COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
May 17, 2010

The regular meeting of the Ontario City Council was called to order by Mayor Joe Dominick at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, May 17, 2010, in the Council Chambers of City Hall. Council members present were Norm Crume, Joe Dominick, Charlotte Fugate, John Gaskill, Susann Mills, David Sullivan and Ron Verini.

Members of staff present were Tori Barnett, Larry Sullivan, Chuck Mickelson, Marcy Skinner, David Richey, and camera operator Erika Hopper.

Norm Crume led everyone in the Pledge of Allegiance.

AGENDA
Susann Mills moved, seconded by Ron Verini, to adopt the Agenda as presented. Roll call vote: Crume-yes; Fugate-yes; Gaskill-yes; Mills-yes; Sullivan-yes; Verini-yes; Dominick-yes. Motion carried 7/0/0.

CONSENT AGENDA
Mayor Dominick recused himself from taking action on the Consent Agenda as his corporation had a payment due under the bills.

Ron Verini moved, seconded by John Gaskill, to approve Consent Agenda Item A: Approval of Minutes of regular meeting of 05/03/2010; Item B: Approval of Minutes of Special Meeting of 04/29/10; Item C: Fuel Bid Award; and Item D: Approval of the Bills. Roll call vote: Crume-yes; Fugate-yes; Gaskill-yes; Mills-yes; Sullivan-yes; Verini-yes; Dominick-abstain. Motion carried 6/0/0/1.

PRESENTATION: EXCELLENCE IN LEADERSHIP AWARD - 2010
Councilor Gaskill presented the 2010 Excellence in Leadership Award from the City of Ontario and CK3, LLC, in the amount of $750, to Aimee Fritsch.

Councilor Gaskill presented the 2010 Excellence in Leadership Award from the City of Ontario and Anderson-Perry, Inc., in the amount of $750, to Justine Maeda (represented by her mother, Lisa). Justine was out of the area participating in the state round of golf for the high school.

OLD BUSINESS
Ordinance #2642-2010: Consenting to the Assignment of the Malheur Home Telephone Company Franchise to Qwest Corporation (1st Reading)

Charlotte Fugate moved, seconded by John Gaskill, to table Ordinance #2642-2010. Roll call vote: Crume-yes; Fugate-yes; Gaskill-yes; Mills-yes; Sullivan-yes; Verini-yes; Dominick-yes. Motion carried 7/0/0.

NEW BUSINESS
Resolution #2010-125: Transfer Funds to Purchase Ordinance Vehicle Computer and Printer
Mike Kee, Police Chief, stated the Council had recently placed an emphasis on increased nuisance enforcement and had shown an interest in making enforcement more efficient. Therefore, the police department would like to purchase a portable computer, printer, and computer mount for the Ordinance vehicle. This would allow the Ordinance Officer to complete documents in the field. Additionally, the computer would be equipped with a cellular air card and the Ordinance Officer would have access to the Internet. This would allow the officer to locate tax records, and to access the police records management system, while in the field. The department believed with the addition of this equipment the Ordinance Officer would be much more efficient and would be able to spend more time in the field.

As these items were not budgeted for, approval of the resolution would reduce the General Fund Contingency by $5,000, which would be transferred into police materials and supplies.

The police department received two quotes, each for a ruggedized laptop computer, portable printer, and computer mount. A Dell Latitude XT2 XFR $4,000.00, Computer mount - $600.00, Portable printer - $400.00, for a total of $5,000.00, and a Panasonic CF19 Toughbook/tablet - $3,900.00, Computer mount $650.00, Portable printer - $400.00, for a total of $4,950.00.

Councilor Crume stated the cost of the ruggedized computer was extremely high. He believed more research should be done. Maybe this item should be tabled to allow them to look into it more in-depth, and that maybe a ruggedized computer wasn't really necessary.

Chief Kee disagreed; the ruggedized computer was necessary.

Both Councilor Sullivan and Councilor Verini believed Chief Kee knew what was needed, and should be given the ability to purchase this piece of equipment for his department.

John Gaskill moved, seconded by Ron Verini, to adopt Resolution #2010-125, A RESOLUTION APPROVING THE REALLOCATION OF $5,000 WITHIN THE GENERAL FUND FOR THE PURCHASE OF POLICE DEPARTMENT EQUIPMENT. Roll call vote: Crume-no; Fugate-yes; Gaskill-yes; Mills-yes; Sullivan-yes; Verini-yes; Dominick-no. Motion carried 5/2/0.

PUBLIC HEARING

Resolution #2010-128: Subdivision Plat of 98.13 Acres of City-Owned Property

It being the date advertised for public hearing on the matter of Resolution #2010-128, the Mayor declared the hearing open. There were no objections to the city's jurisdiction to hear the action, no abstentions, ex-parte contact, and no declarations of conflict of interest.

David Richey, Planning Director, stated at its regular meeting of May 10, 2010 the Planning Commission reviewed the tentative subdivision plat of 98.13 acres of City owned land titled the "Stelling Subdivision". The action by the Planning Commission approved the tentative plat and was now recommending approval of the final plat. The Planning Commission heard testimony from Mr. and Mrs. Jennings, residents of NW 4th Avenue, who voiced objection to the street right-of-way proposed along the west boundary of the subdivision. That street, in deference to the Jennings house, was proposed to be entirely on city land rather than partially on each property adjacent to the street alignment. The Planning Commission was sympathetic to the Jennings' point of view because the proposed street intersection with NW 4th Avenue was less than ideal, including the fact that it was at the crest of the hill where clear vision was restricted. The Commission voted 4/2 in favor of approving the tentative plat.

The subject city land had particular value to the community if it could contribute to expanding the economic base by generating added employment. The subject plat was necessary primarily due to the fact that recent improvements of Highway 201 divided the city property physically, but not legally. The subject plat was therefore the primary step in preparing the city land for economic expansion by private developers.

The final plat proposal contained in planning file 2010-01-01 SUB was a limited response to facilitate the city sale of portions of the site with the pass through requirement that new owners of any portion of the plat bear the responsibility for construction of all required development improvements in effect at the time chosen for improvement of the property. The development improvements would be commenced prior to issuance of building or other on-site permits and were expected to be completed prior to issuance of occupancy permits.

Dan Cummings, CK3, LLC, stated the main objective of this action was to legally split apart the land, which was already split by the Yturri Beltline. The proposal was to make a 5-lot subdivision, with Lot 1 being 12.2 acres, lying south of the canal that separated the land. Lot 2 would be 10 acres. Lot 3, located in the Northeast corner, was about .73 acres, and the City had a sanitary sewer lift station on that parcel. It was thought that the city should retain ownership of that. Lot 4 was being created by following the connectivity regulations by connecting right-of-way from the Yturri Beltline to Malheur Drive. There was no development proposed for this subdivision. The land was basically surrounded by existing roads, not up to city standards. Lot 5, the remainder of the parcel, was the main reason for the subdivision, as they wanted to break that off to allow the sale of the property to developers.

During the Planning Commission process, residents on the west side expressed concerns about the dedication of the right-of-way, more with the construction in the future. It was mainly a safety concern, with the vision clearance being an issue at the intersection. The Jennings' were asking to not put it in, or move it further to the east. There were two problems with moving it to the east. First, when the State of Oregon received the right-of-way for the Yturri Belton and the connections for NW 4th Avenue, they took all the right-of-way accesses away from that property, from that station east. With the width of the road, the maximum distance they could move to the east would be 35 feet. They would then get into vision clearance issues. The ideal location for vision purposes was right down the property line, or split on the right-of-way. The city was proposing to take all the right-of-way from city property as the Jennings' property was so close to the property line, if they had to give their half of the right-of-way, the road would be sitting on their front door. If it all came off the city side, it would leave approximately 37 feet from their house to their property line, and approximately 51 feet to the curb if it was proposed to build a 40-foot wide street.

Pushing it over 35 feet brought it into the recommended vision requirements. If it was moved over to the property line, it would have no vision issues. If it was to move 35 feet to the west, it would not meet any of the vision clearance standards at all. It would create a dangerous intersection, and would require the reconstruction of NW 4th. He did not see any way the city could not put that in there at that location. The further east it was moved, didn't really help in correcting the vision clearance problem. In his opinion, for future development, it was going to be required to be there.

Councilor Gaskill verified there was no possible access of the beltway onto that piece of property.

Mr. Cummings stated that was correct. In his opinion, if they didn't put the proposed access in there, then there was no reason to split the 10-acre parcel as there would be no access. Not putting the road in took away a huge value from that property. He understood the concerns of the Jennings', and while it might not be for awhile, he believed that road, once built, would be a safer access to their property than their access onto NW 4th right now. The hill was extremely dangerous.

Councilor Gaskill asked if there was a way to engineer mitigation on NW 4th that would reduce the vision problem at the hill, on the west?

Mr. Cummings stated yes. The hillside from about 100+ feet to the east, and if about 300 foot on the hill was shaved off about a foot or a foot and a half, it would reduce all the vision clearance completely. If his firm was hired to do the design on the development of that road, that would be their design recommendation. The further east it was moved, the less it lined up with the property to the south. They would probably also ask that the posted speed limit not exceed 30 or 35 mph in that area.

The Mayor opened the hearing for public testimony.

Proponents: None.

Opponents:

Wes Jennings, Ontario, stated he owned property southwest of the Stellings piece. He was not opposed to subdividing; he was not opposed to the development of it, he encouraged it. He wanted to see Ontario grow. They bought a house to become a member of the community. They bought a place in the county, and they thought they would have county neighbors, they thought it was zoned in the county as urban growth. They knew the plans, but they didn't think it would be quite this soon. The right-of-way, they talked a lot about it last week. The 70 foot was going to go on the city property. His big concern was that he had a 1-year old son, who would be playing in the front yard. With the road right there, with the sight visibility that Mr. Cummings mentioned, he had documentation that there was going to be some draining taking place, with that said, he would not necessarily want the right-of-way moved, but if they could push the road as far east as possible, getting that intersection away from his front yard, he truly worried about the safety of his kids, his family, the motorists on the road. If there was already plans to redo 4th Avenue to get it up to standards to drop the speed limit, there shouldn't be a problem moving it another 35 feet. It was still within the 70 foot right-of-way, it was just moved over another 15 feet. He had done a lot of thinking about what could be done, and that was really the only thing...he didn't want the city to lose any more money than they had to, and the city was taking the entire 70 foot on their own property, he understood that. His well head sat about 4 or 5 feet from the property line. They were just really close, and it really worried him that they would have that intersection right on top of his front yard where his kid was going to be playing. He contacted Civil Dynamics, an engineering firm in Caldwell, and he wanted to submit a letter from them. (See attachment)

Mr. Jennings stated he really wanted to see growth and the development of Ontario. With the grading of the road right there, he would be curious to see what the cost would be. He didn't have that answer. If they were going to take a foot or a foot and a half down, if they moved it 35 feet further to the east, on the edge of the right-of-way, they'd probably only have to take it down a total of a foot and a half to two feet to get the sight visibility. Dan talked about getting the speed limit down to 35, that was good on paper, but as anybody knew, no one followed the speed limit, especially on that road. When they bought it their place, they actually had, what they thought was their driveway, his realtor, Richard Teramura, could attest to that. They extended that road to try and get off the main road, and put a bunch of gravel down there so they were off city property as far as parking. They had been accessing that since they bought the place in September of 2009. They talked to Dave at the city about that. He gave them the okay. He said that there was going to be right –of0way in there anyway and as soon as that was in, it would be public access, so they continued to use that to get themselves off the street. In closing, he just asked the Council to think if they could change it now before it became a finalized plat map, if it was just as simple as moving the road from the middle of the right-of-way to the far east of the right-of-way, he would ask that they do it now before they got a finalized map, or a developer bought the property, thinking that the right-of-way was going to be dead center. As far as the property to the south, accessing those, he wanted to see everyone be able to develop. You should be able to do on your own

land what you wanted. But, he had to look at his property. The safety of the other side of the property didn't concern him because if something happened, at least it was across the street. If something happened on his side of the street, the chances of it ending up in his front yard was very real, and it scared him. He thanked the Council for allowing him the opportunity to speak.

Richard Teramura, Ontario, stated they were appealing to the Council. They were all on board with development, and they wanted to see the growth in Ontario. The Jennings' were appealing to the Council's sense of maintaining a good neighbor policy. There were some issues, safety wise, as Mr. Cummings stated. He had been very helpful and forthcoming through the process. The Jennings' were just hoping to see a guideline set for developers. If it was shifted over, as Mr. Cummings stated at the Planning Commission meeting, they would probably have to do some adjusting. There was also the possibility of other access ways. The possibility of crossing Yturri, he didn't know if that was something considered. Looking into other avenues would be much appreciated. The number one factor was the safety concerns. He thanked the Council for their time.

Larry Sullivan, City Attorney, stated staff might not have had enough time to react to the letter from Civil Dynamics, and Council should afford staff time to comment on it.

Chuck Mickelson, Public Works Director, stated he might not address issues in the letter from Civil Dynamics, but he did have some comments as a result of listening to the testimony. First, if the Council was to agree to move the roadway to the east, that would necessitate, and Mr. Cummings could confirm, that another lot would have to be created because they would be sliding it over 35 feet and they would have a 35 foot lot that needed to named, number, and would need to be dealt with in the plat, so that would have to be modified. Second, he believed the offsetting of the intersection was inappropriate. His biggest concern was how to deal with the extra lot. Perhaps the Jennings' could purchase it.

There being no Proponent and no further Opponent testimony, the Mayor declared the hearing closed.

Mayor Dominick stated this was the only allowed access to that property off NW 4th. On the Yturri Beltline, all accesses off the beltline to any of that property had been closed, with the exception of Dorian Drive, which went onto proposed Lot 4 and proposed Lot 2. Those were the only two remaining accesses off of Yturri allowed by ODOT.

Mr. Cummings stated it appeared in the letter that they proposed moving the road section, not the right-of-way. If they did that, they would need something like a development agreement, because it wouldn't show on the plat. Moving the road section 15 feet would put the face of curb on the right-of-way, leaving no room for sidewalks or any improvements on that side. Even a 14 foot move would leave room for a curb in the right-of-way, but no room for sidewalks or swales or grass, anything, on the east side. The west side would have plenty of room. If they moved the right-of-way, then they'd have to create another lot, which would not be large enough for a dwelling, therefore making it into a "common area".

Mayor Dominick reminded the Council again that this action was to dedicate the right-of-way. No design, nor construction documents were being drawn up.

Councilor Gaskill confirmed that if the Council accepted the proposal by the Planning Commission, it would automatically jeopardize the Jennings'. Their claim of jeopardy was the location of the road in relation to their property and the potential hazard it created for their family. But no one was proposing the plat, so the action just designated a right-of-way on the edge of the property that the city was claiming and wanting to establish.

Mr. Cummings agreed. They would have an opportunity to comment and voice concerns when development occurred.

Councilor Verini stated it was his understanding when the Planning Commission met, when the Jennings' brought up their concern regarding the safety of their children, it was also brought up that there was a misunderstanding what the property around the Jennings' was zoned for. They talked about that they thought it was zoned the same as what their property was, Residential.

Mr. Cummings stated the Jennings' said they were told by someone that the land was zoned the same as their land.

Councilor Verini stated after that, they were later told from someone else, that is was zoned Light Industrial. Eventually, they were told by someone, that it was actually zoned Heavy Industrial. He believed the city moved the right-of-way away from the Jennings' because of the misinterpretation regarding the property. Because of that, the city was giving a little "buffer" for when the road was put in.

Mr. Cummings stated the first time he heard of it was at the Planning Commission meeting. The PDAC on the matter was well over a year ago, and the property didn't even belong to the Jennings' at that time. They purchased the property last August.

Councilor Verini stated the movement of the right-of-way was NOT because of the misinterpretation by the Jennings'?

Mr. Cummings stated it was his recommendation to the city based on his survey results.

Councilor Crume asked what the movement would do about a proposed roadway to the south?

Mr. Cummings stated there would be a 50 foot off-set intersection, which was not allowed by city code. Off-set intersections were a very bad idea.

Councilor Crume stated another alternative would be if the Tomiyoshi's would give up 50 foot of their property to try and straighten it out.

Councilor Gaskill stated he believed they needed to work with the Jennings' to alleviate their concerns as much as possible. How about creating a buffer that was still right-of-way allowing a better safety area? They should be granted a right of access off the road that would built. He realized that by approving the action before them, it didn't approve anything about the road except to reserve right-of-way, but he didn't think they needed to move the right-of-way. Some type of proviso needed to be put with the plat indicating the way that the road should be dealt with in the future. That way, when development did occur, the developer would be aware of the concerns, and could take them into consideration.

Mr. Sullivan reminded the Council that the front yard set-back that the Jennings' would end up with, even if the road was built right in the middle of the right-of-way, was still considerably wider than most people living in Ontario had. Most residents have found a way to adapt to front yard set-backs that were much narrower, and they still dealt with child safety concerns. He didn't want to minimize the concern of the Jennings', but this issue was also due to the fact that they thought they were buying a parcel of property that wasn't going to be affected by urbanization as quickly as it might be. That was where much of this discussion was coming from.

Mayor Dominick stated he would get with staff to see what the legal ramifications might be by adding in the information Councilor Gaskill had suggested.

Susann Mills moved, seconded by John Gaskill, to adopt the Findings of Fact as presented. Roll call vote: Crume-yes; Fugate-yes; Gaskill-yes; Mills-yes; Sullivan-yes; Verini-yes; Dominick-yes. Motion carried 7/0/0.

Ron Verini moved, seconded by Charlotte Fugate, to adopt Resolution #2010-128, A RESOLUTION TO APPROVE A CITY-OWNED SUBDIVISION OF 98.13 ACRES. Roll call vote: Crume-yes; Fugate-yes; Gaskill-yes; Mills-yes; Sullivan-yes; Verini-yes; Dominick-yes. Motion carried 7/0/0.

RETURN TO NEW BUSINESS

Resolution #2010-129: Declare OPD Ford Expedition as Surplus

Mike Kee, Police Chief, stated the police department no longer had a need for the 2002 Ford Expedition that was given to the department in 2009, by the Linn County Sheriff's Department. The department would like to have it declared surplus property and then donate it to the Nyssa Police Department, as they had expressed an interest in taking the vehicle into their fleet. Due to the transfer within the department of the dog handler, there would no longer be a need for the vehicle.

Currently, the vehicle had approximately 130,000 miles and was in reasonably good shape. The blue book value of the vehicle was $2,500. To prepare the vehicle for auction would take staff time and approximately $800 to remove equipment and stripping. In donating the vehicle to Nyssa, the Nyssa Police Department would bear the costs of removing the current striping and for the application of the City of Nyssa graphics. Further, OPD would realize a small amount of savings in maintenance and fuel costs on the vehicle.

Mayor Dominick asked how often police vehicles were down, wherein this vehicle could be used as a back-up?

Chief Kee stated there were never so many down that there weren't enough vehicles for use.

Councilor Mills asked how much maintenance had been done on the vehicle in the year the city had it?

Chief Kee replied he did not know.

Councilor Crume still believed the vehicle should be kept for a back-up rig. It had too much value to be given away.

Chief Kee stated he didn't think they would get use out of it, but would still have the cost of maintaining it.

David Sullivan moved, seconded by Norm Crume, to disapprove Resolution #2010-129. Roll call vote: Crume-yes; Fugate-yes; Gaskill-no; Mills-yes; Sullivan-yes; Verini-yes; Dominick-yes. Motion carried 6/1/0.

Ordinance #2645-2010: Requiring Telecommunications Franchises to Maintain their Facilities Free from Nuisances, Including Graffiti (1s Reading)

Larry Sullivan, City Attorney, stated the proposed ordinance would impose nuisance abatement standards on telecommunications franchisees, including graffiti removal. Ordinance 2645-2010 was primarily intended to address the City's graffiti complaints against telecommunications franchisees. The issue first arose during the City Council's review of proposed Ordinance 2642-2010 at its work session on April 29, 2010 and again at its regular meeting on May 3, 2010. In that proposed ordinance, Qwest Corporation was seeking the City's consent to a transfer of the telecommunications franchise from its former subsidiary, Malheur Home Telephone Company. During the meeting of April 29, 2010, there was a discussion with the Council about Qwest's lack of responsiveness to the City's complaints about graffiti on Qwest equipment. After further discussion of the issue on May 3, 2010, the Council tabled Ordinance 2642-2010 and instructed the City Attorney to contact Qwest to resolve the graffiti issue.

The Attorney's recommendation was to resolve the issue through an ordinance rather than a separate negotiation with Qwest. The City had entered into two telecommunications franchise agreements in 2009 and 2010, and it appeared there might be more franchise requests forthcoming. In both of the recent franchise agreements, the grantees insisted on having provisions saying that all telecommunications franchisees be treated the same, so that one franchisee was not treated more favorably than another. Both of the franchise agreements explicitly incorporated the provisions of Chapter 2 of Title 3 of the City Code provision regulating telecommunications franchises. If the City wanted to impose any conditions on Qwest pertaining to graffiti removal, adding those same provisions to the City Code would insure that all telecommunications franchisees were treated equally by making all telecommunications franchisees subject to the same graffiti cleanup requirements.

Ordinance 2645-2010 added a new Section 3-2-47A, requiring grantees of telecommunications franchises to comply with the nuisance provisions of the City Code, including the anti-graffiti provisions of Sections 7-4-5 and 7-4-6. Section 3-2-47A also stated that it was a "material provision" of the telecommunications Chapter, thereby allowing the City to impose sanctions for noncompliance, including franchise revocation or lesser sanctions under City Code Section 3-2-45.

If the Council approved Ordinance 2645-2010, it would authorize the City to make compliance with the ordinance a condition of the City's consent to the transfer of the telecommunications franchise to Qwest in Ordinance 2642-2010. Ordinance 2645-2010 would also apply automatically to other telecommunications franchisees in the future.

David Sullivan moved, seconded by Charlotte Fugate, to adopt Ordinance #2645-2010, AN ORDINANCE REQUIRING TELECOMMUNICATIONS FRANCHISES TO MAINTAIN THEIR FACILITIES FREE FROM NUISANCES, INCLUDING GRAFFITI, on First Reading by Title Only. Roll call vote: Crume-yes; Fugate-yes; Gaskill-yes; Mills-yes; Sullivan-yes; Verini-yes; Dominick-yes. Motion carried 7/0/0.

EnerNOC Demand Response Program

Chuck Mickelson, Public Works Director, stated EnerNOC was North America's largest commercial and industrial demand response provider. They contracted directly with Idaho Power to reduce power demands during peak power usage. They achieved these reduced demands by paying commercial and industrial users to use less power during these peak demand periods. The demand response programs from EnerNOC provided payments to organizations that chose to reduce energy during times of peak power demands. EnerNOC would work with the City of Ontario to define customized energy reduction strategies. EnerNOC would absorb all costs associated with this program and would protect the City from any penalties that could be incurred for not meeting reduction targets. This program helped to stabilize the region's energy resources without requiring construction of new power plants.

Idaho Power's peak demand period in the summer months was between 2:00 PM and 8:00 PM. There was an opportunity to modify the pumping scenarios at both the water treatment plant and the wastewater treatment plant to reduce power consumption during the peak demand period. At the water treatment plant, for instance, normal operation was 20-hours per day with shutdown being in the morning hours between 2:00 AM and 6:00 AM. By modifying the operation so that shut down was between 2:00 PM and 6:00 PM, it could reduce peak hour usage and be eligible for payment from EnerNOC.

For no investment on the part of the City of Ontario, the City could be eligible for payments of between $21,000 and $53,000 annually from EnerNOC.

Ron Verini moved, seconded by Susann Mills, to authorize the City Manager to execute a contract with EnerNOC for their demand response program. Roll call vote: Crume-yes; Fugate-yes; Gaskill-yes; Mills-yes; Sullivan-yes; Verini-yes; Dominick-yes. Motion carried 7/0/0.

CORRESPONDENCE, COMMENTS, AND EX-OFFICIO REPORTS

- Chuck Mickelson stated there had been positive comments about the angled parking in front of the Post Office. There had already been some other areas identified for angled parking, and he would be bringing a proposal to the Council.
- Councilor Verini thanked Bob Boyd, an Ontario Middle School teacher, for putting together the free lunch/dinner for all veterans, active duty military, national guardsmen, and their families, on May 15th
- Councilor Gaskill stated the high school would be having their awards assembly on Tuesday evening.
- Councilor Sullivan encouraged everyone to go out and check out the Golf Course, both inside and out.

  Mayor Dominick stated the city was still searching for a concessionaire to run the restaurant. Information could be obtained from City Hall.
- Councilor Fugate stated they held their yard sale to benefit the feral cat program, and they had raised almost $3000. They also had an auction coming up on the 30th of June, at the golf course. There would be a sailboat auctioned off, among many other items.
- Mayor Dominick thanked everyone for participating on Serve Day.

ADJOURN

Ron Verini moved, seconded by John Gaskill, that the meeting be adjourned. Roll call vote: Crume-yes; Fugate-yes; Gaskill-yes; Mills-yes; Sullivan-yes; Verini-yes; Dominick-yes. Motion carried 7/0/0.

ATTEST:

Joe Dominick, Mayor

Tori Barnett, MMC, City Recorder