



City Council Chamber  
735 Eighth Street South  
Naples, Florida 34102

---

**City Council Workshop Meeting – December 4, 2006 – 8:30 a.m.**

---

Mayor Barnett called the meeting to order and presided.

---

**ROLL CALL .....ITEM 1**

**Present:**

Bill Barnett, Mayor  
Johnny Nocera, Vice Mayor

**Council Members:**

William MacIlvaine  
Gary Price, II  
John Sorey, III  
Penny Taylor  
William Willkomm, III

---

**Also Present:**

Robert Lee, City Manager  
Robert Pritt, City Attorney  
Vicki Smith, Technical Writing Specialist  
Stephen Weeks, Technology Services Director  
Tara Norman, City Clerk  
Jessica Rosenberg, Deputy City Clerk  
Denise Perez, Human Resources Director  
Michael Bauer, Natural Resources Manager  
Robin Singer, Community Development Director  
Linda Tanner-Bevard, Human Resources Generalist  
David Lykins, Community Services Director

Judith Chirgwin  
Lisa Garmon  
Sue Smith  
Henry Kennedy  
Barry Williams  
Joe Biasella  
James Lennane  
Keith Laakkonen  
Amanda Townsend

Herb Marlowe  
Wynn Phillips  
Dorothy Hirsch  
Dave Ball

**Media:**

Eric Staats, Naples Daily News

Other interested citizens and visitors.

**SET AGENDA.....ITEM 2**

No changes were noted.

**PUBLIC COMMENT.....ITEM 3**

**James Lennane, President of Continental Aviation, 200 Patriot Way**, indicated that his company had been a tenant at the Naples Municipal Airport for the past 14 years. He said he was speaking to City Council regarding concerns with the handling of stormwater in conjunction with a new facility being constructed near Continental's location by the Collier County Sheriff's Department for its SWAT operations. He said that areas formerly used to contain runoff have been filled. Mr. Lennane also noted that the parking lot of the Sheriff's facility will be

approximately two feet above the Continental site and that a retaining wall would be constructed which would block sheet flow for the purposes of drainage. In addition, there had been damage due to heavy construction truck traffic to a 2,000 gallon underground device used to separate stormwater from fuels and other byproducts from the servicing aircraft. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has begun an investigation of the matter; however, he said, there is no further land area to reconstruct this particular apparatus. Mr. Lennane provided an aerial photograph and diagrams in conjunction with his comments, copies of which are contained in the file for this meeting in the City Clerk's Office. He requested that the City verify the adequacy of the drainage system constructed at the Sheriff's building and also cited a risk to Continental from anticipated flooding in the area of its fuel tanks, although this had not been an issue before the aforementioned construction. In conclusion, Mr. Lennane stated that a six- to eight-foot chain link fence is to be constructed upon the retaining wall, resulting in what he described as a ten-foot wall at the edge of Continental's site which was, in fact, not needed for security purposes by the SWAT facility. Mayor Barnett said that while this matter would be pursued based on Mr. Lennane's assertions, a written narrative would also be helpful in this regard. Mr. Lennane attributed the urgency of his request to the fact that destruction of prior provisions to handle runoff had been adversely affected and that it would then be Continental's responsibility to correct the situation; therefore, he is requesting investigation by the City. City Manager Robert Lee confirmed that the City would investigate this matter. Council Member Taylor expressed concern with reference to the degree of zoning control which the City has exercised in regard to placement of the aforementioned SWAT building, and Council Member Price said he believed that the Sheriff's facilities had expanded to a degree that had not been anticipated when initial approvals were conveyed. He asked for further information in this regard. Council Member Willkomm received confirmation from Mr. Lennane that the lease on the airport property was for Collier Sheriff's Special Operations. Council Member Sorey requested that records be assembled regarding any waivers which had been granted by the City in the approval process for the SWAT facility. Mayor Barnett requested that staff provide an update at the regular meeting of December 6. **Dorothy Hirsch, 626 Regatta Road**, reported on a meeting the prior week between citizens, a representative of the construction industry and City staff regarding drainage issues and expressed the hope that the necessary ordinance modifications would be prepared for Council action prior to its summer recess. She referred to concerns expressed by builders with regard to the need for retrofitting for certain projects and issues raised regarding effects of activities in the unincorporated area upon City drainage flows. Mrs. Hirsch also expressed concern that changes made by the legal staff to the noise ordinance amendment to come before Council that week would result in confusion; she said she planned to address this in writing. **Dr. Dave Ball (no address given)**, referred to a recent letter to the Council in which he had addressed the issue of allowing emergency generators to be installed in the setback area of existing homes. In response to Dr. Ball, Mayor Barnett indicated that the appropriate time for citizens to address questions with regard to the noise ordinance amendment would be during the Council's review at that week's regular meeting.

**INTERVIEW WITH COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY ADVISORY BOARD CANDIDATE.....ITEM 4**

Wynn Phillips was interviewed for the Community Redevelopment Agency Advisory Board (CRAAB).

---

**VISIONING WORKSHOP #1 – POTENTIAL SURVEY TOPICS.....ITEM 5**

Council Member Taylor requested that the City Manager's Office staff place a reminder call to Council Members on time-sensitive matters such as submittal to the consultant of lists of visioning issues and potential community interviewees.

Herbert Marlowe of Arrington Marlowe indicated that he was seeking Council's guidance on prioritizing topics to be included in the citizen survey in conjunction with the visioning process. (Mr. Marlowe's comments were accompanied by an electronic presentation, a printed copy of which is contained in the file for this meeting in the City Clerk's Office.) Mr. Marlowe reviewed various types of surveys (Attachment 1), cautioning that the more specific the survey questions, the higher the level of controversy. Also displayed was a list of potential survey topics which Mr. Marlowe said had been selected at random, and he asked Council Members to provide their three top priority issues. The Council then discussed the questions that would be asked with reference to the following areas: natural environment; annexation; density, intensity and scale; growth in Collier County; traffic; tourism activity in the City; historic preservation; what first attracted people to Naples; affordable/workforce housing; and the biggest concerns for the next five years (Attachment 2). Mr. Marlowe also noted that some of the questions which were being listed for the survey, due to their complexity, should instead be raised in focus groups.

Council Member Sorey also recommended that respondents be identified by such categories as full-time and seasonal residency. Mr. Marlowe then listed the following issues with reference to demographics:

- Are you a full-time resident? Is Naples your legal residence?
- How long have you been in Naples?
- Do you own a business?
- How much time do you spend in Naples?
- Are you raising a family here?
- Do you have children in school?
- Are you retired or employed or both?
- What is your primary recreation?
- Do you use parks or other public facilities?

Mr. Marlowe said that another workshop discussion would be scheduled in mid-January; in the interim, he said he would work with staff regarding the information provided above. It was also noted that a list of community interviewees would be developed from names provided by individual Council Members. In addition, he said that the subcontractor who will actually conduct the survey will be available that day to answer Council's questions. Council Member Sorey requested that as much information as possible be made available to the Council in advance of that session.

---

**Recess: 10:03 a.m. to 10:17 a.m. It is noted for the record that all Council Members were in attendance when the meeting reconvened.**

---

At this point in the meeting, Mayor Barnett acknowledged individuals who had registered to speak on Item 5. **Judith Chirgwin, 112 Tenth Avenue South**, urged that the Council remain mindful that Naples is a residential community which should be enriched through the visioning process. **Lisa Garmon, Naples and Marco Island**, suggested with reference to traffic that speed tables be installed to slow vehicles. She said she had observed excessive speeds in the area of Fifth Avenue South and Second Street. She also said that an artist from New Hampshire

would be proposing lighting for Fifth Avenue South which Ms. Garmon characterized as more tasteful than the fixtures currently in place.

**CITY PAY & CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM.....ITEM 6**

Human Resources Director Denise Perez made a presentation regarding the City's pay and classification systems, including collective bargaining agreements, how competitive pay scales are developed, and recent steps taken in this regard by the City administration. (A printed copy of Ms. Perez's electronic presentation is contained in the file for this meeting in the City Clerk's Office.)

Ms. Perez listed the following purposes of a pay and classification system:

- Provides for an equitable compensation system which allows the City to recruit and retain qualified employees;
- Places the City in a competitive position with other comparable organizations in the local market, although state and national comparisons are also made;
- Ensures that employees performing similar work are compensated comparably; and
- Functions within mandatory collective bargaining.

Ms. Perez also noted the City's two types of pay plans: step plans which provide set pay adjustments each year on an employee's anniversary date (police and fire); and salary ranges applicable to all other positions, modified through negotiated wage agreements, and affected by general increases but not by performance-based increases. She then explained that among the challenges currently faced is a difficulty in recruiting, pointing out the vacancy rate since May which is up to 11%, or approximately 40 positions per month. Unemployment in Collier County is 3.4% and 3.1% in the State, the lowest since 2001, Ms. Perez noted. She further pointed out other factors such as housing costs and the cost of living in Collier County which contribute to vacancy and turnover rate; which had reached 20% during the past fiscal year, the highest since 1999. Pay rates have not kept pace with the above costs, she added, citing also increasing competition for workers, particularly from other public sector employers. The salary ranges for some classifications, such as building inspectors, utility plant operators and telecommunications operators in Police & Emergency Services had already been adjusted to address recruitment and retention difficulties.

Director Perez further indicated that the City's pay plan had been adjusted wherever possible to be comparable to rates paid employees by Collier County government which is considered to be the City's primary competitor in the labor market. Recommendations, therefore, include approval of tentative agreements with bargaining units, and adoption of the Collier County pay plan for like positions; this would necessitate adjustment of applicable City employee salaries that fall below the new minimums.

Council Member Sorey requested further discussion of the methodology involved in establishing a pay range. Ms. Perez said that in the past, the City has used a combination of salary studies and a point system to rate duties and proficiencies required for particular functions. In addition, salary comparisons are made in the immediate area as well as statewide and nationwide. She said that this information is examined annually to determine whether any upgrades in pay are warranted.

Council Member MacIlvaine asked for an estimate of the cost involved should the City adopt the Collier County pay plan as noted above. Ms. Perez estimated \$119,000 annually for only those employees which fall below the new pay ranges, or approximately 50 individuals. (It is noted for the record that additional information regarding fiscal impacts of various increases is contained in the file for the December 6, 2006, regular meeting.)

Council Member Price asked to receive any information received in exit interviews with terminating employees. Ms. Perez indicated that currently no formal exit interview is conducted; however, she said she believed that a large percentage were leaving for out of state, having taken advantage of profits derived from the local real estate market. However, more recently, she added, the reasons given involved taking positions with Collier County government which had effected significant pay plan adjustments in the past year. Council Member MacIlvaine asked that any responses included on exit forms however be assembled.

In response to Council Member Taylor, Ms. Perez clarified that the bargaining unit agreements submitted for approval at that week's regular meeting contain provision for general increases only and that the Council would be asked to approve separately any adjustment in pay ranges, following further negotiations with bargaining units.

**Public Comment:** **Sue Smith, 11th Avenue South**, asked whether the Council monitored implementation of approved salary increases, citing a Council discussion of an increase for clerical workers which had not been accomplished; therefore, she asked whether these salary increases would be made retroactive. City Manager Robert Lee said that Mrs. Smith had been referring to one classification which is a subject of collective bargaining and that, following negotiations, it had been implemented. Council Member Price noted that the aforementioned positions had been in the City Clerk's Office and that, despite collective bargaining agreements, it was unlikely that a union would refuse a salary increase at any point if offered to its members. City Manager Lee said that in general unions seek to have increases applied to all members; however, instances like this can be brought to the bargaining unit as had been done in the case of positions found to be below rates paid by Collier County. In the future, he added, contact could be made with the unions as situations like that in the Clerk's Office arise. Mrs. Smith said that she believed that retention of employees goes beyond housing needs and is attributable to an atmosphere that is not congenial and can be related first to management and then to the City Council in its oversight role. She requested costs which the City has incurred for contract employees brought in to fill vacancies and whether these fees are higher than the rate of pay that would be given to an employee in that function. She said that she did not feel that City employees were being treated equitably, pointing out that even though the City Manager may have received the same percentage salary adjustment as other employees, his higher salary level results in a substantial dollar amount of increase. These matters, she said, should be investigated by the Council on behalf of the citizens who desire answers in this regard. Mrs. Smith also took issue with comparisons to other communities that are not similar to Naples and criticized other expenditures in areas that she characterized as frivolous. Mayor Barnett said he disagreed with Mrs. Smith, and Council Member MacIlvaine said that he did not perceive the fear that he had heard was occurring among City employees, pointing out that this issue is unquantifiable. **Henry Kennedy, Naples**, said that he had for many years requested that the Council grant salary increases to City employees, particularly those in the police patrol division, which he said was in need of significant attention, regardless of statistics obtained from such organizations as the

Florida League of Cities or other communities. To obtain the best services, he added, the City must be willing to compensate accordingly; currently, he added, the City of Naples police officers deserve to be rewarded for the work they do. Mr. Kennedy also said that comparisons with Collier County are not relevant when the City is in need of workers commensurate with the expectations of the community. However, management salaries except cost of living should be frozen while others should actually experience a significant reduction. In conclusion, he asserted that City employees share their feelings with citizens and not with Council, therefore, he encouraged Council to seek out this type of information.

At the request of Council Member MacIlvaine, Human Resources Director Perez said that she would provide salary comparisons between the City's police officers and other agencies in the region; in addition, he asked that these figures include recent increases in City contributions to police pensions. City Manager Lee also pointed out that the bargaining units had negotiated salary levels, and that it should be considered positive that agreements had been reached. It is also significant, he added, that it was the City, not the bargaining units, that was requesting upward adjustments in salary ranges for certain positions. He also commended the City's negotiating team and stressed that salary levels in the City are in fact competitive.

Mayor Barnett suggested that the visioning process include discussion of salaries, and Council Member Price also recommended that the public be asked whether they would be willing to fund these added costs as a component to maintaining the community's level of service. Mr. Price also received clarification that there had not been a practice for a Council Member to attend employee exit interviews; however, Council Member Taylor said that there were many questions regarding the reasons for the departure of staff members. Council Member Sorey suggested that a formal exit interview process be established and that Council receive a report on a monthly basis.

**KEEWAYDIN ISLAND CITY-COUNTY PARK.....ITEM 7**

Natural Resources Manager Michael Bauer gave an electronic presentation, a printed copy of which is contained in the file for this meeting in the City Clerk's Office. He said that he had initially opposed any plan by Collier County to bring more visitors to Keewaydin Island (also known as Key Island) due to the fragility of its natural environment. He said he had learned that talks were nevertheless underway between Collier County and Rookery Bay in this regard. After having been invited to attend, he had however learned that a ferry was planned which would be limited to 20 to 25 people in each of four trips per day to provide an environmental/ecological experience for the visitors, not for the purpose of sunbathing. He illustrated on aerial photographs the point at which a ferry would most likely access the island from the County's Bayview Park, noting that all the island areas described for this purpose are within the City limits. Included would be boardwalks, restrooms, and a deck where visitors could hear a talk by a naturalist. While a trail system installed by Rookery Bay is currently in existence, few resources are available to devote to its management. While it a very valuable ecological experience, it is virtually unused by the public.

Dr. Bauer than referred to extensive and uncontrolled use at the south end of the island combined with a lack of enforcement capabilities; while this should be avoided on the north end of the island, he said, violations were nevertheless beginning to occur in that area and that wildlife is therefore at risk.

Dr. Bauer then made the following recommendations: 1) enter into an interlocal agreement with Collier County and Rookery Bay/Florida Department of Environmental Protection (DEP); 2) function as an active partner in development of a park on Keewaydin Island; and 3) consider taking the lead in providing a park ranger/naturalist presence which could provide control of activities as well as information. Therefore, he said, the area could be protected while people would be informed about the natural environment in the City of Naples. He indicated that County representatives Barry Williams and Amanda Townsend were present, as well as Keith Laakkonen of Rookery Bay, to answer questions.

In response to Council Member MacIlvaine, Dr. Bauer clarified that while the land being proposed for a park is in the City limits, none is actually owned by the City of Naples. Mayor Barnett asked whether visitors would be required to return by ferry after conclusion of the tours/lectures. Other than some visitors who may occasionally wish to remain, Dr. Bauer said it was anticipated that all would depart once the program and tour offered by the naturalists had concluded; he said that a schedule of four trips a day would be appropriate. Council Member Sorey said that he could not support an excessive number of visitors and cautioned that visitation strictly to use the beach would result. Despite its under-utilization by the public, he said, stringent guidelines as to the conduct of activities should nevertheless be clearly delineated in any interlocal agreement. Mr. Sorey said that he could, under certain stringent controls, support the concept as outlined. Dr. Bauer recommended that the City determine what role it wished to play in the plan, the park being a County facility occupying State-owned land.

Council Member Willkomm pointed out that the national park system is under stress because of over-utilization; therefore, he questioned why a pristine area like the northern area of Keewaydin Island would be further opened to public visitation; this, he added, could cause its ruin. Because of its inaccessibility the northern section of the island serves no purpose for the average resident, he added, and predicted that the proposal would destroy one of the few remaining pristine areas. Council Member Taylor said that construction of a dock would open the area to traffic other than that controlled by the park function described. Although the City should have a voice in the process, there are nevertheless a myriad of legal questions which must be addressed. Mayor Barnett observed that it is contradictory to propose a public park in order to protect an area that is now difficult to access.

Keith Laakkonen, Resource Coordinator for Rookery Bay Natural Estuarine Resource Reserve, recommended the proposal since it would better manage the public access that is already occurring. Infrastructure, he added, would be minimal and he assured Council that any interlocal agreement proposed must be compatible with the Rookery Bay management plan for the area, pointing out that Rookery Bay now manages approximately 40% of the shoreline in Collier County. He took the position that the proposal would allow management to be more pro-active, particularly in the County providing a more uniform park ranger presence combined with an educational experience. A public forum will be held the week of January 29, he said, to address these and other issues including environmental concerns and usage. Council Member Taylor received confirmation from Mr. Laakkonen that there would in fact be legal grounds to restrict the use of a dock constructed for access to this area and that this restriction would most likely be effected via a State submerged land lease to the County. Miss Taylor however stressed that definitive answers in this regard are critical to the concept, requesting that City staff assemble

information in this regard. She also took the position that education could however be provided at Rookery Bay without traversing the island, and rangers could then be deployed on Keewaydin solely to prohibit illegal activity.

Citing Corkscrew Swamp Sanctuary, Council Member Sorey pointed out that an area could actually benefit from some limited degree of access and that he was inclined to favor the proposal, noting that tours can be controlled through a registration system.

Barry Williams, Collier County Parks & Recreation Director, said that the goal was to maintain the pristine nature of the locale, comparing Keewaydin Island issues with those faced in protecting Barefoot Beach. He assured Council that a collaborative agreement between the three governmental entities was being sought to incorporate a low-intensity use by the public. In response to Council Member Taylor, Mr. Williams indicated that the County had initiated the proposal in order to provide an experience that was different from the typical beach visit. In response to Council Member Price, Mr. Williams said that it had not been finalized as to whether it would be a City or a County park. Mr. Price also received confirmation on the location of a private beach club which had been proposed by the developer of some of the lands on the island. Mr. Price took issue with the project having advanced to its present stage without City involvement and expressed concern that initiating visits by approximately 100 people per day to Keewaydin would in some manner be a responsibility of City government. Council Member Sorey, however, assured Mr. Price that the discussion was in fact preliminary, although the matter had already been covered to an extent at the Tourist Development Council (TDC). Nevertheless, Mr. Sorey said that he would require assurances that the proposal is environmentally oriented and that there was no intent whatsoever to provide beach access at any time in the future. Mr. Williams said that an interlocal agreement would be the best means of providing these assurances; he also stressed that the County was perceiving this specific proposal not as one that would provide beach access on the northern sector of the island.

Council Member Willkomm said that a project of this sort should not be considered until all uses on the island are taken into consideration. He said he however feared that the proposal was in fact a foregone conclusion that in fact had not actually called for City involvement, a factor that he said had caused discomfort on his part. Mr. Willkomm said he would not support an interlocal agreement even with further extensive information. Council Member MacIlvaine also cited population pressures in Collier County that he said would result in eventual expansion of the use on Keewaydin for beach access, pointing out the necessity of a decision on whether people should be excluded from certain resources.

Mayor Barnett said he believed that the proposal was indeed preliminary in nature, recommending that conversations go forward and that the City continue to be informed so that a well-reasoned final decision could be made. Council Member Sorey said that he would much rather the City be a part of the process than be excluded, pointing out that currently access can be achieved from the south end of Keewaydin Island via the beach which underscores the need for staff to control activities.

Vice Mayor Nocera indicated his support for the proposal, and Council Member Taylor expressed appreciation for inclusion of the Council at this point.



**Public Comment:** **Henry Kennedy, Naples**, stated his opposition to the proposal, noting that Keewaydin Island is the last such area that has not been destroyed. He also expressed distrust in assertions by Collier County, pointing out changes in focus which had occurred in the water filtration area on Goodlette-Frank Road and Golden Gate Parkway which had evolved into a public park; he also cited development of the overpass at Airport-Pulling Road and Golden Gate Parkway and the County's response to requests for support of the City's park system as issues in which the County had failed to perform as represented. He predicted that ferry passengers would remain on the island until the last trip of the day and that public facilities such as restrooms would be required. He was also critical of the effectiveness of the DEP, asserted that beach access was in fact the impetus for the current proposal, and took issue with the City Council not having been informed earlier in the process. Mr. Kennedy further expressed suspicion that the County had in fact formulated final plans for Keewaydin Island which involve much more extensive usage than represented at that point. **Joseph Biasella, Naples**, asked that the Council advise the County that it has no interest in this proposal, warning of the danger of incremental destruction of the natural environment on Keewaydin Island. He reiterated that the City should not become involved.

Mayor Barnett urged the Council to continue to examine the proposal which should in fairness be allowed to be fully developed so that a decision could be made based on factual information. He said that Keewaydin Island is being destroyed from the south end, regardless of whether the current proposal materializes; however, a means by which rangers could be introduced is a positive aspect, he added. Council Member Taylor urged that legal research be accomplished with regard to controlling access; Council Member MacIlvaine agreed that this is the key issue as it relates to placement of a dock. Council Member Willkomm however said that City involvement should be curtailed immediately, characterizing the proposal as insidious encroachment on a natural resource. Expressing a lack of confidence in the County's assertions in the past, Council Member Sorey nevertheless said he believed that the County could construct a dock on land controlled by Rookery Bay without a City voice in the matter.

**Public Comment:** (cont.) **Lisa Garmon, Marco Island and Naples**, said that she supported the proposal and assured Council that access to the area under consideration could be controlled through the ferry system. She noted that many people who do not own vessels have no other way to visit Keewaydin Island.

City Manager Robert Lee pointed out that the staff would gather further information and expressed appreciation to Dr. Bauer for his efforts. He said he believed that there was a majority consensus that legal research be conducted to delineate the City's control options with reference to the proposal.

*Consensus to continue to gather information, particularly on legal issues  
(Council Member Willkomm dissenting).*

City Attorney Robert Pritt said that the complexity of issues would however preclude an answer to Council's questions by that week's regular meeting. He estimated that legal research could however be completed by January. Council Member Taylor stressed to County representatives that any assertions on the part of the County Commission to the effect that this proposal was intended for preservation, not beach access, would greatly raise the Council's comfort level.

**BRIEFING BY CITY MANAGER.....ITEM 9**

City Manager Robert Lee referenced his written report (contained in the file for this meeting in the City Clerk's Office). He noted an upcoming Gordon River Greenway meeting to be held at City Hall as well as the second session on the Comprehensive Pathways workshop in the coming week. City Manager Lee also mentioned implementation of requirements to screen trash containers, and while the staff is not recommending further amendments, the City is working with those who have requested exemptions as well as those who have not complied. Delays have been caused due to the fact that condominium board members had not yet returned for the season; nevertheless, those who have not complied are considered to be in violation. In conclusion, he reported that a draft agenda for the joint City Council/County Commission meeting on December 18th would be prepared for Council review that week. Mayor Barnett noted the need to discuss annexation issues; Council Member Sorey said that infrastructure should be added to that topic and also suggested a discussion of the Keewaydin Island matter just reviewed. Council Member Price said that he believed that the priorities of the County's Washington lobbyist should be discussed relative to reported impending reconsideration of spending on the federal level.

**Recess: 12:01 p.m. to 1:30 p.m. It is noted for the record that the same Council Members were present when the meeting reconvened except Council Member Taylor, who arrived at 1:32 p.m., Vice Mayor Nocera, who arrived at 1:34 p.m. It is also noted that Council Member MacIlvaine was absent when the meeting reconvened.**

**COMMUNITY SERVICES RECREATION FEES.....ITEM 8**

Community Services Director David Lykins noted that, in the past, most recreational facilities in Collier County were those located in the City of Naples. Even though in the last decade Collier County began developing parks and recreational facilities, the City's parks have increasingly functioned as regional facilities resulting in an increasing need to address infrastructure. Significant improvements have also been made to such City facilities as Cambier Park, Naples Landing, Lowdermilk Park, Fleischmann Park, and new community centers at River Park and Cambier Park, Mr. Lykins noted. Nevertheless, frequency of use and pressures on capacity are threatening the wellbeing of City recreational facilities. As an example, Mr. Lykins noted that concerts at the bandshell in Camber Park have seen attendance rise from approximately 5,000 to between 8,000 and 10,000 per event resulting in increasing pressures on the green area surrounding the facility. He stressed that, with the fee increase proposed, the City had no intent to preclude usage of facilities by any club or group, but to merely achieve consistency between the City and County park system usage fees; he said that the City's fee schedule is however currently artificially low.

Mr. Lykins said that fees were last adjusted in 2001 and that a comparison had been provided showing current resident and non-resident City fees compared to Collier County and the new fees proposed. He noted that there were no non-resident fees shown in the cases where interlocal agreements have resulted in County contributions toward park infrastructure (Attachment 3). However, the new rates will be contained in a unified structure which does not differentiate between resident and non-resident.

Mr. Lykins then addressed skate park operations (Fleischmann), noting that the facility was initially constructed in 1996 and has grown to over 2,000 members; however, as with many other City park facilities, 80% or more of users are non-City residents (Attachment 4). With regard to

youth leagues using Fleischmann Park, Mr. Lykins provided a report (Attachment 5) and assured the Council and the public that it was not the City's intent to limit or curtail this usage. He said that in order for these youth leagues to be competitive, district boundaries must continually expand for these organizations to obtain a sufficient number of participants, a situation to which the City is sensitive (Attachment 6).

Mr. Lykins then reported that tennis fees were covering all expenses and memberships continue to increase; however, in this segment of the park system, 83% of adult resident memberships are from the City and 90% of the junior members live within the City. The only change being recommended is to apply sales tax separately to the base rate instead of charging a tax-included rate as is currently the case.

With regard to City Dock rates, he pointed out that the budget for Fiscal Year 2006-07 had anticipated a rate increase for recreational slips of \$1.00 per foot; regardless, Mr. Lykins said that this remains the most attractive rate in the area. Commercial slip rates are adjusted annually based on Consumer Price Index (CPI) calculations, with the latest upward adjustment being in October at 4.32%. In response to Council Member Sorey, Mr. Lykins reported that approximately 50% of those occupying recreational boat slips at the City Dock are City residents; there are also 51 individuals on the waiting list for recreational slips, although just nine of these are City residents (Attachment 7).

In conclusion, Community Services Director Lykins recommended that Council approve the revised fees for the following: recreational, athletic and skate park user fees; tennis membership fee; and City Dock Fund recreational slip rental fees.

Council Member Willkomm complimented the presentation and said he supported discontinuance of the prior two-tiered fee system; he also received clarification that while funds from recreational fees go into the general fund, some assumptions in the current budget year had taken into account an anticipated fee increase. City Manager Robert Lee also pointed out that the general fund is currently subsidizing many recreational programs which are not self-sustaining. Mr. Willkomm recommended adoption of a policy that would call for review of fees every two to three years rather than the five-year period which had just elapsed. Council Member Price concurred and complimented the staff serving at all the City recreational facilities. Vice Mayor Nocera said he was reluctant to increase skate park fees since the facility is a safe and positive outlet for youth activity. Nevertheless, due to the City's providing a state-of-the-art new facility, a \$30 membership fee was considered low. Mr. Nocera also said that fees should be reviewed every two years. Council Member Taylor received clarification that skate board drop-in fees are competitive with other facilities on the West Coast of Florida but lower than those on the East Coast which in fact can be substantially higher. Miss Taylor said that she believed the quality of the facility warranted a higher drop-in fee.

Miss Taylor then conveyed a suggestion she had received from Community Services Advisory Board Member Doug Finlay that rates for not-for-profit users of community center facilities be reduced if multi-year reservations are made. Mr. Lykins said that the City now operates on a 12-month cycle with groups of this type; however, it is not recommended for longer periods due to issues of entitlement on the part of both the City and the leasing entity. However, Mr. Lykins

also indicated that groups may not be required to pay a fee for incidental or drop-in use should a room be available. Miss Taylor commended the work of Community Services and the positive and effective attitude of the staff. Council Member Sorey asked whether groups regularly using community center facilities were billed annually; Mr. Lykins said a more frequent basis is however advisable in order to avoid the need to process refunds should a group not use the facilities as often as anticipated. Mr. Sorey said that he did not believe refunds should be granted in this instance; he also said that it is often more costly to collect lower-rate fees unless it is done on a long-term basis. With regard to the City Dock waiting list, Mr. Sorey received clarification from Mr. Lykins that City residents are granted preference if a slip of the size they are seeking is available. Mr. Sorey also concurred that County residents should not be made unwelcome in City programs and facilities, particularly in light of the need of numbers of participants in order to mount certain programs; however, he said he hoped the Collier County Commission would also be more receptive to subsidizing use by residents of the unincorporated area.

Mayor Barnett acknowledged the Community Services Advisory Board for its work in study and recommendations with regard to the rate adjustment process.

**REVIEW OF ITEMS ON THE 12/06/06 REGULAR MEETING AGENDA .....ITEM 10**

Regarding Item 6-c (lawn maintenance contract), Council Member Taylor asked whether the vendor would provide lawn vacuum equipment; with regard to Item 6-d (forestry grant), she asked that staff provide the reason trees had not yet been planted in conjunction with median rehab. On Items 6-g and 6-h (bargaining unit contracts) Council Member Price asked for further information on Council's prior approval of salary adjustments for Technical Writing Specialists; on Item 6-I (recycling services) he requested the termination date of the original contract. It was noted that Item 6-k (monetary contribution for WGPU historical documentaries) was being withdrawn by staff and that the petitioner had requested a continuance to the second meeting in January for Item 7 (rezone/residential impact statement, parking garage Fourth Avenue South and Fourth Street). Council Member Sorey asked whether Item 8 (administrative appeal relative to Item 7) was filed in a timely manner. Council Member Taylor asked that an explanation of the workings of the drainage system be provided as well as a description of alleyway improvements, with reference to Item 9 (Conditional use for added residential density in "D" Downtown 06-CU13); and Item 10 (Conditional use for bank drive-through 06-CU15). She also asked to be informed of the responsible entity if drainage problems subsequently occur. Council Member Sorey requested hours of operation for Item 16 (waiver of distance petition, Ted's Montana Grill, Coastland Mall), and Council Member Price requested an explanation of the overall Coastland Mall expansion plans. Council Member Sorey cited Item 18 (Port Royal rezone 06-T13) and asked whether a requirement for riprap installation could be included in a future amendment to Section 58-122. With regard to Item 19 (amendment to noise ordinance 06-T11), Council member Taylor asked for the basis for the change in regulations, particularly as it applies to the point of measurement; Council Member Sorey also requested the date for implementation, manner in which 100-foot notification is established, and issue of placement of emergency generators at existing homes. Council Member Taylor asked the reason for the requested continuance on Item 20 (anchorage ordinance). Council Member Sorey asked that under Item 21 (annexation procedure) items listed on Page 4 of October 16, 2006, City Council workshop minutes be included. Regarding Item 22 (urban services report regarding Collier Park of Commerce), Council Member Price said that various issues were in need of amendment; he also requested continuance of Item 23-b (Appointment to Community Redevelopment Agency

Advisory Board/CRAAB) in order to consider an additional applicant. Council Member Taylor requested an additional form with reference to Item 25 (City Clerk evaluation); Council Member Sorey (Items 25 and 26) asked whether percentage increases for City Clerk and City Manager should be handled in a similar manner. Council Member Price asked whether a salary range for City Manager should be established.

**CORRESPONDENCE and COMMUNICATIONS.....**

Council Member Taylor requested a summary of monetary contributions by the City to Fun Time Early Childhood Development Center, including Community Development Block Grant monies. Council Member Willkomm asked the cost for the visioning process, and City Manager Robert Lee said it was in the range of \$140,000. Mr. Willkomm said he had received a call from a member of the Presidents' Council (property owner associations) expressing concern that one hour is the only amount of time that had been designated to receive input from that entire group of approximately 16 representatives. City Manager Lee said that a special meeting had in fact been scheduled with the Presidents' Council, but that there would not be a time constraint as to the length of the meeting; he also said he believed that various members of the Presidents' Council may be listed among other input groups. Mayor Barnett pointed out however that focus groups would be the principal forums in the input process where individual citizens and not group representatives would be heard. City Manager Robert Lee further said that he believed the meeting with the Presidents' Council would not be limited to one hour and that a subsequent meeting could be scheduled, if needed.

**ADJOURN .....**  
2:28 p.m.

---

Bill Barnett, Mayor

Minutes prepared by:

---

Tara A. Norman, City Clerk

Minutes Approved: 1/10/07

General attitude (most general)

In general is the City going in the right direction?

Specific concerns/importance

How important or concerned are you about the following ...

General action

The City should take some action on the following...

Policy information (most specific)

Are you in favor of ....

Natural Environment	Annexation	Density, Intensity, Scale	Growth in Collier County
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Cost.</li> <li>■ Understanding of impact on natural environment on life in Naples.</li> <li>■ What are the goals?</li> <li>■ Water quality.</li> <li>■ Background, federal regulations, orders.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Understand pros and cons.</li> <li>■ How big do you want the city to be?</li> <li>■ What impact do you want the City to have on the County?</li> <li>■ What is impact on daily life of City residents?</li> <li>■ Impacts of various scenarios.</li> <li>■ Impact on representation regarding City Council and government if the City grows.</li> <li>■ Is bigger better? Is smaller more desirable?</li> <li>■ Level of service.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Setbacks/lot coverage.</li> <li>■ Drainage.</li> <li>■ Units per acre.</li> <li>■ Parking.</li> <li>■ Required green space.</li> <li>■ Parking garages/need for or not/where?</li> <li>■ Height of residential, commercial.</li> <li>■ Is it important to maintain a small town feel?</li> <li>■ Do we have a small town feel? What is it?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Impact on city infrastructure.</li> <li>■ Traffic.</li> <li>■ Parking.</li> <li>■ Beach access.</li> <li>■ Parks.</li> <li>■ Level of service.</li> <li>■ Require County to pay for City uses.</li> <li>■ What is the effect on the City? What is under control?</li> <li>■ Would you like to increase City taxes to pay for County use</li> <li>■ How do we handle effects of growth?</li> <li>■ Do we want to be the hub of activity?</li> <li>■ How important is it that Naples be the downtown?</li> <li>■ How do we impact Board of County Commissioners decisions; election method</li> <li>■ How important are positive city county relations</li> </ul>

Traffic	Tourism Activity in City	Historic Preservation	What attracted you?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Public transport.</li> <li>■ Trolley connecting major shopping districts and medical centers.</li> <li>■ One way streets.</li> <li>■ Parking garages.</li> <li>■ Sidewalks.</li> <li>■ Traffic control systems.</li> <li>■ Accommodating pedestrian and bicycle uses – address or leave alone?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Diversifying economy: medical center, biotech, etc.</li> <li>■ Enhance tourism?</li> <li>■ Do we want to continue and grow Naples as a tourism center? What would distinguish us?</li> <li>■ Hours of operation, types of entities, mix.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Do want it? How important? Who will pay?</li> <li>■ Impact on existing owners.</li> <li>■ How much are we willing to allow via regulations to preserve structures?</li> <li>■ Would people like see a specific district? Case by case/voluntary vs. mandatory.</li> <li>■ Impact on tourism.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Is it still here? Better? Worse? Is it worth protecting? Are you willing to pay?</li> <li>■ Are we “East Coasting” our West Coast? If so, what would the City do you do? Are you ok or not?</li> <li>■ What makes City distinctive, unique? Is there still a sense of place? What does sense of place mean?</li> <li>■ What businesses would you like to see?</li> <li>■ How responsible is the City for providing affordable housing? Do you want City to address? How would you pay?</li> </ul>



Affordable/Workforce Housing	Biggest Concern for Next Five Years	Undergrounding Power
<p>■ How responsible is the City for providing affordable/ workforce housing? Do you want city to address? How would you pay?</p> <p>■ What does it mean?</p> <p>■ How important to preserve river park area? Willing to subsidize?</p>	<p>■ Are you willing to pay for it? Quantify</p> <p>■ How many people expect to be here, living within City; if so, moving where to? Naples, in next five years?</p>	<p>■ Pay?</p> <p>■ Want it?</p>

Roll call votes by Council Members are recorded in random order, pursuant to City Council policy.

City of Naples  
Community Services Department  
**CURRENT, PROPOSED and COMPARISON USE FEES 2006**

I T E M	CURRENT NAPLES FEES		CURRENT COLLIER COUNTY FEES	PROPOSED CITY OF NAPLES FEES
	RESIDENT	NON-RES		
<b>CLASS I: Charitable/Civic/Nonprofit/Government</b>				
A. Indoors under 1,500 sq. ft. per room	\$0/hr	\$5/hr	\$10/hr	\$10/hr
Indoors 1,500 - 3,000 sq. ft. per room	\$0/hr	\$5/hr	\$15/hr	\$15/hr
Indoors over 3,000 sq. ft. per room	N/A	N/A	\$20/hr	\$20/hr
B. Outdoor Open Space (100 x 100)	\$0/hr	\$10/hr	\$10/hr	\$10/hr
C. Gymnasium/Basketball Pavilion (any size)	\$5/hr	\$10/hr	\$30/hr	\$30/hr
D. Athletic Facilities (Per field)				
General Use (non athletic programs/events)	\$10/hr	\$15/hr	\$30/hr	\$30/hr
Athletic Use	\$10/hr	\$15/hr	\$15/hr	\$15/hr
Basketball/Racquetball/Volleyball/Tennis Crts	\$5/hr	\$10/hr	\$5/hr	\$5/hr
E. Lights (Outdoor Only)	\$5/hr	\$10/hr	\$10/hr	\$10/hr
F. Shelter/Gazebo/Wedding Areas (Small/Large)	\$5/hr	\$5/hr	\$10/\$20/hr	\$10/\$20/hr
Non-City & Non-Collier Co. Residents	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$80/hr
G. Bandshell/Amphitheatre Grass Area Rental	\$20/day	\$30/day	\$30/hr	\$30/hr
H. Park rental for large event	N/A	N/A	\$800/day	\$800/day
I. Additional Fees	See I Below	See I Below	See I Below	See I Below
<b>CLASS II: Private/Profit/Commercial/Independent</b>				
A. Indoors under 1,500 sq. ft. per room	\$15/hr	\$30/hr/rm	\$25/hr	\$25/hr
Indoors 1,500 - 3,000 sq. ft. per room	\$20/hr	\$40/hr/rm	\$45/hr	\$45/hr
Indoors over 3,000 sq. ft. per room	N/A	N/A	\$60/hr	\$60/hr
Outdoor Open Space (100 x 100)	\$0/hr	\$10/hr	\$20/hr	\$20/hr
C. Gymnasium/Basketball Pavilion (any size)	\$5/hr	\$10/hr	\$60/hr	\$60/hr
D. Athletic Facilities (Per field)				
General Use (non athletic programs/events)	\$10/hr	\$15/hr	\$30/hr	\$30/hr
Athletic Use	\$10/hr	\$15/hr	\$40/hr	\$40/hr
Basketball/Racquetball/Volleyball/Tennis Crts	\$5/hr	\$10/hr	\$12/hr	\$12/hr
E. Lights (Outdoor Only)	\$5/hr	\$10/hr	\$10/hr	\$10/hr
F. Shelter/Gazebo/Wedding Areas (Small/Large)	\$5/hr	\$5/hr	\$20/\$30/hr	\$20/\$30/hr
Non-City & Non-Collier Co. Residents	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$100/hr
G. Bandshell/Amphitheatre Grass Area Rental	\$100/hr	\$100/hr	\$60/hr	\$100/hr
H. Park rental for large event	N/A	N/A	\$1200/day	\$1200/day
I. Additional Fees	See I Below	See I Below	See I Below	See I Below
<b>Player Fees: (State/national affiliated leagues)</b>				
A. Youth - 16 years and under	\$2/season	\$7/season	\$1/child/wk	\$1/child/wk
B. Lights (Outdoor Only)	\$10/hr	\$10/hr	\$10/hr	\$10/hr
<b>I. Additional Fees</b>				
1.Rental during non-business hours (added to rental fee):	\$20/hr/rm	\$40/hr/rm	\$20/hr/rm	\$20/hr/rm
2.Staff for Set up/Take Down (Tables/Chairs, etc.)	\$20hr/person	\$40hr/person	\$20hr/person	\$20hr/person
3.Light Fees (where not specified)	\$10/hr	\$20/hr	\$10/hr	\$10/hr
4.Damage Deposit (refundable if no damage) Small/Large	\$50	\$150	TBD	\$50/\$150
5.Audio/Visual and other equipment rentals	\$10 ea	\$20 ea	\$10 ea	\$10 ea
I. Skate Park Fees	\$10/yr	\$10/yr	\$10/yr child \$25/yr adult	See Attached

Note: The proposed City fees will increase/decrease the same as Collier County.

**SKATE PARK COMPARISONS**

Revised 12/4/2006

LOCATION	SKATE PARK SIZE		YOUTH FEES	ADULT FEES	VISITOR FEES	BIKES ALLOWED
BONITA SPRINGS	15,000 SQ. FT.		\$10 Yr	\$10 Yr	\$10 Yr	YES
FT MYERS	15,000 SQ. FT.		\$10 Yr	\$10 Yr	\$10 Yr	YES
COLLIER COUNTY	20,000 SQ. FT.		\$10 Yr	\$25 Yr	\$5 day	YES
CAPE CORAL	20,000 SQ. FT.		\$25 Yr	\$25 Yr	\$6 day	YES
SARASOTA COUNTY	35,000 SQ. FT.		\$30 Yr	\$30 Yr	\$5 day	NO
CITY OF NAPLES	40,000 SQ. FT.	Current =	\$10 Yr	\$10 Yr	\$10 Yr	YES
		Proposed =	\$30 yr city & county resident - or - \$80 Family for city residents only		\$10 day - or - \$30 week	

City of Naples  
**FLEISCHMANN PARK**  
**2001 - 2005 ANNUAL PARTICIPANT USAGE REPORT**

FLEISCHMANN RECREATION:	2005		2004		2003		2002		2001	
	RES	NON-RES	RES	NON-RES	RES	NON-RES	RES	NON-RES	RES	NON-RES
AFTERSCHOOL CLUB	28	18	38	10	35	9	36	8	15	5
ART SHOWS (6 shows per yr)	13000	92000	11500	78000	10000	68000	8800	60000	3600	45000
BIRTHDAY PARTIES	42	100	55	88	26	59	12	32	9	25
CAMP-SPECIALTY SUMMER	430	631	209	389	199	352	157	247	151	178
CAMP-CHRISTMAS BREAK	58	89	56	73	56	67	35	53	25	51
CAMP-CHRISTMAS PRESCHOOL	12	35	X	X	X	X	6	20	5	20
CAMP-FUNDAYS	110	155	50	100	80	120	75	125	60	80
CAMP-FLEISCHMANN ELEMENTARY	130	295	60	100	50	100	25	90	15	65
CAMP-FLEISCHMANN PRESCHOOL	90	88	104	59	X	X	X	X	X	X
CAMP-FLEISCHMANN MIDDLE	25	45	16	14	15	16	13	15	15	16
CAMP-INCLUSION	2	18	2	12	2	8	3	30	3	29
CAMP-SPRING BREAK K - 5	18	40	30	54	27	57	25	54	17	43
CAMP-SPRING BREAK PRE-K	5	10	X	X	11	19	10	20	12	18
CLASSES-ADULT	54	232	8	42	15	50	12	45	12	46
CLASSES - YOUTH	121	204	35	70	30	65	20	45	20	40
MARTIAL ARTS-YOUTH & ADULT	37	27	18	11	15	8	22	15	20	16
MUSIC LESSONS	18	66	15	54	11	20	8	2	X	X
PARENTS NIGHT OUT	74	66	60	55	50	48	50	50	X	X
PLAYGROUND USAGE	450	1650	300	1300	400	1100	250	850	200	770
PRESCHOOL/TODDLER CLASSES	61	98	40	24	35	20	38	21	35	15
ROOM RENTAL USAGE	25	49	12	12	20	15	21	16	20	15
SENIOR TRAVEL CLUB- MTGS	120	200	100	195	95	185	90	180	80	165
SENIOR TRAVEL CLUB- TRIPS	58	142	45	170	42	166	40	160	35	125
SPECIAL EVENT-EASTER	600	3950	450	3500	300	3000	250	2800	200	2700
SPECIAL EVENT-HALLOWEEN	X	X	350	1600	200	1200	150	1000	125	1100
SPECIAL NEEDS EVENTS	X	X	X	X	2	50	2	30	2	30
YARD SALE	15	65	16	29	24	66	16	46	12	43
<b>FLEISCHMANN TOTALS</b>	<b>15,583</b>	<b>100,273</b>	<b>13,569</b>	<b>85,961</b>	<b>11,740</b>	<b>74,800</b>	<b>10,166</b>	<b>65,954</b>	<b>4,688</b>	<b>50,595</b>

City of Naples  
**FLEISCHMANN PARK**  
**2001 - 2005 ANNUAL PARTICIPANT USAGE REPORT**

FLEISCHMANN ATHLETICS:	2005		2004		2003		2002		2001	
	RES	NON-RES	RES	NON-RES	RES	NON-RES	RES	NON-RES	RES	NON-RES
BASKETBALL COURT USAGE	3800	9100	3750	7800	3500	7700	3300	7400	3000	7250
BASKETBALL - MEN'S	18	52	15	45	13	41	11	37	7	26
SPORTS CAMPS	55	215	43	143	32	95	18	84	21	99
FIELD RENTALS	85	254	75	214	4	45	6	40	7	33
FLAG FOOTBALL - MEN'S	60	240	44	175	37	165	30	147	25	130
TOURNAMENTS	85	210	24	104	60	520	36	51	36	45
FLAG FOOTBALL - YOUTH	38	130	35	125	30	120	22	125	20	81
GATORS YOUTH FOOTBALL/CHEER	40	184	42	105	31	154	97	213	X	X
GREATTER NAPLES LITTLE LEAGUE	243	246	225	270	248	242	245	182	240	180
PRESCHOOL ATHLETICS	28	48	18	35	17	30	16	29	X	X
RACQUETBALL COURTS	1800	5200	1700	4600	1700	3500	1600	3300	1500	3000
ULTIMATE FRISBEE	3	19	1	17	1	19	X	X	X	X
SEMI PRO FOOTBALL USAGE	X	X	7	50	6	48	8	50	6	44
SOFTBALL-COED "A" DIV	32	128	24	103	38	159	40	161	21	110
SOFTBALL-COED "B" DIV	72	408	65	367	86	345	95	326	78	295
SOFTBALL-WOMEN'S	X	X	X	X	30	99	21	82	14	68
TABLE TENNIS CLUB	6	43	2	31	3	25	3	21	4	22
VOLLEYBALL LEAGUES	12	85	16	45	8	21	7	26	16	49
SPECIAL EVENTS	24	155	35	118	17	167	10	145	23	135
VOLLEYBALL-SAND COURTS	1600	3800	1400	3650	1250	3500	1000	3100	800	2800
<b>ATHLETICS TOTALS</b>	<b>8,001</b>	<b>20,517</b>	<b>7,521</b>	<b>17,997</b>	<b>7,111</b>	<b>16,995</b>	<b>6,565</b>	<b>15,519</b>	<b>5,818</b>	<b>14,367</b>
<b>SKATE PARK:</b>	<b>RES</b>	<b>NON-RES</b>	<b>RES</b>	<b>NON-RES</b>	<b>RES</b>	<b>NON-RES</b>	<b>RES</b>	<b>NON-RES</b>	<b>RES</b>	<b>NON-RES</b>
CAMPS-INLINE/SKATEBOARD	50	140	62	103	75	120	39	91	12	15
COMPETITIONS	0	0	6	28	22	44	15	35	14	35
MEMBERSHIPS	116	1637	228	1856	400	2600	500	3500	400	3100
TEEN- BAND SHOWS	62	300	50	250	65	264	70	300	62	270
SPECIAL EVENTS	400	650	300	500	350	700	375	950	340	800
TEEN- D.J. NIGHT	100	330	88	275	80	225	72	195	X	X
<b>SKATE PARK TOTALS</b>	<b>728</b>	<b>3,057</b>	<b>734</b>	<b>3,010</b>	<b>992</b>	<b>3,953</b>	<b>1,071</b>	<b>5,071</b>	<b>828</b>	<b>4,220</b>
<b>GRAND TOTALS</b>	<b>24,312</b>	<b>123,847</b>	<b>21,824</b>	<b>106,968</b>	<b>19,843</b>	<b>95,748</b>	<b>17,802</b>	<b>86,544</b>	<b>11,334</b>	<b>69,182</b>
<b>OVERALL USE PERCENTAGE</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>79%</b>

**Youth Leagues utilization of city facilities continued:**

**Greater Naples Little League (Girls Softball)**

**2006: 156 participants =**

**38 City // 118 County (24% City / 76% County)**

**2005: 153 participants =**

**35 City // 115 County (25% City / 75% County)**

**Youth Leagues utilization of city facilities continued:**

**Naples Gators (Football)**

**2006: 229 participants =**

**43 City // 186 County (19% City / 81% County)**

**2005: 224 participants =**

**40 City // 184 County (18% City / 82% County)**

**2004: 213 participants =**

**38 City // 175 County (18% City / 82% County)**

**2003: 193 participants =**

**31 City // 162 County (16% City / 84% County)**

**Recommended League Fees:**

**\$1.00 per child per week (Same as Collier Co.)**

**Organized youth league fees and charges will be adjusted to reflect and maintain the same fees and charges assessed by Collier County for similar parks, recreation and athletic league use or programs. Such fees including utility fees for concessions, storage, meeting rooms and other facilities utilized by the league may be assessed when using any park.**

**City Dock Fees:**

***Regular/permanent berths:*** Based on slip size; per foot; per month; plus state sales tax; per lineal foot of slip rounded to the nearest dollar, approximately:

	<u><b>Current</b></u>	<u><b>Recommended</b></u>
<b>Resident</b>	<b>\$10.00</b>	<b>\$11.00</b>
<b>Non-resident</b>	<b>\$12.00</b>	<b>\$13.00</b>
 <b>30-foot slip</b>		
<b>Resident</b>	<b>\$300.00</b>	<b>\$330.00</b>
<b>Nonresident</b>	<b>\$360.00</b>	<b>\$390.00</b>
 <b>35-foot slip</b>		
<b>Resident</b>	<b>\$350.00</b>	<b>\$385.00</b>
<b>Nonresident</b>	<b>\$420.00</b>	<b>\$455.00</b>
 <b>40-foot slip</b>		
<b>Resident</b>	<b>\$400.00</b>	<b>\$440.00</b>
<b>Nonresident</b>	<b>\$480.00</b>	<b>\$520.00</b>
 <b>42-foot slip</b>		
<b>Resident</b>	<b>\$420.00</b>	<b>\$462.00</b>
<b>Nonresident</b>	<b>\$504.00</b>	<b>\$546.00</b>
 <b>48-foot slip</b>		
<b>Resident</b>	<b>\$480.00</b>	<b>\$528.00</b>
<b>Nonresident</b>	<b>\$576.00</b>	<b>\$624.00</b>
 <b>58-foot slip</b>		
<b>Resident</b>	<b>\$580.00</b>	<b>\$638.00</b>
<b>Nonresident</b>	<b>\$696.00</b>	<b>\$754.00</b>