

MINUTES
WAYCROSS CITY COMMISSION PLANNING & INFORMATION SESSION
MONDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 2026, | 5:00 P.M.
WAYCROSS CITY COMMISSION CHAMBERS
(417 PENDLETON STREET, WAYCROSS, GA)

I. CALL TO ORDER:

The Waycross City Commission Meeting was called to order on Tuesday, February 2, 2026, at 5 pm by Mayor James. The meeting was held in the Commission Chambers of City Hall. Present was Commissioners Alvin Nelson, William Simmons, William Tompkins, Shawn Sanders and Shawn Roberts.

A. Invocation: Commissioner William Tompkins

Invocation led by Pastor Carlos White

B. Pledge of Allegiance

C. City Clerk to Read Section 2-67 (b) – Decorum

Read by City Clerk, Jacqueline Powell

II. GUESTS:

Mr. James Woods, 217 Baltimore Ave, Waycross Ga. 31501-spoke against the resolution that passed In March 2025, regarding the increase in alcohol sales

Ms. Melissa Ingle, 506 Elizabeth St., Waycross Ga. 31501-she welcomed the new district commissioner, as well spoke on some of the things that the downtown businesses face.

III. TRAVEL/TRAINING SCHEDULE AND REQUESTS

IV. PLANNING & INFORMATION SESSION

A. Discussion Items: ***SEE DISCUSSION NOTES***

1. Bids:

- a. WAYX 26-08 Surplus Property-Fire Rescue Equipment
- b. Surplus Land Sale-City Blvd Lot 3

- 2. Animal Management Fee Increases
- 3. Ordinance Amendment: Oath of Office for Police Officers
- 4. Golf Cart Proposal
- 5. Service Agreement with Magnolia House
- 6. Vacancy Inspections
- 7. Property Setbacks

B. Privilege Licenses Renewals:

1. Gooley's Pizza Too, S. Meis, 910 Memorial Drive, Waycross Ga. 31501, Beer, Consumption on Premises.

C. Privilege Licenses: n/a

D. Proposed Ordinances: n/a

E. Proposed Resolutions: n/a

F. City Attorney Report:

G. City Managers Report:

H. Last Call

I. Adjourn to Executive Session

There was a motion made by Commissioner Tompkins to adjourn into executive session regarding personnel, seconded by Commissioner Simmons. All voted in favor and the meeting adjourned to go into executive session at 6:31pm

J. Adjournment

CITY OF WAYCROSS

BY:

+ Michael Angelo James

MICHAEL-ANGELO JAMES, Mayor

ATTEST:

Jacqueline Powell

JACQUALINE POWELL, City Clerk



*****DISCUSSION NOTES*****

02022026

WS

MAYOR: The Waycross City Commission Planning and Information session is now called to order. At this time, we look to our City Manager to call for our invocation.

CITY MANAGER: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. The invocation will be led by Commissioner Tompkins, followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

TOMPKINS: I've asked Pastor Carlos White to lead the invocation for us.

PASTOR WHITE: Let us pray. Eternal God, we pause at the beginning of this meeting to acknowledge your presence and your wisdom. You are the giver of life, the source of truth, and the foundation of justice. We thank you for the City of Waycross and its people. We are grateful for our commissioners and mayor who have accepted the responsibility to lead, to serve, and to make decisions that impact the lives of many. I pray on today that you grant them clarity of mind, integrity of heart, and unity of purpose. Guide every decision, every discussion, and every action that they may be marked by fairness, wisdom, and compassion. Help us all to listen well, speak truthfully, and act courageously for the common good of all. May the peace of the Lord rest upon this city, and may justice and righteousness guide its future. Yes, we ask all these things in your strong son's name, and all God's people said, Amen.

ALL: Let's look to the flag. I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands. One nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MAYOR: I want to thank our city manager for calling on our Commissioner Tompkins, who called upon our Bishop White, who led us in our invocation. And thank you, Bishop, for being present tonight. And with that, I will look to see if we have any guest tonight.

CITY MANAGER: Uh. We do. Mr. mayor, I will go ahead and read the decorum prior.

MAYOR: We will read decorum. So, at this time, cue that up.

CITY CLERK: Attention to that 67-b public comment in meetings. Persons who wish to address the city commission at a work session shall have the right to address or speak to the city commissioners on official actions or other topics relating to the business or interests of the city. The commission will not hear from persons and persons who are not permitted to speak on matters or issues which are not related to official city business matters, or issues not under the jurisdiction or control of the commission. Matters or issues published on an agenda as a public hearing agenda item, or on matters as issues which are traditionally reserved for executive session, Such as personal matters and matters which are the subject of or pertain to pending or current litigation. Because time is a limited resource and, in an effort, to hear from the public in the most efficient and effective manner possible. A total of four persons will be permitted to speak at each work session, with a maximum of three minutes allotted to each speaker. Speakers shall sign up on a first come, first served basis. Failing to follow the procedures outlined herein may result in an individual not being eligible to address the commission until he or she agrees to the mayor's satisfaction to abide by the rules stated herein. The speaker must begin remarks by stating his or her name, address, and organization represented, if any. The speaker must initially address all remarks to the mayor and not to any to any individuals. The speaker shall follow the rules of decorum as set out in section 2-66 and must avoid repetition and argument. Any commissioner, the city manager or the city attorney may, after receiving permission from the mayor, ask questions of the speaker. The asking them questions by any commissioner, the mayor, city manager, or city attorney shall automatically suspend a three minute time limit. Persons who have not satisfied the sign requirements to speak, unless there is a consensus of commissioners to allow the person to speak.

CITY CLERK: The city commission, with the consensus of the members present, may suspend all or any of these rules to the extent permitted by law. Any person who violates any of these rules may be removed from the meeting. A speaker or proposed speaker who violates these rules after first being

*****DISCUSSION NOTES*****

02022026

WS

warned by the mayor of the city commission, either or both, to cease such violations, shall, upon the conviction in the municipal court, be guilty of an offense and punished as set forth in section one through nine. Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

MAYOR: Thanks, Madam Clerk. At this time, we will listen to our guests.

CITY MANAGER: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. At this time, we have two guests. The first guest will be Mr. James Wood. He is speaking on alcohol license increases. Mr. Wood, you approach the podium. You have three minutes once you begin.

SPEAKER 1: Okay, guys, my name is Mr. Wood, my address is 217 Baltimore Ave. and I'm the owner of Woody's Top Putt. Recently, the alcohol license in Waycross tripled. That really hurt my business. And also, Wally's. We have Dell Wally right over there. I have this outline, but I'm going to have to go really fast because I only got three minutes. The recent tripling of alcohol license fees placed a disproportionate financial burden on small and limited our businesses, while favoring large seven day operations that can more easily absorb higher costs. This proposal recommends adopting a fair, scalable fee structure that preserves city revenue while protecting small businesses and encouraging economic growth. Specifically, I propose adopting one of the following options, a prorated alcohol license fee based on days of operation or a percentage based alcohol sales fee structure. So, I'm going to skip all the way to the back. A percentage based alcohol sales fee structure is the most fair, sustainable and future proof approach to alcohol licenses. Unlike flat fees or operating day formulas, this model directly ties a business license cost to its actual level of alcohol sales, ensuring that food focused, family friendly, and experience based businesses that sell very little alcohol are not penalized the same as establishments whose primary revenue is alcohol seven days a week, while prorated day models based improve fairness compared to flat fees, they still fail to account for major differences in alcohol sales volume between businesses operating the same number of days. Two businesses open three days a week may generate drastically different alcohol revenue, yet we'd pay the same under a days open system. A sales percentage model corrects this imbalance. So that for businesses that primarily sell food, entertainment or services with alcohol as a small secondary offering, this approach ensures licenses costs remain reasonable and proportional to actual alcohol activity. At the same time, higher volume alcohol sellers contribute more aligning fees with true impact and usage. This model naturally scales with business success, protects small businesses and seasonal businesses, supports food forward establishments, and allow city revenue to grow alongside economic growth. It also relies on sales data, and businesses already support keeping administration as simple and transparent. By adopting percentage-based sales alcohol sales license model, the city can eliminate inequities created by flat or day-based systems, encourage entrepreneurship, reduce business closures, and establish a modern licensing structure that is fair to all business types. So, for my business, we're open 15 hours a week, two days, and I paid the same as everybody else. All these big franchises uptown. So, to me, that was not fair to anybody downtown those small businesses. That's what I wanted to say. That's my three minutes of fame.

MAYOR: Thank you. Mr. City Manager.

CITY MANAGER: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Next, we have Miss Engle and she's going to be speaking on new business downtown concerns. Miss Engle, you have three minutes as well. But could you just pause until we.

SPEAKER 2: Hello. Good evening. Um, my name is Melissa Ingle. I'm the president of the Downtown Merchants Association. I wanted to welcome our new district commissioner. Also, I haven't been to meetings lately, but I wanted to come and introduce myself personally to you again. Talk a little bit about the downtown businesses and some of the things that we face downtown. We have wondered often about if there are going to be fees or any kind of fines allocated for these abandoned businesses that have just been left. We've got some prime retail locations that would be awesome for storefront businesses. Every day people contact us wanting to know if there's any vacancies downtown, that they don't have to go in and do a lot of work to, unfortunately, the Phoenix building there are going to be

*****DISCUSSION NOTES*****

02022026

WS

some vacancies over there. But the problem with that is, is the rent has shot up so high that we're actually losing some businesses over there as well. So, we've done an amazing job growing downtown over the last couple of years. Matter of fact, we went from like five restaurants I think now we're pushing 11 to 12. So, we have got a lot of traffic downtown now, a lot of activity happening, working together closely with the city and the development authorities. You know, we're trying to make sure that there's activities and everything. So, I do feel the pain coming from the liquor licenses. I know that that is beer and wine. Some of our people just do beer and wine, but it's going to hurt them. It's going to hurt them. It's going to take it's going to end up costing us, losing them. So, I really would like for you guys to revisit that myself alone. I try to keep up with the meetings, but I actually missed that somehow, I missed that was a thing coming on the ballot. I was wondering if possibly the email could get added to. Maybe that would help me kind of keep up with what's going on in the meetings. And I can also make sure that the right people are here. We all work two and three jobs, you know, I'm a business owner, small business owner downtown, and I operate my business, and I also teach at the high school. So, I have many hats as well, and it's hard to keep up with the meetings. You know, for a long time there was much stuff going on in the meetings that it was it was really hard to keep up with the actual meat of things. So, I apologize not only to my downtown merchants, but to you guys. We didn't, I didn't catch it. I didn't know that was coming up for discussion. But it does seem rather large for smaller businesses that are only open 2 or 3 days a week. You know, maybe there's some something that we can do to help them out, to keep them downtown and that's pretty much all I have to say.

MAYOR: Thank you. Mr. City Manager, if there are no more guests, we'll move to travel training in our scheduling.

CITY MANAGER: Sorry about that, Mr. Mayor. Mr. Mayor, we have no travel training scheduled at this time. We're moving to the planning information session. Mr. Mayor, the vision and the mission remain the same. City plans remain the same, Mr. Mayor. Again, with the 2 to 4 year mark at this time. Still strengthening those weaknesses that we still struggle with and leveraging all the improvements that we've made over the last three years. With that, Mr. Mayor, we're going to move into the items and we're going to start with the bids. And she has two items for discussion.

MAMIE: Mr. Mayor, commissioners Hutchison has two items before you this evening. The first one is for surplus property. It is the rescue tool set. It is called an AMCUS rescue tool set. It's commonly referred to as the Jaws of Life. There are five components to it. This particular set was purchased back in 1988, I'm sorry, it was a 1988 set. I'm not sure when we acquired it, but we have recently, as of January 2026, purchased a new tool set. And we are asking that the commission allow us to surplus the old set so that we can get it out of rotation and sell it on GovDeals.com.

MAYOR: With that presentation from the Director of Procurement. I want to start off with looking at each of the districts. Open the floor for your consent to allow for the surplus of these items. And I'll start with district one.

ROBERTS: Yes, sir.

MAYOR: District one is a yes. District two. District two is a yes. District three.

SANDERS: Yes, Mr. Mayor.

MAYOR: And district three is a yes. District four.

TOMPKINS: Yes.

MAYOR: And district four gives a yes. District five.

NELSON: Yes, sir.

*****DISCUSSION NOTES*****

02022026

WS

MAYOR: District five gives a yes. That gives us unanimous consent. We move forward.

MAMIE: The next item before the commission is surplus property, it is on City Boulevard. It is lot three. We actually surplus this property back in 2021. Her Resolution 21-106. Of this property was appraised and we have received an offer on it. And at the December 10th meeting, we actually went to executive session, and the commission agreed to I'm sorry. They went into an executive session on 1215 and agreed to accept the full price offer of 17,900. And we are just asking that the commission allow us to go ahead and put this in a resolution so that we can close this sale.

MAYOR: Thank you for that. We'll look now to the commission to give their consent. We'll start with district one.

ROBERTS: Yes, sir.

MAYOR: District one gives consent. District two.

SIMMONS: May I ask a question before I consent

MAYOR: Yes, you certainly can.

SIMMONS: When we sell properties like this, do we require any description of what they plan to do with that property?

MAMIE: This particular buyer is a subcontractor. She's been a subcontractor for the last 27 years dealing with commercial properties. And she actually would like to take this piece of property, which is approximately 1.96 acres, and build homes on that property.

SIMMONS: You mean like residential homes?

MAMIE: Residential homes. Yes, sir.

SIMMONS: Yes, sir, Mr. Mayor.

MAYOR: Okay. Thank you. District two. Consenting. District three.

SANDERS: Yes, Mr. Mayor.

SPEAKER 1: District four.

SPEAKER 3: Yes, sir.

TOMPKINS: District three and four. Consenting. District five.

NELSON: Yes, sir.

MAYOR: And district five. Consenting. You have all five districts.

MAMIE: Thank you.

CITY MANAGER: Thank you, Mr. Jackson. Next, Mr. Mayor, we move into the remaining items, and we're going to start with animal management. These next few items as far as the on the scales as far as animal management, the vacancy inspections and property setbacks they do not require a decision tonight. We will take these items as build on them to the retreat in April. So, this is the follow up we're

*****DISCUSSION NOTES*****

02022026

WS

going to do until that time frame. So, with that, Mr. Mayor, I've been asked by the commission to look at the fees and the fines for our animal violations. And we kind of looked over this it's been a while since they've been updated. This will require some conversation with our court support system as well. I talked to the staff about these numbers, and we contacted some other cities to see if they looked appropriate and these are the numbers we came up with. See before you, if you can see it, I'll read to the public they might not be able to see it. So, animals at large are off leash, our current fee is \$420. Now, this is a one time fee. So, this means if we can identify the animal, the owner of the animal, we would then do the court proceedings, and the court proceedings could be up to a year. And then we will take it to the judge. And the judge would, would assign this fee of \$420. Now, in between that time frame the citizen would probably still own the dog, and the dog could probably get off the leash multiple times within that time period and still be only getting this \$420 fee. Is that clear, Mr. Mayor? Make sure that's clear before I move on.

MAYOR: It's clear, but I'll open the floor to discussion with the commission if they choose to ask any questions. Okay.

CITY MANAGER: With that, Mr. Mayor, we start looking at some of our some of our processes, and we look back over the last three years at this problem. So, with that, it's not taking a real dent in the issue, and this goes back to the conversation that initially we had about registration and shipping. And I know y'all received comments about punishing good pet owners. That is, in my opinion, not assessment is not punishing good pet owners. The primary reason we can't enforce some of these penalties because we don't know who the pet owner is. Regardless if it's a responsible pet owner or irresponsible pet owner, because sometimes responsible pet owner's dogs get out of their fences too. So, I want to make that clear. The registration would be the driver for all of this, because we would know who the animal belongs to, as well as the chipping would go a step further. That's why it's critically important that that's the first piece that we do as far as getting our animal management back under control. So, with that, Mr. Mayor, I'll go back to the slides. Roaming at large which was \$420. We're going to ask commissioner at the retreat to look at considering raising to \$500 for the first offense. Second offense \$1000, third offence \$2000. I know everybody is going to look at this and say we're punishing somebody but again, if you properly manage your animal, this doesn't affect you at all. But right now, we have too many cases where we take people to court for that year's process, and the dog is constantly getting out and running around. Next, Mr. Mayor, we have vicious and bites these two categories that are kind of combined. Now, as of right now, it's \$690. Again, that's a one time fee. What's taking the court for that year. We're going to ask the commission to raise that to a thousand, then 2000, then 3000. Now, the difference here is that we do have the ability to have the dog to make the owner of the dog when the court has the ability to do that. So, it might not get to that point of the 1000, 2000, 3000 the first time that they go to court. But we'll make that clear as well as when you do have a dog and when it says vicious or biting. Biting, of course, is biting anybody. Another animal, another person. And vicious is, you know, being vicious, barking all those things. So, with that, we already have a process of registration. So, when that gets identified to go to court, they have to register that animal. So, we know who the animal is that's put on that. But again, um in most cases when a dog does do a bite, we do ask the owner to relinquish the animal, then abandonment. You see, it's \$420 as of right now. The same thing applies to animals at large. We're looking at 500, 1000, 2000. Again, the enforcement piece of this is going to be that registration and that chip. Without that, it's kind of hard to figure out when these dogs are and cats get abandoned because they simply let them go into the streets or drop them off at the at the shelter in the middle of the night. And the last thing, improper confinement restraint. Cruelty. Right now, \$690. Again, we're asking for a significant increase, 1000, 2003 thousand. And again, for those citizens who are watching right now and might see as a negative, see this as a negative, it's not negative. We are trying to solve this problem up with our animals. Regardless of if the owner is responsible or not. Because this applies to everybody. Some of our responsible owners, they have vicious dogs too. So that will become, uh, that is in play. So, these are just proposals, um, that we're going to ask at the retreat for you to consider. Again, you see the bottom down there. These numbers do not require the registration charges. If you got a vicious animal and then it does not have the relinquishment authority, which we can do in regard to vicious and sometimes abandonment. If

*****DISCUSSION NOTES*****

02022026

WS

animals are abandoned, we identify the owner. We do have the right now to have them relinquish that animal. I'm going to pause there. Mr. Mayor, any feedback from the commission?

MAYOR: I'll start off with a couple of thoughts. And one of them is, are there any fines coupled with the court cost? And alongside that, say, for instance, there's a possible disposition. Should they go to court, would that also be incurred with this fee?

CITY MANAGER: Correct. It would be, Mr. Mayor.

MAYOR: Okay. I'll open it up to districts. Districts one.

ROBERTS: Yes, sir. Like the dogs, like the strays or whatever. That are going into neighbor's yards and tearing up their property and running them back in the house. So how many times do we give a situation like that before we take the dog?

CITY MANAGER: So, that would be an animal at large, off leash. So again, we take them to court, and that could be we have to take them to court first before we can actually do anything. But that could be a year. Like I said, it could take a year process. The only time we actually ask them to give the dog up is when they become aggressive, they've killed another animal or they've bitten a person that's the only time. Because again, we have to think about how many animals there are at the shelter, which is already at capacity. So, we can't, I mean, we can only really take the dangerous animals away. The ones out here running around, we really don't have any room for them. So, I'm hoping that answers your question. I know people might not want to hear that, but that's just the reality of what it is right now.

ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

MAYOR: Thank you. District two, no questions

MAYOR: And district three.

SANDERS: Yes, I have a question. Why is the price the same for animal at large and abandonment? It seems like the prices for abandonment would be more severe than this animal at large.

CITY MANAGER: Well, good point. Fair question. Commissioner. Y'all can change this. Hey, y'all want to. These are just suggested prices. I'm looking at what we don't want to happen. This is going to be a byproduct regardless if we don't have a proper registration and a shipping fee. You know, people, they're not going to claim any animal at that point. So again, we have to have that registration, that chipping fee to enforce all these other actions. Without them, it's going to still be a problem. But if y'all want to raise or lower any of these fees that would be fine as well. Simply stating it right now and it's been a year of looking into this and I'll cover this at the retreat, but I'll talk a little bit of now. We have reached out to a few companies that do this holistically. They do the registration; they do the chipping. They do all that, do all the tracking. They'll take the animal back for us. They will lessen the burden on our animal control in many ways. They can focus on their primary role. So that's going to be part of it, too. But these are the prices that we kind of been talking about up in the air because yes, you will find other cities and it's probably unfair to do a city to city comparison on a lot of stuff. I should mention that with alcohol licensing, what y'all do? During my city manager's remarks depending how the scale of the problem is going to be different and right now our fees are generally low. If you think about it's a whole year of this, then sometimes not all the time, but sometimes the judge doesn't necessarily apply these fees either. Or these fines if they make an agreement with the owner. So.

MAYOR: District three any further questions? Hearing none. We'll go to district four. Any questions?

TOMPKINS: I do have a question. So just for those that are present and those that are listening, if say, for instance, we have a senior citizen that has a dog just for companionship, it's typically housebroken.

*****DISCUSSION NOTES*****

02022026

WS

Let's say they sneak out of the house. So, for the first offense you're saying right now it's \$420. Is that correct?

CITY MANAGER: Correct. Correct.

TOMPKINS: Okay. My only concern with that would be, as we all know, a lot of retirees are on a fixed income, so a \$420 fine for a one time escape may seem extreme to some folks. We may want to look at maybe for those that are on lower income scale, you know, as far as fine. Because, you know, if somebody's getting \$1,000 a month Social Security, a \$500 fine would pretty much determine whether they pay their power that month. So, I think that's something we need to look at as well. That's all.

MAYOR: Thank you, Commissioner and district five.

NELSON: Yes, sir. Mr. Mayor, you said something that concerned me that if we charge a person with a violation it could take up to a year to go to court, and that dog will stay at home, correct? Yes, Let's say if that dog or that owner keeps violating what before it goes to court. I would like to see if we could cite them continuously and then when they eventually go to court, lay all those fines out there, and then that person will be charged one, two, three, and four. How many times they've been violated since it occurred. So, is that something we could look at as well?

CITY MANAGER: Yes, Commissioner, to answer both of your both of your questions. So, if you remember, we discussed doing the restoration in the chip and all that. We had those three different plans for when you register your animal, and you register. I have a service dog. Those tears, we would know, you know. So, in this situation, I think it could be avoided. But the problem we have is we don't know. You know, we have a lot of people who just get animals for. No, just get them just to have them and right now, the fines, even at this amount, are not working. You know, they do often pay the fines. You take a year, so you save \$50 a month. You walk in there and pay that fine off. This approach, if you look at this it's within a 12 month time frame. So, we're talking about three, you know, three fines within a 12 month time period. But all this, you know, y'all can mix and match if you want to commission however you want to see fit to do it. Like I said, we've been looking at this for a whole year and again, if we don't have a forcing function to know who the animal belongs to, that's the first part we got to fix. That's why registration should be mandatory. I know we're going to have some pushback from that, but the two cities in Georgia that seem to have a little bit of control of this, they have a registration process. So that's the first thing and then they got a two tier level fines and fees process. So, but all of this we can talk about at the retreat and kind of go from there.

NELSON: Because the reason I asked was because this lady or this gentleman in this neighborhood, these dogs were getting out constantly and these were like dangerous dogs, you know. I told you about those. And warning, warning again, again and again. Until one morning the lady called me and said, the dogs are in my front yard. And they just killed the cat. So, this is something that we need to address right away.

SPEAKER 5: Great.

NELSON: Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

CITY MANAGER: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. That's the only slide for this. And again, at the retreat, this would be one of the main topics that we will bring to you, for consideration. Next, I'm going to bring the police chief up. He's going to cover an oath of office. Provide an update on the oath of office for the police officers. A proposal for a golf cart. A resolution. We won't do it today. It will be on the agenda, during the retreat. And then it's going to talk about a service agreement, with the Magnolia house. Chief Cox.

*****DISCUSSION NOTES*****

02022026

WS

CHIEF COX: Evening, Mr. Mayor. Commission. Good evening. The first thing on the agenda for me in particular is, I think when you originally sent the email, it spoke of House Bill 384 and going back and looking through it today. That House Bill was actually combined with House Bill 582, but the language is the exact same. They just combined it with another bill before it went to the governor for signature. And pretty much now under state law, it's got specific wording for the oath of office for police officers. And it also states now that the chief executive officer for the agency can actually administer the oath. As it stands right now, our city clerk and city attorney is able to do that. So, we're just asking for our ordinance to be brought in compliance with current state law. Okay.

MAYOR: And that doesn't seem like that would be a problem, but I'll go ahead and take it through the Commission for consenting. Okay. District one.

ROBERTS: Yes, sir.

MAYOR: District two.

SIMMONS: Well, briefly. What are the differences between the changes in the bill? Just a capsule thing.

CHIEF COX: Well, in the large bill itself I can't speak on everything. Concerning that has a lot of domestic violence in it, but they can bind this into that bill. But specifically, what it speaks of. They've added some wording in there that says faithfully, fairly and without malice. They've included that in the oath now. And really the only other particular thing is now the police chiefs can actually administer the oath to the police officers.

CITY MANAGER: Mr. Mayor, if I can I know you haven't had time to read that, so. And I didn't get a chance to talk to you, because if y'all can, this is for information. And then it'll be on the next agenda for approval, because it is a lot to read in there if y'all want to just do that versus.

MAYOR: If that's the desire of the commission, that'll be fine with me. Okay. We have consent on one and on two. It was just a question, and we can turn this back around and see if you want to forego consenting today and wait and put it on later agenda. Or do we need to go ahead now? It doesn't seem like it should be such a difficult thing, because all you're really trying to do is put it in the hands of the chief, so that he may be able to go ahead and swear his officers in without having to go through our clerk or through our attorney. That's what it sounds like to me. Is that what I'm hearing?

SPEAKER 13: I read it, yes.

SPEAKER 15: That's perfect.

MAYOR: So, everybody's ready. Okay.

CHIEF COX: It's actually a very large bill, like I said. But the only thing I'm speaking specifically to is that overall facility administration.

MAYOR: And that's what was highlighted here. So, I'll go back and I'll just stick with what we were doing and just getting consent. We won't push it off. We'll go ahead and handle it tonight. Consenting. Is that consent for one? What about two? Yes, sir. Okay. And district three? Yes, sir. And district four? Yes, sir. And district five, sir. All right. We have all consenting. Thank you. Chief. I think there's a golf cart proposal.

CHIEF COX: There he is.

MAYOR: Okay.

*****DISCUSSION NOTES*****

02022026

WS

CHIEF COX: We'll refer to it as a specialty vehicle traffic ordinance. What some people call it. But it's there's the impression by many in our community, and it's been going on for years now where they think, you know, it's illegal. They're legally can get out on the roadways with motorized carts and low speed vehicles, and that's not the case. What state law says is it allows local municipalities to create their own ordinance on how we want to, see motorized cars and such operate on roadways. And that's particularly what we've done here with this ordinance.

MAYOR: Okay. And so really, you just need our consent to go ahead and put it up for a resolution or an ordinance, or it's going to actually it's going to be ordinance because that wouldn't be a resolution. But what are you going to say?

CITY ATTORNEY GREEN: Mr. Mayor, if I may going through the excuse me, the ordinance that was presented, I've been back through the previous files when he was working on with Mr. Curry and Huey, and there are a couple of sections that need to be updated that aren't accurate. And there's some other things under the tweaks that need to be made to it so that it can be a viable, enforceable ordinance. And so, my understanding was that it was just going to be introduced today is a part of discussion as it was previously. However, at this time it is not in a position to where it is the final version for the Commission to then have and be able to know that it does comply with state law.

MAYOR: So, this is basically for information purposes. Okay. Thanks. So, we will wait till you get the wording and verbiage in line. Then we'll come back with it again. Got it. So, we've heard this twice. Am I correct. If not before that time.

CHIEF COX: We have. We discussed it 2 or 3 years back. It seems like.

NELSON: Mr. Mayor, if I may.

MAYOR: You, may.

NELSON: I noticed there's like 12, 11 streets on here. I'm assuming their speed limit restrictions. I don't see Ossie Davis Parkway on there. That's a pretty fast.

CHIEF COX: Well, that is a state route. So regardless of what the city of Waycross said, we couldn't use that anyhow. Okay. And that's in the in the proposed ordinance that we've got here, it mentions state routes, but we go one step further. We say you can't write it on any state route, which is what Ozzie Davis is. But we also say you can't operate on any roadway as exceed 35mph. You can't operate on any multi lane roadway. And we've included several other streets on there, which I just don't think it'd be safe to operate on like Tebeau, Knight Avenue. I mean, I've got like 8 or 9 streets, that of my opinion and I think really the only non multi-lane roadway that I've asked for in there is Darling Avenue between Alice Street and Plant Avenue, and the only reason I put it in there is because ambulance is coming back into from the hospital and don't want anything to kind of impede on that.

NELSON: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

MAYOR: Thank you, Commissioner Tompkins.

TOMPKINS: I do have one question. Actually, I have several, but I'll just limit it to this one right now. In here, it talks about insurance requirements. State law does not establish a mandatory minimum liability insurance coverage amount for motorized carts. But yet we have a proposal for a minimum of \$25,000 per person, 50,000 per accident or bodily injury, and 25,000 for property damage. I looked at those costs. For the average person, that's going to be somewhere between 25 to \$75 a month. Is there any particular reason why we're superseding state law?

*****DISCUSSION NOTES*****

02022026

WS

CHIEF COX: I don't think we're superseding state law. State law allows us to go in there and adopt the ordinance and shape it the way we.

TOMPKINS: Well, what I was talking about was the mandatory insurance liability. If the state law doesn't establish it and I'm going to play devil's advocate for a moment. How many golf carts have been involved in an accident in the past five years?

CHIEF COX: Yeah. I can't give you that figure without going back.

TOMPKINS: That's my only concern. My district primarily has a lot of homeowners that have golf carts and I can see that that being a concern is, you know, now they're going to have insurance for a golf cart that maybe they only ride on Halloween, you know, that kind of thing. So that was my only question. But once we get the wording a little bit different, then we could definitely go back and look at that.

CHIEF COX: Yeah. And like I said, its state law says you can go in there and adjust whatever you feel is right for your community. And I would equate it to this state law that says nothing about them not being able to drive on Tebeau Street. Yeah, well, as a city, I say, I think it's a little bit too dangerous for that. And so, the insurance, in my view, is not only protection from the people on the carts, whatever, but also protection of other people on the roadway. So, you know, you're giving a little bit of liability coverage to them also.

TOMPKINS: I have one more question. Okay. What exactly does state law say, for instance, corridor Z or Memorial Drive, which are actually state maintained roads? What is the state law as far as carts or ATVs?

CHIEF COX: It says you can't. You cannot do it. Well, let me adjust that a little bit. You cannot drive them on state roads unless you can, if there is a designated crossing or a cart, you can do it. But under our ordinance, we still wouldn't allow for you to do it.

TOMPKINS: Just want to get clarity because, you know, there may be some folks that don't know. I mean, we live in South Georgia. A lot of people are used to doing things that aren't necessarily within the legal guidelines. So just wanted that for clarity's sake.

CHIEF COX: Oh yeah. We encounter them every day.

TOMPKINS: Okay. That's all. Thank you.

MAYOR: If there are no other questions, that would be good. You have no other questions? Thank you.

CHIEF COX: The service agreement. Okay. Yes, sir. Very last thing is service agreement between the City of Waycross and Family Justice Center. This renews every year and pretty much what it does. We have a detective assigned to the Family Justice Center. And through that assignment, we actually get reimbursed \$68,000 and some change every year. And so, every year we submit an invoice to the Family Justice Center. And they cut a check to the city of Waycross, so that's pretty much paying for one of our employees.

MAYOR: Anything specific that you need from us regarding that or this is just information?

CHIEF COX: No, sir. Just renewal of the. Okay. So, we'll need your signature again.

MAYOR: Yes. My signature. Yes, sir. All right. I can do that. All right.

*****DISCUSSION NOTES*****

02022026

WS

CITY MANAGER: Thank you, Chief Cox. All right, Mr. Mayor. And the final two items on the agenda. First, we'll start with the vacancy inspections. This was asked to be put on by co-chaired by all commissioners. So, Mr. Mayor, I read the executive summary just to catch everybody up to speed. So the city currently conducts vacant inspections prior to reconnecting water and electrical service to ensure minimum life safety conditions are met. While intended to protect public safety. This process has created delays, staffing burdens, and customer frustration. Several Georgia municipalities have adopted alternate approaches, including reliance on licensed contractor's affidavits or eliminating vacancy inspections altogether. These proposals present three policy options for the Commission to consider, including eliminating the city vacancy inspections entirely. Again, Mr. Mayor, this will be a further discussion at the retreat. But I want to give you some of this right now to consider as we move forward to that date in April. All right. Current practice again. City staff perform vacancy inspection before authorizing reconnection of utilities inspections, verify basic safety conditions, electrical, plumbing, structural, and general. This process involves staff time and scheduling, delays, and reconnection for residents and property owners. Places the city directly in the liability chain for safety determinations. So, this is the first option, Mr. Mayor, for the commission to consider and you'll get a full copy of this with your emails sometime tomorrow. Option one. And this is the part we do, a partial delegation, with licensed contractors. So, we allow reconnection utilities based on affidavits from licensed professionals. Key elements of this option are licensed electrical contractors may submit an affidavit certifying electrical safety for power. Reconnections licensed plumbers may submit an affidavit certifying plumber safety for water reconnection. During this the city we do not perform the vacancy inspection. We accept professional certifications as a basis for the reconnections and that place that responsibility goes to the licensed contractor, not the city. Some of the pros for this are its faster reconnections. It reduces staff workload. It shifts liability away from the city, aligns with practices adopted by some other cities in Georgia. Cons rely on third party compliance. Less direct city oversight requires affidavit for development and enforcement standards.

CITY MANAGER: Option two, Mr. Mayor, is a hybrid model with limited city oversight. We use contractor affidavits for standard cases with city inspections only when triggered. Key element to this, affidavit is accepted for reconnection. City inspections require only when property has documented code violations. Property is condemned or unsafe. There's a history of repeat violations from the owner. Routine vacancies, bypass city inspections. So, the pros maintain a safety back up, reduce inspection volume, preserve discretion for high risk properties. The cons it still requires some staff involvement. It's kind of more complex to administer. May still cause delays for certain cases. Option three Mr. Mayor, of course, is eliminated by making inspections altogether. Key elements of this, of course. No city inspector, no contractor. Utilities reconnected upon customer request and payment code enforcement response only to complaints or visible violations. Pros immediate reconnection zero inspection burden to staff. Simplifies process for residents and landlords and eliminates city involvement in reconnection decisions. Cons no preoccupancy safety verification. Increased reliance on reactive enforcement. Potential increased risk to occupants. Political and public perception considerations following any incident. I put those two down there. Mr. Mayor, just to give you some context of how we got here with the vacancy inspections full transparency and clarity we could have better landlords here in the city of Waycross. That's why this process was first implemented if we remove ourselves from it, just because I know that's the talk in some of the talk out here some of our citizens will be adversely affected. It has to be something we have to consider. Again, don't wait to be the basis of your decision, but they started their vacancy inspection because we had some serious safety and health violations. Violations from our residents by other residents. As you all know, two thirds of the population Waycross rent. So, that's a big part of population that will be reliant on some type of oversight if we remove the city's current oversight.

CITY MANAGER: Some things to consider. As far as liability and our current model, the city shared responsibility. You know, by certifying safety, the affidavit model, the liability shifts to the licensed professionals. And, of course, with no inspection model, it rests entirely with property owners and then the people they rent to fiscal and operational impacts. For us it definitely reduces staff time and administrative costs. No direct revenue impact. We don't get any real revenue off of this process right

*****DISCUSSION NOTES*****

02022026

WS

now. Because it's right now, it's just geared for safety for residents' potential reduction in customer complaints and delays for those that are not satisfied with some of the vacancies. And again, if you look at it from a data point, only you got to talk about we have thousands permits pull, you know, every year. And we have maybe 2 or 3 complaints out of that. So, that should not also be the driving factor because those people complain. We have everybody else who seems to be able to understand how to make this work. But again, I just wanted to highlight some of that to the commission. I know you need a deep dive on this at the retreat. Um, but those are just some of the recommendations that we came up with as staff. And I paused there for any comments or questions on that.

MAYOR: Okay. I started with district one.

ROBERTS: Excuse me, sir. I think the last time this came up; we were just talking about eliminating the water off the vacancy inspection. I mean, I understand all that, but it just totally be a problem if we eliminate the water off the vacancy inspection. I mean, since the water, you know, like I said, one time for water don't really not killing it. Don't kill anyone.

CITY MANAGER: So, the problem we're having as Miss Engle kind of mentioned, to even, like the downtown properties, if we don't ever look at them. I mean, they're not up here, you know, and really just the water inspections are really only forcing function to make sure that home is safe. Because we won't be there, you know, and then, like I say, two thirds of our population, they rent and we have a lot of unsafe homes. We have a lot of court cases. And they will require that the residents take the property owner to court. You know, I'm not sure what the impact would be commissioner on right now. I just know if we don't do some type of inspection or some type of requirement getting affidavits from licensed professionals, we take a serious chance on safety with the public.

ROBERTS: Thank you, sir.

MAYOR: Thank you. District one. District two.

SIMMONS: Yes, sir. I don't have any problems with that.

MAYOR: Okay. And district three.

SANDERS: I kind of looked into the issue when it was first put on the agenda. And even with the water, there is some potential responsibility if it was mismanaged or not done as far as the back pressure entering in our main lines, and that can cause issues and problems. I do believe we need some type of oversight in that regard. But it is a cry outcry from the public that we reduce some of the restrictions associated with the vacancy inspection. So, you gave us a hybrid option. I think as a commission, we should consider weighing on public safety as well as trying to address the public concerns.

CITY MANAGER: Can I respond to that, Mr. Mayor? Yes, sir. So just one point two this is already kind of built in to our charter. I have allowed residents when they becomes unsafe for everybody for the relationship to get other contractors to inspect their property. We're having a hard time now, uh, even with that, you know, many cities don't have license code departments all around. Nobody has licensed code departments, so they really can't do inspections either. I mean, so and with the affidavits, the only problem I might see is the plumbers. It's going to be difficult because we have limited plumbers here. That's what always the city holding us up is that it's the the lack of plumbers a lot of times. So that's going to be a problem, um, as well. But I have allowed that to happen over the last 90 days. And I've called other city, I've had a hard time. I've invited other cities, um, inspectors to come down to just show our residents that we don't do anything different than anybody else. Um, and of course, city after city after city, they don't have a license code enforcement. So outside of the the four big cities. So everybody's facing this, this challenge kind of differently. Um, but again, uh, we definitely need some type of oversight. I mean, because you made a good point about the, you know, the back through, it's a lot of stuff. If on the surface, it don't seem like it's a problem with the water, if it goes unmaintained or,

*****DISCUSSION NOTES*****

02022026

WS

or even the meter, um, we don't check those things out, but these are options that we're presenting the commission. I want to do it now and give you a few months to really think about it and do your own research as well. I know, um, you missed a training date for Atlanta. You probably got some good feedback from other commissioners, but there's not a lot. It's either we do it or we don't do it. And with the hybrid, it's going to be kind of hard because even with the hybrid model, you know, the appearance can be that we're picking and choosing when to send our people out. So, you know, um, but that's one thing. So but we got time to think about it. And I know with the retreat, this is going to be the bulk of the discussion. Um, with I know y'all mentioned already about getting rid of some of the codes, which should lessen some of this as well. Um, wants to go through the code section and get rid of some of the esthetic stuff that don't need to be inspected. That probably should share things up as well.

MAYOR: Thank you, Commissioner. District four.

TOMPKINS: Uh, I don't have any questions at this time. I'll probably wait till the retreat when we get closer.

MAYOR: And district five.

NELSON: No, sir.

MAYOR: All right.

CITY MANAGER: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Next. Mr. mayor, we went to the last item on the discussion item was going to be property setbacks. Um, and this is co-chaired by all the commissioners as well, with concerns. Executive summary. So the city's current setback requirements will adopted on development patterns that no longer reflect present day conditions in many parts of the community, particularly older neighborhoods, infill areas and redevelopment corridors. Uh, strict application of existing setbacks has in some cases, limited reinvestment, uh, increased variance requirements and created inconsistencies between older and newer developments. Uh these proposals outline options for updating setback standards to better align with existing neighborhood character, promote infill housing and redevelopment, and reduce unnecessary regulatory barriers while maintaining public safety and orderly development. Now, I knew we had this discussion on setbacks a while back, and, um, we didn't make that decision, so, uh, we'll take it to the retreat as well and hopefully come out the retreat and put that back on the agenda for a vote. So the background for those who might not understand this. So setback requirements regulate the minimum distance between structures and property lines. Uh, these standards are intended to ensure safety, access, light, air and neighborhood compatibility. And across many neighborhoods were developed before zoning standards, resulting in homes built closer to property lines that currently, um, that currently currently aren't allowed. Um, narrow or irregular lots that cannot meet current setbacks. Increase variance requests for modest improvements or reconstruction. As a result, cities frequently faces requests that are administrative in nature rather than sustainable land use concerns. Uh, this is the problem that we're trying to fix, Mr. Mayor. Uh, infill constraints. Uh, current setbacks can make otherwise buildable unusable. Uh, redevelopment barriers building on existing footprints may require, uh, variances, administrative burdens, staff time, and Board of zoning appeals. Reviews are consumed by routine setback issues. The majority of, uh zoning board is going to be setback concerns for the most part, 75% of IT inconsistencies. New constructions may be forced out of alignment with surrounding historic development patterns. So the policy goals, um, amendment to our current setback regulations to do the following. Encourage housing development and reinvestment. Respect existing neighborhoods. Character um, as much as possible. Uh. Reduce unnecessary references. Maintain life safety standards and access. Improve predictability for property owners and builders. Um, these are some of the options we're going to ask that you incorporate. Um, now, this is already in, um, the charter in the code, but I want to just say it out loud so I know vertical development and flexible setback allowance for infill and redevelopment. Uh, this this option is intended to facilitate reinvestment in established neighborhoods where a lot with death or configuration makes compliance with current setbacks requirements impractical. It allows vertical construction to

DISCUSSION NOTES

02022026

WS

build up with horizontal expansion, is constrained, and provides targeted setbacks, flexibility for investors, redevelopment without compromising public safety or neighborhood compatibility. So with this bottom line, Mr. Mayor, um, I think a question was asked why can't you build up, uh, so you've always been able to build up meaning second and third floors, uh, by our current regulations. But I definitely want to rewrite this. So it's clearly understood on those certain lots. Um, so we're talking about, like, row houses and, you know, houses, uh, with, I think, second floors. Uh, I know there's still some verbiage in there, uh, about sizes. So that would have to be changed. So if you got a, you know, if you got housing, it's 1000 foot. But the two houses besides the 1000 foot, but you go up and that's going to be 2000 foot. We got to change that verbiage as well. That's something we're trying to do right now. But this is just an option to you, Mr. Mayor, and commission to, to consider, uh, some of the provisions from this, uh, construction allowance or on narrow or constrained lots. Uh, it will permit residential structure to increase height on number of stories with minimum lot width or size. Side setbacks cannot be met. Um, as ability criteria, of course. Existing blighted lots, um, lots below a defined minimum width threshold. Infill development uh, maximum height limit to maintain, uh, neighborhood scale. So that would be a thing if, um, if all the houses are, You know, ten, ten feet ceilings to look at that as an option. And then, of course, to maintain fire life safety and building code compliance is required. So the intent it allows homes to grow upward rather than outward where width is unavailable. Setback modifications for investors led redevelopment. Uh, this is going to allow reduce this proposal to allow reduced front, side and or rear setbacks for properties being rehabilitated or redeveloped by investors, uh, applicable to vacant or blighted properties, um rehabs, reconstructions, uh properties, improving neighborhood conditions or housing supplies. Um. The approval process is administrative approval by the planning and building staff. Uh no variance required. Clear objective standards to ensure consistency intent. Mr. mayor, Commission to remove regulatory barriers that discourage private investments into older neighborhoods. So the sort of this is we have a lot of homes. This goes back again to the small lots. Um, um, because so you can't really build there because of the lot size or the closing of the other houses. And there will be a case by case, uh, type scenario, but we won't allow like a single investor to come there as well. So if I want to maybe come in there and do two homes, um, we kind of moved us around so they can do that, right? Right now. Because, uh, a lot of these homes were built. We didn't really have any true setbacks. Um, it's been almost impossible for those types of redevelopment. And, you know, this might help out with our properties, those houses that can be salvaged. Um, and also so that's another, um, maybe with this, uh, but again, this is just something that we're going to throw out to the commission for consideration. We did talk about setbacks a while back, and, uh, we didn't fall all the way through. So hopefully this time, uh, we can make some type of decision on that. Um, context sensitive compatibility requirements, uh, ensure flexible setbacks do not negatively impact adjacent properties. So this is just kind of, um, what we say. We want to help investors come in there too. We don't want to let somebody come in and build a 5000 square foot house. It consumes everybody at the same time. So that's just saying that, um, safeguards limitation. Um, none of these changes that you're going to see override fire building or life safety codes, uh, does not apply to new subdivisions unless, uh, especially authorized applies to, uh, residential zoning districts or defined overlay areas. City retains enforcement authority for unsafe, uh, non-compliant structures. So the benefits, Mr. Mayor, um, for, you know, doing a little modification for the setbacks. Uh, also to allow, uh, upwards building it were able development on narrow or irregular lots. Uh, as you know, we have many lots currently right now that you can't build on simply because the way the lot itself is built, uh, encourage housing production and reinvestment, reduces variance, requests delays. Once again, 75%, uh, of our concerns of variance requests, uh, support small scale investors and local builders. Again, we do have some people that might want to just rehab 1 or 2 homes just to give them, make them more likely to be able to do that. Uh, preserve the neighborhood's character while allowing flexibility. And again, I know the goal is to keep some neighborhoods houses look in the same theme, Victoria and those things. But we do want to make sure that we're not, you know, turning the rest away because of a front facing house. Uh. Potential considerations. Um, requires clear height and design standards. Uh, may require staff training. And, um, like I said, to rewrite some of our ordinances for clarity. And then public communication necessary to avoid misconception of overbuilding. Um, so definitely don't want to let anybody come in here and just be a bill. And b have no rules in place. Uh, but we do want to make the process easier. Uh, definitely for a big time, not big time. Um, if somebody wants to come in and

*****DISCUSSION NOTES*****

02022026

WS

do homes development, uh, like, neighborhoods definitely make it easier on on them as possible. But at the same time, if we have a single person who wanted to rehab a home. Make it as simple as possible for them as well. And with that, Mr. Mayor, that completes that portion of the agenda. And I'll pause there for any questions or recommendations or concerns.

MAYOR: I'll start off listening to what you're saying. One of the concerns I had while listening is that if you're doing these, are we doing them customized per district so that they fit those areas? That's one question, because if you think about our. Our historic district is going to have more of Victorian style look. And that's going to be one of those concerns that if you go to another section of our community or other areas in the districts, you may not have the same kind of need. So I'm asking one, is there a customized way then secondly, will there be a group of people, maybe a committee of people who live in those districts who will be a part of this conversation so that when we do, maybe a round table of some sort. They have some input and conversation around what could or should be done in their neighborhoods, so that it won't be a conflict of interest for us, because many of us who live in different districts, and I think everyone in the room has a different place that they're involved in, but there needs to be some form of a template maybe created for that particular group, alongside proper verbiage inside of these ordinances, and making sure that we meet what is necessary. My question alongside that, that's that's one two. And my third question, the third question is going to deal with. Having not only groups of people, that's the first. The second thing, and not only having a particular template, but do want to know if there is going to be, if anything, a time where we're going to sit down with the documents that we have before us or had before us in order to meet these needs. Because if we don't have the persons who are going to be dealing with economic development, or the people who are not going to be dealing with it, because if you're talking about bringing people in and building developers and so forth, and we don't have rulings, as you said, we need to have the rules for that. How are we going to maintain that? That's another question on the end. How are we going to reinforce whether or not that's going to be done, especially if you go back and someone says, well, that house down the street didn't have it done this way, so why are we having to do it this way now? And if that's going to impede upon the development within those different groups. So I don't know if my questions are. Already addressed in some of your thinking, but if that's not the case, we need to try to address those things as well. But I'll open the floor to the districts and I'll start off with district one. They may have some comments.

ROBERTS: No I'm good thank you ma'am.

MAYOR: Okay. And district two.

SIMMONS: Uh, Mr. City Manager, is this something we're going to address? The retreat.

CITY MANAGER: Correct. Okay. I'll wait.

MAYOR: This sounds like a whole retreat thing. And district three.

SPEAKER 12: I'll wait till retreat.

MAYOR: Okay. District four.

TOMPKINS: I'll hold off on any questions right now.

MAYOR: Okay, and district 5

NELSON: And no comment, Mr. Mayor.

MAYOR: I'm going to keep commenting. And the reason and the reason I do that is because we'll get in here and do this right here. And then when we get to that meeting, we would have gotten on. And I need to have my thoughts bullet pointed so that when we come back in here, we can actually address

DISCUSSION NOTES

02022026

WS

them step by step as opposed to somehow having amnesia as we sometimes do. But anyway, that's that's all I have.

CITY MANAGER: Okay, so just a few points, Mr. Mayor. I do think two things can be happening at the same time. Uh, the setback modification, that's just in general, we need to look at the setbacks all together. So the setback modification, that's that's something actually separate. That would be a case by case. But just in general, we do need to kind of change the setback rules right now. Because right now you can't build anything because of our current setbacks. But we have those cases and it'll be like we have to determine the lot size. There will be requirements. It won't be like, I'm coming here, I want to build a McDonald's house because, you know, because y'all want me a thing like that. It'll be this lot is .28 acres, and it can only maintain a house this size. That's when those adjustable setbacks will come into play. So we'll be like a case by case. Uh, I do think talking to other cities again, everybody's facing these same challenges. At some point, we all have to get away from some of the esthetics, um, some of the homes that we try to stick to, um, because those homes just not being built anymore, um, and we do need housing, um, rapidly at this time. So any way we can get people to come here and we have some of these homes or build some of these homes, uh, we got to definitely take advantage of that. Um, but again, this will be one of the discussion items at the retreat, and you'll get information papers on all these tomorrow morning, kind of outlining, uh, the pros and cons and death. And I'll give you, um, a month and a half to really consider that. And then anything you want to add, Mr. Mayor, y'all can add at the retreat, and we'll go from there.

MAYOR: Okay. Sounds good.

CITY MANAGER: Uh, with that, Mr. Mayor, we're going to have, uh, one previous license renewal. We have no privilege licenses. We're going to have two ordinances. There's like two resolutions. I'm going to double check that. And with that, I'm going to turn my time over to the city attorney for her report.

CITY ATTORNEY GREEN: Uh, there is no report. At this time.

CITY MANAGER: Okay. All right, Mr. Mayor, with that, Mr. Mayor, I'm moving to my report. Uh, Mr. Mayor, I'm going to do my report, and I'm going to turn over a little bit of my time to the procurement officer. Uh, she wants to provide an update with enterprise, the enterprise system for our leasing program that we found out, uh, right before the meeting. So. Again, Mr. Mayor these are the zones, everyone. Zone one, Zone two. Zone three. Zone four. This is where the team is this week, Mr. Mayor as you all know, we did have a lot of people get sick from this constantly changing weather. So we've been short some crews today, so we'll try to catch up as the weather gets better. Um, we did have a lot of pipes burst over the weekend. I'll make a public statement now, please. Um, follow all rules. Uh, not rules. Follow all, um, recommendations. Uh, by the fire department. Um, by West County, um, emergency management about turning your faucets on. I think we're up to, like, 32 leaks, busted leaks right now. And most of these are on private property. Uh, so we can't do a lot with it. We can assist where we can, but we can't do a lot with it. So, please, uh, supposed to be cold the rest of this week. Please turn your let your water, uh, drip throughout the night. Um, the engineering project have not changed, Mr. Mayor. Um, we are going to be set back a little bit, um, with some of our big projects, um, Lee The avenue. Culvert placement on depending on the weather is going to be over the next few days. And with that, Mr. Mayor, I'm going to turn it over to the person's director with the enterprise update, and we're going to have the enterprise. She's actually going to kind of.

CITY MANAGER: She's doing teams or okay, she's going to come in through teams, Mr. Mayor.

MAYOR: Okay.

MAMIE: Good evening again, Mr. Mayor. Commissioners, um, because we do have a few new commissioners on board, we kind of wanted to give a, uh, introduction and a brief overview of what we

*****DISCUSSION NOTES*****

02022026

WS

have with enterprise. We currently have a leasing program with enterprise. It started before I started, which was approximately 2020 or 21 when they when they came in. Um, and we were not able to fully, take advantage of everything they had to offer because that was the time of Covid. So a lot of things shut down. And I wanted to give miss Heather Bell a chance to, uh, basically introduce the program to you all and answer any questions you may have. Miss Heather, are you there?

HEATHER BELL: I am. You guys hear me?

ALL: Yes, yes.

HEATHER BELL: Awesome. Thank you guys for having me. Um, I had sent some stuff to Patrick. Were you able to print it out and share it?

MAYOR: We have it.

MAMIE: Yes.

HEATHER BELL: Okay, perfect. Okay, so, um, I just wanted to kind of do a brief overview and one of the main things that I, a lot of them didn't realize is one of the ways that you partnered with us was through Sourcewell. So I just kind of included that on here. So because with Sourcewell, you don't have to, since we're already been vetted out, um, the pricing plan, whenever you guys reach out to us for a vehicle, we typically try to factory order a vehicle straight from the factory to get the lowest cost. And your pricing plan is already set with, uh sourcewell. So you don't have to go out and bid against it because it's already going to be the best price that way. And I can kind of explain more if you guys have questions. But I know typically the process is three bids, but that kind of helps you not have to do that. And then the main thing, um, when I have that slide on there that says the effective vehicle life cycle. Um, what we found out is we've been partnered with government clients, and now, you know, we've had some that have been on the program for ten plus years, and it's grown a lot. And when we first started, we realized that, you know, most government, you guys don't drive a ton of miles and you kind of keep the cars for a long time, 15, 20, 25 years. And then the value of the vehicles just kind of plateaued is really not worth anything. And so we kind of brought our way that we do our rental side to the government space. And that is just trying to to get out of it at the right time to kind of show that if you get out of it, even though it's low miles, it's kind of crazy to think, why would I trade in a car with 45,000 miles? But, um, when you do, you can kind of see and I have some examples in the packet from another government entity. And then I'll kind of help explain because we don't want to exceed these funds. So even though it's 45,000 miles, if it gets over that seven year period, we're really going to start to plateau. So that's where I look at like when is the best time to get out of it? And then for you guys I just have another slide just kind of on the government depreciation of like buying a vehicle and like what a holding period looks like. So you guys see if you have a vehicle and you drove it for one year and you had 5000 miles on it. So if you were to just buy like that Chevy, that 2026 GMC Silverado and you went straight to the website, that's what your cost is. But with your price, because of your government assistance and everything, you're actually getting it for 45. So if you were to, um, in one year, pay 45 and then sell it for 45 194, you technically have put out \$100. And we're just kind of showing that in year two, year three, the annual outlay isn't much different than keeping it for 15 years. So it's like, why keep it for 15 years and have an older vehicle that needs more maintenance on it? Um, versus just kind of maybe keeping a vehicle, you know, three, four years? Um, we are a little behind. I know I've been wanting, I think for about a couple years now. I was I was hoping to get, um, bicycles out of them, but now it's definitely time on some of these silverados and stuff that I have in here. If, if we're able to cycle out, um, and then just to kind of explain the open engine leasing model. So you guys have a slide. And just to kind of give like a brief overview of when it comes to leasing. It's not like leasing a dealership. These are your cars. You do whatever they're registered to you. We're just kind of helping you not have to put all the cash up front. So the idea is, is if a vehicle costs \$42,000, instead of going and buying the vehicle for \$42,000 or having a monthly payment on that 42. And so it's like, hey, maybe we do 32 and you keep ten of that as a residual. And so at the end whenever we go to sell it, so

*****DISCUSSION NOTES*****

02022026

WS

if we sell it for 22 five and you owe ten, we're going to take that extra 12 five and roll it into your next vehicle. And then that gave you an extra ten grand to maybe go do something else with it. So if there was another thing that you had to purchase. Um, I know some of my amenities. They really needed some, like refrigerator trucks or if it's a county like, you know, ambulances and stuff like that. So that just kind of helps free up money. And that's kind of the idea behind the leasing model. Um, and why government needs to partner with us. I included way back. Um, I wasn't a part of the, um, implementation. I had taken over the account soon after Linda left. But when you guys came on, I did find where, um, your current fleet and, like, what your fleet looked like before partnering with enterprise. And at that time, your current fleet cycle was almost 15 years. So that meant it would take you. If you bought a car today, you would replace it in 15 years. Oh. Go ahead.

MAMIE: No questions. Not yet.

HEATHER BELL: Oh, sorry. And your average age of your vehicle, um, was, um, like 7 or 8 years, I think it was like. Yeah, that was on here. The average age of your vehicle was, uh, ten years old. So it was an average age of ten, and then it would take 14 years. I included your current fleet profile in here, and this doesn't have all of the vehicles. A lot of the vehicles were taken out, but you guys did a really old on here. So this isn't even an actual representation because I know there's still some older vehicles that you have. But if you take the 47 that I see, you've actually increased your average holding period. So based off of these, if you buy a car today, it will take you 17 years to replace it versus the 13 you started off with. And that's just because, um, um, some of the older vehicles. But your average age has lowered, so it looks like you have a healthier fleet. But if we don't think ahead or be proactive, we'll just kind of be back where we were prior to it. So that's where I'm just trying to bring some light so that we. One of the big reasons is to partner with us is to try to get away from that aging fleet. And so I have if you see the example where it says resell overview example, um, that is a government client. The mix of these seven cars was um, two Malibus and some Chevy pickup trucks. And so when you look at this, they had it in their fleet for 50 months and you can see the odometer was very low, very low, like some of yours. So 40 just under 42,000 miles. So whenever we look at this and we see like the gains and the sales, the biggest thing that I like people to take away is at the very bottom it says average effective depreciation. And so what that is is whenever you have your lease payments. So over that 50 months they made their lease payments. And at the end when we sold it, they effectively only paid on average for these seven cards less than \$3,800. So you were able to have a vehicle for \$3,800, effectively, versus having to keep it forever. Because if you keep it forever and you paid 40 grand, effectively, that vehicle would have cost you 40 grand. And that's just what we're trying to bring back is can we, as we come to term, do we have permission to replace them? Um, and possibly I know there are some vehicles that you guys own that we were looking to possibly get on the program in the next budget year. And so I have both of those slides just to kind of highlight some of the vehicles that are already leased that are at term. And then the ones that you guys own that you would like to get onto the program. I know I kind of went through that fast, but I wasn't sure how much time I had. Um, so what questions. Do you guys have? What? Can I provide more insight?

MAYOR: I'll open the floor to the districts to ask or comment if they have questions or comments. Uh, starting with district one. If you have any comments or questions.

ROBERTS: No, sir.

MAYOR: District two. **SIMMONS:** no sir

MAYOR: District three.

SANDERS: No, sir.

MAYOR: District four.

*****DISCUSSION NOTES*****

02022026

WS

TOMPKINS: Um. Currently, how many vehicles do we have under this fleet program?

HEATHER BELL: So, your current profile. Um, I guess I should have left that on your slide for you. Do you have, I think, 37. Hold on, I have it.

NELSON: This is 47.

HEATHER BELL: That includes the police and your administration.

TOMPKINS: So that would be 47.

HEATHER BELL: I think it's 37. But hold on. I was going to get your exact. I took it off for some reason. I'm also here. Yeah, we have 38. Sorry. 38.

MAYOR: 38. Okay.

TOMPKINS: So the vehicles that are on there, how would we would we just initially trade them in to get on the the fleet program?

HEATHER BELL: So what we would do is we wouldn't pick them up or anything until you have replacements. So the idea is to be proactive. And so um, find out I can do a cost comparison. Um, I had spent like a little budget tool ahead of time to, um, you guys probably don't have it, or I don't know if they brought it with you, but, um, it kind of just shows different options, so I can. I gave different options if you prefer. Ram. The Chevy 1500 or GMC, and you guys can see what the cost would be estimated. And as that vehicle comes in, we would just pick that car up, sell it, and then apply the gains to the new car.

TOMPKINS: Okay. I have no other questions.

MAYOR: Okay. And district five.

NELSON: No, Mr. Mayor, I don't have anything.

MAYOR: Okay. Thank you.

MAMIE: Thank you Heather.

HEATHER BELL: Anything else?

MAYOR: That's all from us.

MAMIE: That's all. Thank you.

HEATHER BELL: Okay, let me know if you have any other questions, I appreciate it.

MAMIE: Alrighty. Thank you.

CITY MANAGER: And Mr. Mayor if I can. Just some more context. So she's not counting our whole fleet. Um, so I think she said 15 years. It's actually, I think we had 22 years for fleet management. Uh, I will say we're very grateful for this. For this. Certain things. Um, ARPA, they allowed us to kind of start turning the fleet over we can catch up. I think by next year's budget. When y'all do next year's budget, we should be able to start. I hate to use the word flipping, but we should be able to start flipping the vehicles, because we have a better inventory. So, um, the reason it didn't work before, of course, came on the tail end of Covid. It was hard to find vehicles. I think the program is working better right

*****DISCUSSION NOTES*****

02022026

WS

now. Um, but we'll probably talk about this more in detail during the budget hearings. Um, when they start the end of April and you'll get a that's when we'll kind of go into that. On the pros and cons of leasing. It really works. Well, of course, for our police, um, they go through the cars the fastest anybody. And so it's a good program for them. But for really to work, we gotta kind of get public works in there too, as well as colds and everybody else and turn over that way. That's it.

MAYOR: Thank you.

CITY MANAGER: All right, that completes the, uh, work session. We do have an executive session. Personnel.

MAYOR: Okay.

MAYOR: I need a motion to go into executive session for personnel.

TOMPKINS: Motion to go in executive session.

SIMMONS: Second.

MAYOR: We have a motion from our Commissioner Tompkins and a second from our Commissioner Simmons. All in favor, raise your right hand. Motion carries. We're going into executive session. Thank you, everyone, for showing up. Have a good evening.