Vice-Chair Lowell Suplicki; Members William Motley, Arlene Graham, Ken Carson, Bunny Dutton and Dave Pauley; Alternate Member Gordon Chize

ALSO PRESENT: City Attorney Tom Trask, Secretary to the Board Joan McHale, Code Enforcement Code Enforcement Inspector Michelle Gilbert, Code Inspector Peter Hinson, Code Inspector Chris Elbon and approximately five attendees via ZOOM.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Approval of the Minutes from Regular Meeting of July 7, 2020

MOTION: Mr. Carson moved to approve the minutes of the regular meeting of the July 7, 2020. Second was made by Vice Chair Suplicki.

VOTE: Motion carried with Chair Bowman, Messrs. Suplicki, Chize, Pauley, Carson, Motley, Ms. Graham and Ms. Dutton voting aye. Chair Bowman voting aye. Voting nay, none.

AFFIDAVITS OF COMPLIANCE

Chair Bowman read the case numbers for the Affidavits of Compliance.

1. DCEB 18-348 City vs CHARLES D CARVER
2. DCEB 20-15 City vs SCOTLAND SEASIDE LLC
3. DCEB 20-144 City vs CAROLYN G JAMES

MOTION: Mr. Pauley moved to accept the Affidavits of Compliance. Second was made by Ms. Dutton.

VOTE: Motion carried with Chair Bowman, Messrs. Suplicki, Chize, Pauley, Carson, Motley, Ms. Graham and Ms. Dutton voting aye. Chair Bowman voting aye. Voting nay, none.

OLD BUSINESS

1. DCEB 19-721 City vs JOSEPH A DOWE
607 Lyndhurst Street

Violation of the International Property Maintenance Code Section 304.7 ROOFS AND DRAINAGE

Chair Bowman determined the respondent was not in attendance.

Code Inspector Chris Elbon advised regarding DCEB 19-721 withdrew the case from the agenda. He advised the City is working with the respondent to get compliance.

2. **DCEB 20-146 City vs JONNIE L MCGEE/JACOB D DELIESSLINE**

476 Lexington Street

Violation of the Land Development Code Section 105-27.1.1(f) BOATS, RVS, TRAILERS

Code Inspector Chris Elbon advised regarding DCEB 20-1461 the City withdrew the case from the agenda. He advised the City is working with the respondent to get compliance.

City Attorney Trask clarified both Old Business cases would be treated as withdrawn by the City from the agenda and no motion is required.

NEW BUSINESS

No New Business to Report

OTHER BUSINESS

1. **DCEB 19-398 Request for Fine Reconsideration**

City vs WORLD OF BOATS LLC / 360 HOMEPROZ LLC

520 Lexington Drive

Current Owner: World of Boats LLC / 360 Homeproz LLC

Fine due as of 8/4/20: \$20,791.25

Chair Bowman determined there were people in attendance for this case.

Chair Bowman asked City Attorney Trask whether or not to bring the attendees for this case up first.

City Attorney Trask advised:

- The Rules of the Board have not changed which specifically provide the Board is to make its determination based solely upon the written position.
- The next agenda item is for Resolution 2020-01 which has been put on the agenda to specifically address this issue of people not having the opportunity to speak. He suggested the Board might want to take the agenda out of order and hear Resolution 2020-01 first and then if that is adopted then those people in attendance would have the opportunity to speak and address the Board.
- There is no need for the item to be in any particular order on the agenda; it is up to the Board.
- Based on the current rule the reconsideration of fine is just what is written.

Chair Bowman asked the Board Members their position:

- Mr. Carson suggested doing the Resolution first.
- Ms. Dutton stated she agreed to doing the Resolution first.

- Mr. Motley commented there might be more questions dealing with the Resolution and he thought the agenda should not be taken out of order.
- Mr. Chize agreed the agenda should not be take out of order; he noted the fine was incurred under the current rule; the new resolution has not been adopted.
- Mr. Pauley agreed the agenda should not be taken out of order.
- Ms. Graham indicated agreement with doing the Resolution first.

Chair Bowman reviewed:

Yes: Mr. Carson and Vice-Chair Suplicki, Mr. Chize, Ms. Dutton, Ms. Graham

No: Mr. Motley and Mr. Pauley

City Attorney Trask advised Alternate Member Chize could not be included in the determination as there was a full Board.

Mr. Carson commented his position was based on City Attorney Trask saying there was no issue and it seems to him this would be a good test case if the Resolution is done first.

Mr. Motley stated he did not have a problem with the testimony in regard to letting the subject testify in their behalf; however, he does have questions on the other issues in the Resolution.

Mr. Carson asked if it was correct that the people could not testify unless a Board Member called them up.

Vice-Chair Suplicki stated that was correct and they could only answer questions and not provide testimony.

Chair Bowman went with the yes votes to hear the Resolution first making it 5 – 2. The agenda item for Resolution 20-01 would be heard first and then go back to DCEB 19-398.

2. Dunedin Code Enforcement Board Rules of Procedure (Amended) Resolution 20-01

City Attorney Trask advised:

- It has been a number of years since the Board had done a resolution. He explained this is a resolution the Board would adopt, this is not a resolution the City Commission would consider or adopt.
- He wanted to review the changes made and reminded the Board Members their Code Enforcement Board Rules were originally adopted in the late 1980's and they have been changed slightly over the last twenty-five years. The last time they were amended he recalled was in 2006.
- The changes to be discussed today are the changes between the rules adopted in 2006 and what is here now. These suggested changes came about as a direct result of the City Commission authorizing a consultant to review the Code Enforcement Board process, rules and how cases are handled and they had made a couple of suggestions. Those suggestions along with input from the Commission along the way and from the Code Enforcement Board Members to look specifically at one rule.

Rule 5 Section 3

- This is the rule that talks about petitions for reconsideration or rehearing. This has nothing to do with the fine reduction, this is just someone having their case heard and it is coming back to the Board

for a rehearing based upon what they believe to be newly discovered evidence or evidence that was not available at the time of the original hearing.

- In the new resolution provided in the agenda package one sentence was added that happens to be the absolute last sentence in that rule it says:
The violator may be granted up to ten (10) minutes to present his/her petition to the Board.
- This is basically setting forth not do they have a process of petitioning, but they have the ability to argue it before the Board for 10 minutes.

Rule 5 Section 4

- This is the section that deals with fine reconsiderations. The rule as it currently reads provides that the Board is to make its determination based solely upon the written petition, that is unless the Board determines it is necessary to hear oral argument. That language is being changed basically to remove it from the rule so that the Board can base its decision on something other than just the written petition; in other words, the Board could hear argument.
- The rule was changed to delete that language and to add in a sentence in the middle of the paragraph:
The City may present in written form a response to the petition for reduction fine. The violator may be granted up to ten (10) minutes to present his/her petition to the Board.
- At the end of the original rule that said the Board would not consider fine reduction requests on cases based upon repeat violations; that language has been removed.
- If the Board adopts the resolution, other than those changes that he suggests there are no other changes to the rules; this has been in existence at least the past fourteen years and some as far back as the 1980's; those would be the changes that would be made.

City Attorney Trask summarized:

- The Board would be allowing people on petitions for rehearing to be given 10 minutes to talk.
- Petitions for fine reductions the Board would be taking out those prohibitions relative to being based solely on the written petition.
- Getting rid of the repeat violation prohibition.
- Adding in the fact that people have 10 minutes to speak.
- The City has the right to give a written response in addition to the written petition filed by the violator.

City Attorney Trask explained the process; he would read Resolution 20-01 by title only, there would be a motion and a second and then discussion amongst the Board. He is aware Mr. Motley has some concerns or questions or thoughts which will be addressed, then there will be a vote. If there are additional changes the Board requests those could be done today as well. He noted the motion can be up or down; it would need to be a positive or affirmative motion, so it would be a motion to approve and if a member is not satisfied they can vote no.

City Attorney Trask read Resolution 20-01 by title only.

City Attorney Trask advised he would answer any questions and City Code Enforcement Board staff was also available if needed.

Mr. Carson inquired whether or not to wait until discussion to bring up the 10 minutes which seemed like a long time to him.

City Attorney Trask suggested there be a motion to approve the resolution, have a second and then if Mr. Carson wanted to make that change during the discussion period that change could be made; he noted there was no real reason for the 10 minutes, it is whatever the Board feels comfortable with; some Code Enforcement Boards have no time limits. If the Board wants less time that can be done and it would require Ms. McHale to keep a timer running like the City Clerk does.

MOTION: Mr. Carson moved to approve Resolution 20-01 as presented. Second was made by Mr. Motley for discussion.

Board Discussion

Mr. Carson commented 10 minutes seems like a long time, he knows it goes by fast; however, he would as soon see it 5 to 7 minutes.

Mr. Pauley commented it could be changed to 10 minutes or less and noted sometimes it could be difficult to explain your case in 10 minutes.

Chair Bowman noted these are all cases the Board had heard before.

Vice-Chair Suplicki commented optimally it might be good to do it for something less than 10 minutes. He asked if 10 is the cap or could it be 5 and 5 or 5 and 7 because sometimes the respondent will provide information and then keep going over the same point over and over and to stop that from happening you want a cap, but by the same token if they do it based on the initial testimony and the Board Members want more information then they have the option of giving additional time and how that would be presented.

City Attorney Trask explained the time frame is the maximum amount; the timer would be running and sound and then the Chair would be responsible to cut the person off from speaking any further. If the Board has additional questions the Chair always has the right to extend that time if he wants and if he is getting that direction from the Board Members. That should be the cut off when the buzzer sounds that is when it should stop, that does not mean the Board cannot accept any more, it would stop there and then the Board would decide whether or not to hear more and that is the call of the Chair.

Vice-Chair Suplicki commented the Board has seen it both ways, where there is some merit to more testimony and sometimes the other way where the respondent just keeps going over and arguing the same point already heard.

Mr. Pauley addressed the situation of a person has submitted a written appeal for the fine; when they have those extra 10 minutes and the Board brings them up; he asked are they supposed to bring new evidence or can they reiterate and debate what they have already given the Board.

City Attorney Trask stated in theory the answer is the Board is not going to try the case over again; however, some of the factual background is important to understand, so the Board might be hearing some of the things they have heard before, but they are not there to reconsider did it happen or not. It obviously happened whatever the violation was, this is just to determine whether or not the Board is going to reduce the fine. Factually, he thinks the Board will hear some of the things they have heard before, but the idea is that they are not going to try the case all over again.

Vice-Chair Suplicki asked with that said would it not be better to do it at 5 minutes and then if the Chair or by direction of other Board Members suggestions have an additional 5 minutes if it is warranted. He sees it both ways.

Ms. Dutton commented she also sees it both ways; however, at that point she did not see belaboring at this point forever and just make a decision. Her vote is for 5 minutes.

Vice-Chair Suplicki supported the 5 minutes.

Mr. Motley supported the 5 minutes

Mr. Pauley supported the 5 minutes

Mr. Carson supported the 5 minutes

Ms. Graham indicated support for 5 minutes

AMENDED MOTION:

Mr. Carson amended the motion on the floor to approve the Resolution 20-01 with Rule 5 Section 3 and Rule 5 Section 4 amended to:

The violator may be granted up to ~~ten (10)~~ five (5) minutes to present his/her petition to the Board.

The City may present in written form a response to the petition for reduction fine. The violator may be granted up to ~~ten (10)~~ five (5) minutes to present his/her petition to the Board.

Mr. Motley seconded the amended motion for discussion.

Mr. Motley in reference to the reconsideration of fine for a repeat violation asked is this giving the opportunity for the respondent to testify or does that conflict with any of the State Statutes under 162.

City Attorney Trask advised it does not conflict. There is no provision in Chapter 162 that talks about that issue. In fact in Chapter 162 the provisions have basically one sentence that says the Board may consider reconsideration of fine. It does not really talk about any other parameters or how it is supposed to be done unlike when the Board makes their motions when they are supposed to determine the gravity of the violation, whether the violator does not bring it into compliance and those types of considerations. The Statute does not prohibit repeat violators from asking for fine reductions.

Mr. Motley explained his feeling on the repeat violation is that the individual, depending on the severity of the violation, the individual has been before the Code Enforcement Board for this type of violation in the past and is brought again as a repeat. He disagrees with being able to reduce a fine on a repeat violation.

Vice-Chair Suplicki commented his understanding based on precedent is the fine runs with the property as well as the person; in those rare occasions when a property changes ownership, unless for example it is for an inoperative vehicle and then the new owners have an inoperative vehicle, the new owners would be exposed to having a repeat automatically if they happen to have the same violation.

City Attorney Trask explained the Statute and the City Code requires that a repeat violation only occur when it is the same person or entity and the same violation. If there is a new owner it would not be the same person or entity.

Vice-Chair Suplicki wanted to clarify that and stated because of the comments by Mr. Motley he would lean toward his thinking on this issue.

Mr. Pauley also concurred with Mr. Motley on the repeat violation.

City Attorney Trask noted the question as to whether or not Mr. Carson was going to amend his motion to include putting the sentence back in about repeat violators; as the motion sits it is adopt the resolution as presented with one change in Section 3 and one in Section 4 changing the time limits from 10 minutes to 5 minutes. If he is going to add back into the resolution and the Board is going to adopt it putting the repeat violator prohibition back in he needs to know that now before the Board adopts the resolution.

Vice-Chair Suplicki asked if there was any particular reason that was included other than it might have been the recommendation of the consultant.

City Attorney Trask advised:

- It was the consultant request.
- Also, as a matter of experience he knows the Board has seen on a number of occasions where someone comes to the Board with a repeat violation and it was basically that the Board said their hands were tied and could not do that because the rules do not allow for it, so he thinks there were some thought processes to let the Code Enforcement Board make a change so that they can hear those cases and they can make fine reductions.
- The bottom line is if the Board decides to adopt as presented by taking out the repeat prohibition the Board can still deny the petition for fine reduction whether it is an original violation or a repeat. The reason he thinks it was originally included in the rules, his thinking because he did not draft back in the 1980's, it was to basically tell people they better figure it out the first time because the second time it is not going to be so easy to get that fine reduction. That is the kind of approach people are told each time.
- Back in the day the Board would tell people that with a repeat violation right away the Rules of the Board do not allow for a fine reduction, so don't even ask.

City Attorney Trask explained if the motion stays as it sits and there is no change then that language would stay out. He needs to know whether or not to include it or not; he heard three Board Members say they want that language back in.

Mr. Carson stated he would support that as well.

Chair Bowman noted that is 4 members, so that is the majority.

AMENDED MOTION:

Mr. Carson amended the motion on the floor to approve the Resolution 20-01 with Rule 5 Section 3 and Rule 5 Section 4 amended to:

The violator may be granted up to ~~ten (10)~~ five (5) minutes to present his/her petition to the Board.

The City may present in written form a response to the petition for reduction fine. The violator may be granted up to ~~ten (10)~~ five (5) minutes to present his/her petition to the Board.

Also, add back the last sentence in Rule 5 Section 4:

Additionally, under no circumstances may the amount of the fine for a repeat violation be reduced.

Mr. Motley seconded the amended motion.

City Attorney Trask reviewed the motion on the floor. He advised he would make the changes and once the type written changes are made he would provide it to the Chair for signature, if the resolution is approved.

Chair Bowman determined there were no more questions and everyone on the Board was clear on the motion.

VOTE: Motion carried with Ms. Dutton, Ms. Graham, Messrs. Carson, Motley, Pauley and Suplicki voting aye. Chair Bowman voting aye. Voting nay, none.

City Attorney Trask acknowledged the Board could go back to DCEB 19-398, there is a new rule in place now, the Board Members can read the petition and if the people in attendance wanted to talk to the Board he would ask that each of them be sworn in under oath if the Board is going to receive information from them. They now have the right under the new rule to talk for 5 minutes in total.

- 1. DCEB 19-398 Request for Fine Reconsideration
City vs WORLD OF BOATS LLC / 360 HOMEPROZ LLC
520 Lexington Drive
Current Owner: World of Boats LLC / 360 Homeproz LLC
Fine due as of 8/4/20: \$20,791.25**

Mr. Motley stated he would like if possible to find out the Inspector on this case and if there could be a brief review of what transpired.

Code Inspector Elbon advised:

- There should be a fact sheet included in the agenda item.
- The only thing that should be considered in this right now rather than doing an entire case review it would just be the fine reduction, he asked if that is how it has been presented.

Mr. Motley clarified he was asking for a review of the case.

Mr. Elbon noted there should be an attached fact sheet, page 2 of the attachments, Code Board Fine Reconsideration Fact Sheet and Page 3 of the attachment is the Calculation of the fines.

Mr. Motley asked then Mr. Elbon did not have in front of him the entire case, Mr. Elbon stated it is the Code Board Fine Reconsideration Fact Sheet.

City Attorney Trask suggested Mr. Motley was asking for a review of when the original complaint was filed, what were the issues raised, what did the Code Enforcement Officer find, how cooperative was the property owner, did it come into compliance timely, those sorts of things. Mr. Motley stated that was correct.

Mr. Elbon advised based on the fact sheet he has:

- May 10, 2019 there was a notice of violation generated for overgrowth of weeds and grass, accessory structures which includes the fence, accumulation of debris, some permitting issues and with a Stop Work Order posted.
- June 19, 2019 there was notice of hearing for July 2, 2019 Code Enforcement Board in which the overgrowth of grass and the accessory structures regarding a fence was addressed.
- July 2, 2019 found the property in violation and requested it be brought into compliance or impose a fine of \$250.00 per day.
- The owner for the property was not present for that hearing.

Mr. Motley asked who the Inspector was on the case and asked if the respondent was cooperative in taking care of these issues.

Mr. Elbon stated from what he could tell the Inspector was Tom Colbert and he could not speak to what else transpired beyond that fact sheet.

Mr. Motley asked if it was correct in other words what transpired here is, they bought this home and they started the process of remodeling and restoring without permits. Mr. Elbon stated that is what he is being advised of as correct, yes.

Vice-Chair Suplicki wanted to clarify on the Inspector comments it says this was not filed timely per the Rules of the Board for reconsideration of fine, because all of this discussion is for naught if that is correct. Mr. Elbon stated that is correct.

Mr. Motley stated according to what he can see on the docket the individual did not file that Request for Reconsideration of Fine until approximately 10 months after the certified signature letter that they received that the case was in compliance and furthermore there is no mention of any extreme or undue hardship in the letter he wrote.

Mr. Carson stated the big thing is he did not make it in the 30 days.

Chair Bowman noted that was not mentioned in the changes as far as the 30 day limit.

City Attorney Trask explained the petition for fine reduction would have to have been filed within 30 days of the property being brought into compliance based upon the Rules of the Board Rule 5 Section 4. According to the fact sheet he has it looks like on October 1, 2019 the Code Enforcement Board

accepted the Affidavit of Compliance, it was signed for on October 15, 2019, but the fine reduction would have to had been filed by November 1, 2019 for it to be timely under the rules.

Chair Bowman acknowledged then basically the Board could not even hear this case.

City Attorney Trask suggested the Board should hear from the property owner; they have the right to present for 5 minutes based upon the new rule.

Chair Bowman determined people were in attendance for this case and Ms. McHale swore in Aigoul Gold of 20325 Heritage Point Drive, Tampa FL 33647.

Ms. Gold stated:

- At the time of receiving the violation they had just purchased this property. It is a small home based business to remodel homes and resell them.
- She was in the process of moving addresses and she thought that might be why they did not receive the initial Notice of Violation. The first notice she received which was certified was probably around July 1st, maybe June 30th to July 3rd.
- As soon as they received the notice they corrected the problem. She immediately notified her partner who was actually doing the work at the property. By July 3rd they had workers on the property mowing the grass and fixing the fence which were the only violations there.
- She heard it mentioned they started work without permits; that was never the truth. They applied for permits for remodeling right away and they never started any work other than cleaning out the property.
- They received the permits which was just recently; it took about a year for them to actually receive them and start the work.
- Meanwhile, their total ignorance and mistake was they did not know they had to renotify the Code Inspector to come out and reinspect. They basically corrected these issues within the first 9 days of their knowing about the issue, but they did not call back to reinspect the property. They only contacted Mr. Colbert she thinks September 16th and he was notified they corrected the issue and they were mowing the yard ever since; they knew they had to comply.
- This is why they are asking for reconsideration of the fine because it was corrected and it was kept up ever since then. When they received the property it was in very bad shape, there was garbage and boats and trailers and all kinds of trash. They had to hire three dumpsters to remove the trash.
- They are up on all the compliances and never had any issues. They mostly work in Pasco County, but this is their first experience with Pinellas and they never had any issues with any violations anywhere.
- This is why they are asking the Board to reconsider and let them pay what they can afford to pay and make this property beautiful.

Vice-Chair Suplicki asked why there was a Stop Work Order if there was not work being done before a permit was issued; generally, that would not happen.

Ms. Gold stated she did not know about a Stop Work Order; however, her partner was online if he could answer that, because she was not aware it; they did not do any work other than cleaning up and demolishing before receiving the permits.

Ms. McHale swore in Patrick Strickland of 1448 Lake Tarpon Avenue, Tarpon Springs, FL 34689.

Mr. Strickland stated:

- They did receive a Stop Work Order, but as Ms. Gold was saying all they did when they first purchased the home was clean everything out from the inside.
- There were some things that looked like had been done by the previous owner like the roof itself had holes where it was leaking and they had moved things on their own and he believes that is what the Stop Work Order was for, the bathroom was already demoed when they purchased the house.
- All they did was clear things out and did not do any work at all to the house, they had already submitted the permit he believed on June 17 which that was submitted for all the work they are currently doing on the project.
- He believes when the Inspector came by and saw the bathroom already demoed and some other items wrong with the property is why the Stop Work Order was issued.

Ms. Gilbert advised the application for permit was done on June 11, 2019 and was issued April 9, 2020.

Vice-Chair Suplicki inquired about it taking so long to get the permit.

Mr. Strickland explained there were complications and things they had to go back and forth on and they had to make some modifications on the way the property sits because they were trying to put on an addition to the back. It took time for the permit going back and forth, but they did not do any work on the house; that is one of the reasons the grass got tall because there was no one at the property and when they finally got the notification, obviously they would not acquire a \$15,000 fine over grass being tall, as soon as she knew about it they had the grass mowed and even put in a whole new fence knowing they were going to put in a new vinyl fence and Mr. Colbert said that still did not solve the issue of the fence so they just removed the whole fence from the back and left it open until the new fence came in.

Vice-Chair Suplicki commented based on the testimony they did not do any demo which does require a permit and basically that there was a misunderstanding there was demo done, but they did not do it.

Mr. Strickland stated that was correct, the only demo they did was old furniture that was in there and old drywall that had been falling down on one wall they cleaned up, but the bathroom itself had already been demolished and one of the rooms in the back had already been opened up and exposed when they purchased the home. It was an "as is" purchase.

Mr. Motley inquired if Mr. Strickland was a board certified contractor.

Mr. Strickland stated he was not, the gentleman that does the work on the house is Jeff; he helps him out as the Project Manager.

Mr. Pauley asked when and how would the respondent have been notified they had 30 days from the date of compliance to file for a fine reduction.

Mr. Motley stated in that October 15th certified letter they signed for.

MOTION: Mr. Motley moved in case DCEB 19-398 to deny the request for fine reduction.
Second was made by Mr. Pauley.

Mr. Motley stated the reason being the request does not meet the criteria for reduction of the fine.

VOTE: Motion carried 5 - 2 with Ms. Graham, Messrs. Carson, Motley and Pauley voting aye. Chair Bowman voting aye. Voting nay, Ms. Dutton and Vice-Chair Suplicki.

Chair Bowman reviewed the decision of the Board.

3. Dunedin Code Enforcement Board Alternate Vacant Position

Chair Bowman noted there were four applicants and determined none were in attendance. He asked if all the members had the opportunity to review the applications.

Mr. Motley stated he read over each application and would like to suggest in his opinion that Mr. Stone is probably best qualified.

Ms. Dutton agreed.

Mr. Carson commented he did not know any of the applicants and would go along with the group.

MOTION: Mr. Motley moved to nominate Mr. Phillip Stone to the Alternate Member position. Second was made by Ms. Dutton.

VOTE: Motion carried with Ms. Dutton, Ms. Graham, Messrs. Carson, Motley, Pauley and Suplicki voting aye. Chair Bowman voting aye. Voting nay, none.

Vice-Chair Suplicki wanted to thank all the applicants who all had something to bring to the Board and he thought the Board made the right selection.

City Attorney Trask stated he wanted to be sure it was understood that is a nomination going to the City Commission for consideration and decision as to whether or not to appoint Mr. Stone. He noted the recommendation is great for the City Commission to have.

Ms. McHale advised she would submit the recommendation to the City Clerk's Office and they handle it from that point.

Meeting adjourned at 3:00 P. M.

NOTE: This meeting was recorded and those recordings are a part of the official file.

Michael Bowman, Chair
Dunedin Code Enforcement Board

