

**COTTAGE GROVE CITY COUNCIL  
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES  
April 12, 2010**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Mayor Gary Williams called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers at City Hall.

**ROLL CALL/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

City Recorder Trudy Borrevik called the roll. The following were

**PRESENT:** Mayor Gary Williams, City Councilors Mike Fleck, Jeff Gowing, Thomas Munroe, Heather Murphy, Wayne Clark and Diane Conrad

**YOUTH REPRESENTATIVE:** Teagan Settlemeyer

**STAFF PRESENT:** City Manager Richard Meyers, Police Chief Mike Grover, Public Works Director Jan Wellman, Community Development Director Howard Schesser, Finance Director Bert McClintock, Community Services Director Pete Barrell and City Engineer Ron Bradsby

**CITY ATTORNEY:** Sean Kelly

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Jon Sinnott, The Sentinel

**SPECIAL PRESENTATION**

- (a) Cottage Grove High School Girls Varsity Basketball Team - State 4A Champions Proclamation

Mayor Williams read a proclamation and introduced the Cottage Grove Girls Basketball 4A State Basketball Team and coaches.

**ITEMS TO BE ADDED TO THE AGENDA**

City Manager, Richard Meyers, advised that at Council's seats there was materials to promote the US Census 2010, including a t-shirt, hat and pennant. He encouraged the Mayor and Councilors to wear the t-shirt and hat at the Council meeting this evening or sometime during the next week to encourage citizens to turn in their completed Census forms.

## **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

### **(a) Ward Boundaries Public Hearing**

City Manager, Richard Meyers, said the hearing was being held to discuss the ward boundary change proposals. Council had been provided with three different ward boundary proposals, A, B and C. He gave the background on the ward boundaries and how they had changed in the past. He said the reason for the proposed changes was that there were some areas of Cottage Grove that had been annexed into the City limits and were not currently included in a ward. This year there were four Council positions and the Mayor's position up for election and if the boundaries were going to be changed, now would be the time to do so before the election packets had to be prepared by June 2, 2010. He showed slides of the existing ward boundaries and each of the proposed changes. The current boundaries were difficult for citizens to understand and Proposals B and C simplified the boundaries. Proposal A was the current ward boundaries with extensions to meet the new City Limits. Staff also tried to even out the wards as much as possible as far as population was concerned.

Mayor Williams opened the public hearing.

Pat Patterson, 1140 S. 10<sup>th</sup> Street, Cottage Grove, said he was in favor of the redistricting, it was a long time in coming and he thought it was time the City did it. He wanted to make sure that the City maintained the situation where whoever was a City Councilor stayed as a City Councilor, either at large or to an assigned ward, and that everyone had the opportunity of voting on the members of the City Council. The City couldn't afford to not have equal representation. He said that was why he suggested that be kept on the books and that each one of the Councilors of a ward had residence in that ward, as it was now.

Amy Callahan, 1765 Parks Road, Cottage Grove, said from talking with Lynn Miller and watching Jeff Gowing come onto the Council from Ward 2, she asked if there was significant population and interest in that ward to keep it a little bigger to gain the population center so there was more representation from Ward 2 on a continual basis. She said she understood it was hard to get representation from Ward 2 and encouraged Council to consider that.

Mayor Williams closed the public hearing.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT ON AGENDA ITEMS**

Patti Weiss, 592 Mereweather Street, Eugene, spoke in regards to Item 7(c) and said she had been the Juvenile Probation Officer for Cottage Grove and Creswell area for the past four years and had worked for the Lane County Department of Youth Services for thirteen years as a drug and alcohol counselor, a therapist and currently a probation officer. She said Lane County Juvenile Department's case load was divided geographically and she was responsible for all the youth in Cottage Grove and Creswell and she had the highest case load, currently 45 cases and the normal case load was 30. She said the drugs and alcohol in Cottage Grove are affecting the students she sees and ninety percent of the criminal activity that she sees going on in Cottage Grove has somewhere in it's history drug and alcohol use. One of the agreements she had with

her youth was that they could not enter into Coiner Park due to the activity that goes on in the park. She said she loved the park and her first year as the probation officer she used to meet the youth there but quickly found out that it was where they went to use, buy and sell drugs. She was concerned about the use of alcohol, in particular in Coiner Park. When they attended events where there was alcohol, even though it was legal for some people, it was risky for them, they didn't have the skills to refuse. If there was the continued exposure to drugs and alcohol, even when done legally but in the public, it was harmful to the youth and to the community. She asked the Council to mindfully consider the effect that open alcohol use had on the youth.

Joan Seidel, 1142 Ash Avenue, Cottage Grove, spoke in favor of Item 7(c) and said she reinforced Ms. Weiss' statement. She said if we expect to even slightly influence youth, the example given by adults was crucial. There were many churches and religions in town and several had something against alcohol and she said it was an excellent start toward the right image for youth, than to counter that with a City approval in a park area, it was mixed messages. She said we were asking for more trouble, that we weren't taking our responsibility if we didn't try and limit or not allow alcohol, like we don't allow the other drugs, they were there but they were there illegally, alcohol was often there legally and she thought it was setting a bad example.

Leslie Newfeld, 538 E. Main, Cottage Grove, and said she was a past Bohemia Mining Days chair and spoke against Item 7(c). She said if it hadn't been a problem for the past ten years for grownups to have alcohol, why was this ordinance coming to Council. There were only two events last year that utilized the privilege of a special events permit allowing to have alcohol. She had attended other events such as the toga party, street dances, wine tasting and there were grownups and no problems. There were also out of town groups such as the bicycle tour that brought revenue to the area and had beer and wine in the park when they stayed. Why was one of the City's largest park, the golf course, exempt? Eugene did not have such an ordinance. It tied the hands of organizations that might in the future want to have the option to have wine tasting and such, and it seemed that set a bad precedent for other possible ordinances and seemed too much like prohibition.

Sharon Jean, 33914 Row River Road, Cottage Grove, thanked the Council for giving her the opportunity to speak. She spoke against Item 7(c). She said it was difficult to speak against the concerns for the youth in the community and their use of drugs and alcohol. She spoke about Bohemia Mining Days (BMD) when it was located at Trail Head Park and some issues that occurred with alcohol. She said the next year they moved the festival to Coiner Park and made some changes to the alcohol policy and hired security. They have also put in activities in the park that were wholesome and welcome for youth. She said to say that two events out of the year that serve alcohol was a major contributor to the issues in the community around drinking and youth wasn't right or correct. She said if the option for BMD to sell alcohol during their event was taken away, it would hurt the cash flow of the signature event, as she has heard many refer to BMD. It wasn't that the money couldn't be replaced, however it made it harder and they would have to find that income source somewhere else. She said it also would affect Stacey's whose business supplies the alcohol permit and alcohol, BMD only received fifteen percent of the total alcohol sales. She asked Council to think about where we were economically and give some credit to the BMD organization for running a pretty tight ship.

Allen Payment, 233 S. 22<sup>nd</sup> Street, Cottage Grove, said he was the current BMD Coordinator and spoke against Item 7(c). He said he understood why the Council wanted to control the sale of alcohol, it was to protect the youth in the community. He said, however, that during the four days of BMD there was less drinking by the youth in the park than when BMD wasn't in the park. He talked about the arrests by the Police Department in The Sentinel for youths that involved drinking. He said BMD had adequate security for the festival and Stacey's did a good job of asking for ID. He said he hadn't missed a festival in eight years and has worked in several booths during the event and had yet to encounter anyone that was under the influence to the extent that they were causing a problem. He said he felt the wine and beer added to the ambiance. They promoted activities for families for the festival, they didn't promote a big party. He said they did everything they could to keep it a safe environment for the families that attended and would hope the Council would take that into consideration when making their decision.

David Seidel, 1142 Ash Avenue, spoke in favor of Item 7(c) and said he listened to the last comment made and asked why did they have people there for security, did they expect something to happen that people couldn't manage themselves. That statement to him said they knew it was a dangerous product, it was addictive and a drug. He said he didn't think it was necessary and the fact that it brought them in some money was not rational to him.

Jake Boone, 823 Birch, Cottage Grove, spoke against Item 7(c) said he didn't have any connection with this matter, but said he had a strong feeling that bad law was bad law and most of the youth and adult in Cottage Grove were responsible people. It was a tough thing and as others had brought up, alcohol and drug abuse were big problems and underage drinking was a problem. It was illegal for the youth to drink in Coiner Park and the proposed Ordinance wouldn't make it any more illegal. He said what may be going on was a sense of having to do something to fix the problem, but he didn't think this was the right way to do that. He encouraged Council to look at other cities who have considered something similar and see if it had actually worked. Further restricting the vast majority of law abiding citizens was not going to do anything to solve the problem.

Sue Rosenthal, 1002 N. 19<sup>th</sup>, Cottage Grove, spoke in favor of Item 7(c) and said the problem she had was that Council were adults that had been elected to look out for the best interests of the citizens of Cottage Grove. It seemed to her that they were looking out for the adults but not the youth. She said the problem was getting worse and she didn't think there were very many restaurants that didn't serve alcohol. She owned a business down town and numerous times she came to work with beer cans in front of and on the side of her building. She said Council was to set an example for the citizens, both adults and the youth. She asked Council to step up to the plate and make a tough decision that parks are for children and families, they weren't for partying and alcohol and a good time could be had without alcohol. If people wanted to drink alcohol during Bohemia Mining Days, there were plenty of restaurants where they could have dinner and a drink. It would also force people to go downtown, wasn't that what BMD was about, to bring in people for the benefit of the entire community. She said she remembered when there used to be the beer gardens during BMD when the area was fenced off and there were less problems than they were now. She said Council could help solve the problem now, not by

restricting it everywhere, but to keep it from the park and from the youth in the community.

Don Ware, 1161 N. 16<sup>th</sup>, spoke about Item 8(c) and the Village Green and said he thought it was foolish of the City to consider being involved and a bad risk on the City's part to get the money from Lane County and pass it on and be responsible if anything should happen.

Victoria Doyle, 440 Kalapuya Court, spoke against Item 7(c) and said she didn't have any involvement in the issue, she was just a citizen speaking up. She said drinking alcohol was legal for adults and if they wanted to use the argument that there were dangers with drinking then you could say the same thing with driving because there was a law that said adults drive and you had to be a certain age before you could drive. It was no different and she understood that alcohol had its issues and had its problems but they were talking about a public park where there was two times a year an event that served alcohol and permits were issued and she understood that there was very little, if any, minors being cited or businesses being cited for serving minors. She thought the issues relating to youth should be looked at for what types of activities were available to youth for their off time, the times outside of these events because it sounded like during the events was when they had the least amount of problems. It should be looked at that legal use by adults was somehow promoting the use by youth, which to her was backwards because by showing the youth that you can use alcohol in an adult and responsible manner would seem logical. She wanted to see the City and those interested in the youth, come out with other ideas that the youth can do the other 361 days a year, that there wasn't anything for the kids to do and they are getting into trouble and having problems, she used to be one of those kids. Banning the use of alcohol for people who have permits, who haven't been cited or had a problem under the guides of prevention was ridiculous.

### **RESOLUTIONS AND ORDINANCES**

- (a) Resolution Appropriating Funds of an Unanticipated Special Purpose Grant From the Parks and Recreation Department, State Historic Preservation Office

Community Development Director, Howard Schesser, said the Resolution before Council was to appropriate \$17,000, which was the grant the City received from the State Historic Preservation Office and wasn't included in the FY09/10 Budget. Staff recommended that the Resolution be approved.

**IT WAS MOVED BY COUNCILOR MUNROE AND SECONDED BY COUNCILOR FLECK THAT RESOLUTION NO. 1733 BE ADOPTED.**

The vote on the motion was as follows:

VOTE	Councilor Fleck	Councilor Gowing	Councilor Munroe	Councilor Murphy	Councilor Clark	Councilor Conrad	Mayor Williams
AYES	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
NAYS							

ABSTAIN							
---------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

(b) Resolution Approving the Intergovernmental Agreement Related to the ePermit System and Services

Community Development Director, Howard Schesser, said the Resolution would authorize the City Manager to enter into an agreement with the State of Oregon regarding the implementation and delivery of the ePermit System. The ePermit System was an electronic permit tracking system that would provide citizen access to permits issued and in process and would allow both homeowners and contractors to apply online 24/7 and provide plans electronically if they had that capability. There was no cost to the City other than the initial training which was now being done. Eugene, Springfield and Lane County were in the group ahead of Cottage Grove so they would be rolling it out first and once contractors got used to the process it would be asked for elsewhere. Staff recommended adoption of the Resolution.

**IT WAS MOVED BY COUNCILOR FLECK AND SECONDED BY COUNCILOR MUNROE THAT RESOLUTION NO. 1734 BE ADOPTED.**

The vote on the motion was as follows:

VOTE	Councilor Fleck	Councilor Gowing	Councilor Munroe	Councilor Murphy	Councilor Clark	Councilor Conrad	Mayor Williams
AYES	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
NAYS							
ABSTAIN							

(c) Ordinance Amending Special Event Permits Regarding Alcoholic Beverages

City Manager, Richard Meyers, said Council had been provided with two letters from citizens who were unable to attend tonight’s meeting, Carrie Gilmore and Dian Missar, and they were entered into record.

Richard clarified that the current ordinance said that alcohol consumption, sale and possession of open containers in the parks and on public roads and public property was prohibited unless it was with a permit for a special event that had been approved or if it was a licensed facility like the golf course, those were the exemptions. What the ordinance did was to remove that allowance for that permit. Currently, buying, selling or using alcohol in the park on any other day was illegal. The City did enforce that and had also enforced it a number of times for adults as well as youth.

Sean clarified that it was never legal with or without a permit to use, buy or sell alcohol in the parks to minors.

Richard said BMD had become a model for the City in using and regulating the use of it in the

permits. Council had the letter from Councilor Clark regarding the ordinance. Councilor Clark and Councilor Conrad had proposed the ordinance and the changes that had been made were shown by strike outs and underlined language to show how the ordinance would change and what it would do.

Councilor Clark said he understood everyone's comments about Bohemia Mining Days but that was not what the request for the change in the ordinance was about, it was not just about BMD. Currently the way the ordinance was written was any other group could ask for a special event permit, it just happened to be two times last year.

He said he brought the idea up because Council had so many alcohol discussions at the meetings and so much contention about what the Council could actually do to try to impact the alcohol problem, especially among youth in the community. Council had the discussions every time an alcohol permit came before Council and everyone said it was legal, they had done everything they were supposed to and the permit was approved. The discussion had continued for the three and a half years he had been on Council and nothing had been done.

He thought something could actually be done that might impact the issue for citizens of Cottage Grove, not for the Chamber, not for the business people, but for the regular citizens going to the park or going to a public space. He said during his term the City bought the golf course and people couldn't play golf without drinking beer so he gave up on that one. The Community Center was a controlled environment, he used to run the Community Center and he understood that. He said he then thought about outside and the parks and what exactly the parks were. They were a place for kids to go, they were a place for families to go, they weren't an outdoor tavern, they were open space in the community. He said he knew a lot of people thought it was silly but there were a lot of people who had approached him and said they went to the park and were offended by some of the things going on that involved alcohol and they didn't want their kids to be around it and they didn't want to be around it. There was another opinion out there.

He said it was dangerous to argue with the stature of Sharon Jean or Stacey, they are icons in the community and he was going to lose the fight with them every time. He wanted Council to think about what did they hear. He said Council could make a statement and say that the parks were going to be alcohol free, it wasn't the first place in the country to do that; or maintain the status quo. The argument he heard was that money had been made and he understood that, that was why people were in business. It was difficult to argue with all the social services because it was true, there were all those problems. There was an opportunity to make a statement that the City wasn't going to allow alcohol in the public parks. It was a difficult decision, some people would be mad, some people would lose money, and the events that had alcohol would go on somewhere else. He thought the Council needed to consider how important it really was for adults to set examples for their kids. He said we might think it didn't matter but it did and a little thing could start a conversation. It was not a huge issue to ask but he thought it was something that Council needed to sincerely think about and not just boil it down to money, it needed to be thought of in a broader term than just dollars and cents and hoped Council would give it serious thought and consideration.

Councilor Conrad handed out a sheet with statistics from the police department regarding

alcohol related arrests and bar checks. She said alcohol consumption was a problem in Cottage Grove, not only for adults but for minors. She said there were some good questions brought up about the ordinance such as what would the ordinance do for the alcohol consumption in Cottage Grove, if there were no problems in Coiner Park than why even address it? She said it had to do with the understanding and concept of what prevention was and read excerpts from publications that discussed the issue. It said one approach for reducing alcohol and drug problems were community based prevention programs. These programs focused on changing the environment in which a person consumed alcohol rather than the behavior of the individual drinker. Most people who consumed alcohol couldn't be classified as problem drinkers, the majority of drinking related problems arose from non problem drinkers. As a result community based environment prevention efforts sought to address those wider scaled problems caused by non problem drinkers, such as places where alcohol was consumed, social events where alcoholic beverages were sold and consumed and local laws and regulations. She said the American Medical Association (AMA) said environmental factors such as cultural norms, marketing and promotions all created a culture where drinking was seen as being fun, but you didn't see the consequences. She said she had heard people say that if children see responsible drinking then they will learn responsible drinking, however the AMA disagreed and said this was not true. What AMA and MADD (Mother's Against Drunk Driving) said was that if we think we are teaching children social drinking, that wasn't true, we were actually teaching them that you had fun with alcohol and didn't have consequences. She discussed other studies that had been done regarding adolescent drinking. She said it was a matter of if prevention was important and said it was and the ordinance was about prevention, it was about environmental factors to a problem that we knew existed in the community.

**IT WAS MOVED BY COUNCILOR MUNROE AND SECONDED BY COUNCILOR FLECK THAT ORDINANCE NO. 2995 BE INTRODUCED, READ ONCE BY TITLE ONLY AND FOLLOWING DISCUSSION, IT BE BROUGHT BEFORE THE COUNCIL AT THE NEXT MEETING FOR A SECOND READING AND CONSIDERATION FOR ADOPTION.**

Councilor Fleck talked about his past as a youth and alcohol use in his family and that he didn't have issues with alcohol because he had been taught by his parents responsible drinking. He felt that teaching children responsibility encompassed a great number of things. He said the events in the park were the same sort of situation as the annual review of the taverns in town, if an event was not being responsible and showing responsible alcohol use, then the Council should address that event. He said he disagreed with the fact that it was promoting irresponsible behavior. He said he thought it was the family support that needed to educate the children on what was correct and responsible drinking. Children that had issues needed mentors, people that were going to help them find their way through life, it wasn't about whether or not alcohol was at an event or in a place, because there would also be alcohol somewhere. Teaching them responsibility was the key.

Councilor Murphy said she worked for a social agency and this was an issue that came across her desk every day with families they served. She said it wasn't about money or one event, it was about responsible governance and she understood prevention. She said she could support a lot of things but couldn't support the ordinance. She could support a social host ordinance where it targeted specific youth, but she was in agreement with Councilor Fleck. She appreciated the

passion on both sides, she had read it and considered it carefully. Responsible drinking was legal for adults. Parenting was where it got back to, there were a lot of things she didn't want her kids around and said it was the same thing if she saw someone acting up at an event in a park, she would talk to her kids about responsible use and/or refraining from such activities but this one reached a little beyond the boundaries and got into morals that she wasn't willing to go into at this point.

Councilor Clark said both councilors made good points, but wanted to know what did you say to the parent who didn't want their children around the alcohol, not the parent who was going to teach their children. What did you say to the citizen who didn't want their children exposed to that, did you tell them not to go to the park, do you tell them not to go and enjoy a public resource. He asked what was wrong with doing something proactive. At some point you try and get ahead of the facts and that was what the ordinance was trying to do.

Councilor Gowing said he respected Councilors Clark and Conrad's passion on the issue. He said when he was in the service he was stationed back in the Midwest where there were still dry towns and counties and there was no less alcohol in those places than there was in towns that had bars and served alcohol. He said Council needed to look at the responsible drinking and shouldn't punish those. He said that every one of the concerts in the park last year that he attended, there was someone drinking. There were ordinances in place against that but they weren't being enforced and he didn't think the ordinance was the right way to do away with that. He said he would support if there were organizations at the special events, such as AA, NA, or Al-Anon to set up a booth during the duration of the event and use part of the fees charged to go towards drug and alcohol prevention programs.

Councilor Munroe said he understood where Councilor Clark was coming from but something that puzzled him, besides the alcohol and drug problems, was where the youth in the community were getting the money to buy cigarettes. He wanted to know where the responsibility of the parents was. Sooner or later the youth would have to learn they had to be responsible for their actions and he didn't think the City was in the right person to dictate that.

Councilor Conrad said she heard the seemingly logical, common sense concerns that at least in the current generation, maybe except one member, lived with concerning alcohol and behavioral alcohol and attitude towards alcohol. She didn't know what else to say where studies did not give one pause to rethink that generational attitude about alcohol and the affect of children just watching people drink, that you didn't believe the results of those studies. She said the other thing about adults and business, was the other influence about open air, public land and she was talking about park public land, about people in recovery. If anyone knew anything about recovery programs one of the main things was that you didn't go to places where alcohol was being served. If you stopped alcohol in special events, you might have more people coming to the events because the alcohol was absent.

**IT WAS MOVED BY COUNCILOR CLARK AND SECONDED BY COUNCILOR CONRAD TO TABLE ORDINANCE NO. 2995.**

Discussion was held on whether the matter could be tabled.

City Attorney, Sean Kelly, said there was already a motion on the table that had to be voted on.

Mayor Williams thanked everyone in the audience and the Council for the in depth perspectives given on the issue.

The vote on the motion was as follows:

VOTE	Councilor Fleck	Councilor Gowing	Councilor Munroe	Councilor Murphy	Councilor Clark	Councilor Conrad	Mayor Williams
AYES	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
NAYS							
ABSTAIN							

City Attorney, Sean Kelly, read Ordinance No. 2995 once by title only.

(d) Ordinance Amending Chapter 1.16 Regarding Ward Boundaries

City Manager, Richard Meyers, said Council had the proposed changes for the Ward boundaries before them. There were two people who spoke during the Public Hearing. The population figures on the maps were estimates only, there wouldn't be exact numbers until after 2011 when the Census numbers were received by the City. The boundary changes, however, needed to be done now before the upcoming election. He said that he and Councilor Conrad discussed the ordinance earlier today. The ordinance didn't contain the descriptions, however whatever option Council chose, those Ward boundary descriptions would be added to the ordinance for the second reading. He said Councilor Conrad had suggested putting some kind of time language in the ordinance to keep a monitor on the population figures in each Ward to revisit on a periodic basis to make sure the numbers were correct. The Charter did say specifically that Council could modify it at their discretion.

Councilor Fleck asked Richard about his comment before the public hearing about Ward I being at it's limits, as far as growth, because when he looked at all three of the proposals under Ward I, it was the one that showed the greatest amount of growth.

Richard said yes, that the growth was in the current City limits because of what was currently available for development. Beyond that annexation was where there wasn't a lot of land in Ward I.

Councilor Fleck asked if the City wasn't considering the potential for annexation in the other numbers.

Richard said the numbers on the tables didn't have any annexation numbers included in them, the future estimated on the chart was only looking at the properties that were currently in the City for potential growth in the wards. If the City looked beyond that, what could happen and be

annexed in, Ward 1 and 2 didn't have a lot but Wards 3 and 4 had substantial that could be brought in.

Councilor Fleck said he liked Councilor Conrad's suggestion and he thought it had been about ten years, maybe it could correspond with the next Census or as needed or appropriate.

Councilor Conrad recommended Proposal C because it was geographically more coherent and it was the only proposal that took the population into consideration. She thought population was important, not only to get a pool of prospective candidates for the Council, but to also look to the purpose of why there were wards. Different seats had to live in certain wards which created a line of communication with the people in that ward. She said we needed to make that a working governmental system, so population was important on both issues to avoid having a councilor in one ward representing only 500 people and a councilor in another ward having 5,000 people. She said there needed to be equal population as much as possible. She said there also needed to be some kind of statement so that the City didn't go years without any consideration to the population shift. She suggested evaluating the population figures every four years and if population figures reached more than 1,500 discrepancies between any two wards than boundaries would need to be re-evaluated.

Councilor Munroe said he looked at the projection figures and agreed with Councilor Conrad that Proposal C was the best even though Ward 3 would have the smallest population at the current time. He said if you looked at the map the way it was, and he wasn't sure how far out the urban growth boundary goes beyond that, if the Gates property were eventually annexed and they start the housing there, it would start to equal out with the other three wards.

Mayor Williams said he could live with Proposal B or C, he liked the simplicity of B. He said the important thing was that the way it currently was, there was a serpentine affect of Ward 3 going all over the place. The City would want to avoid the gerrymandered look and currently it did look like that, it wasn't easy to follow. A citizen should be able to look at the map and tell where their ward was. He said Proposal B and C were very simple and on Proposal C it moved up a little bit but also made geographic sense. He asked about Wards 3 and 4 and the delineation on the dividing line between the wards.

Richard said Hwy 99 was the dividing line between the two wards.

City Attorney, Sean Kelly, commented on Councilor Conrad's suggestion regarding the population because it wasn't the only consideration that went into and to isolate that as one factor that would cause redistricting might be an issue so that language might be worked on. Also he said staff should work on the language as to how we came up with the population figures. There have been discussions on that and he would want to clarify those two parts when the ordinance was cleaned up. The change could be made on the second reading.

Councilor Clark said he wasn't going to support it. He supported Proposal A and felt that more time needed to be put into the issue and that it shouldn't be rushed.

Councilor Fleck said he thought we should be less strict and that was why he was proposing once every ten years to review the boundaries. He said every decade with the Census would be appropriate unless Council deemed that there was some huge development that necessitated their moving it.

Councilor Conrad wanted to know how the ordinance would be reworked.

Sean said it was an amendment that could be made prior to the second reading

Richard explained that Council needed to vote for the first reading on either Proposal A, B or C.

Sean said Council would be selecting the legal boundaries that would be input into the ordinance and then language changes would be made for time frames on re-evaluating and looking at the method of re-evaluation.

Councilor Conrad clarified that if Council agreed on Proposal C, that would be put into the ordinance and then the language could be reworked for the second reading.

Sean said yes.

Councilor Fleck asked if Council could adopt Proposal C and then visit the time lines at a later date.

Richard said what Council had to do before June was to get the property that wasn't in a ward, into a ward. If Council wanted to come back later and add in the language to fix the time frame, that could be done then.

Councilor Clark said he didn't understand passing an ordinance and then fix it. Why didn't Council just extend the boundaries of what was current for the election and then fix it.

Discussion was held on how the ordinance should be read.

**IT WAS MOVED BY COUNCILOR CONRAD AND SECONDED BY COUNCILOR MUNROE THAT ORDINANCE NO. 2996 BE ACCEPTED WITH PROPOSAL C AND BE INTRODUCED, READ ONCE BY TITLE ONLY AND FOLLOWING DISCUSSION, IT BE BROUGHT BEFORE THE COUNCIL AT THE NEXT MEETING FOR A SECOND READING AND CONSIDERATION FOR ADOPTION.**

The vote on the motion was as follows:

VOTE	Councilor Fleck	Councilor Gowing	Councilor Munroe	Councilor Murphy	Councilor Clark	Councilor Conrad	Mayor Williams
------	-----------------	------------------	------------------	------------------	-----------------	------------------	----------------

AYES	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
NAYS							
ABSTAIN							

City Attorney, Sean Kelly, read Ordinance No. 2996 once by title only.

**BUSINESS FROM THE CITY COUNCIL**

(a) Oregon National Guard Benefit Program

City Attorney, Richard Meyers, introduced Peg Jennette from the Lane County Mental Health Advisory Committee.

Ms. Jennette said the Committee advised the Board of Commissioners on mental issues and addiction disorder issues in Lane County and last fall formed a Sub-Committee on Veterans Affairs. In April there would be 2700 members of the National Guard returning home to Oregon and Washington and she provided the Council with statistics on issues that returning veterans could encounter and services and programs that would be available to them.

The Mayor thanked Ms. Jennette for coming and providing the information to Council.

(b) Approval of a Cooperative Improvement Agreement between ODOT and the City of Cottage Grove for Reuse Water Irrigation

Public Works Director, Jan Wellman, provided information to Council regarding a Cooperative Intergovernmental Agreement between ODOT and the City of Cottage Grove. He said the agreement would allow the City to spray treated effluent to the grass area of Exit 174 along I-5. He said in January, 2007, DEQ issued a draft NPDES (National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System) permit, however due to a large number of lawsuits filed against DEQ, permits were not issued. The City had been informed by DEQ that the NPDES permit should be issued in two to four months. The City was preparing the golf course to begin receiving treated effluent and to start spraying. He said the problem was that the golf course wasn't able to handle all the effluent that the wastewater treatment plant produced. During the summer months it produced close to 800,000 gallons a day and the golf course was only able to use 350,000 to 450,000 gallons of effluent to water the course, which left a considerable amount of effluent that needed to be disposed of. Murray, Smith and Associates (MSA), a consulting firm hired by the City to look into treated effluent disposal options that may be available to the City, came up with a Tier 1 list of possible disposal sites which included the golf course, old driving range (now owned by the hospital) and the interchange at Exit 174 and Bohemia Park which covered approximately 110 acres which was what was needed to dispose of all of the effluent produced. He said under the permit that would be issued to the City, the problem was phosphoreus. The effluent had too much phosphoreus and the new permit would only allow the City to discharge 1 pound per day into the river and far greater than 1 pound of phosphoreus was produced so land application of the effluent was the way to avoid additional treatment costs that would be associated with pre-

treating the effluent before it was discharged into the river.

Jan said the interchange at Exit 174 was approximately 12 acres. The first thing the City would do was design an irrigation system for that 12 acres and that would have to be submitted to ODOT for their approval. It was their property and they had to okay any irrigation system installed. Whether it was an in ground, pop up, or sprinkler heads or the City used more of an agricultural application to spray the treated effluent, it would be determined in the design of the irrigation system. Part of the problem with the current wastewater plant was the City did not have storage for treated effluent, it should have been done at the time the system was designed to have 1M gallons of storage. He said currently the pond at Middlefield Golf Course would serve the needs of that storage and it would also work when it was sprayed to the interchange as well as the golf course itself. Staff recommended approval of the cooperative improvement agreement with ODOT and to authorize the Mayor, City Manager and City Attorney to sign the document.

Jan said the costs associated with the agreement would be approximately \$50,000 to pay for materials to make the system functional and if the work was contracted out it would be an additional \$50,000. There would also be several borings that would be required under I-5 and two of the entrance and exit ramps which staff was currently getting costs on. He said the project could prove to be fairly expensive, however looking at the alternative of having to pay for an additional system, it was one of the better alternatives.

Jan said if the City proceeded with the project and determined that it would become a problem, there was an option in the agreement for a thirty day cancellation as well as ODOT had a cancellation with the City.

**IT WAS MOVED BY COUNCILOR MUNROE AND SECONDED BY COUNCILOR FLECK THAT COUNCIL APPROVE THE COOPERATIVE IMPROVEMENT AGREEMENT AND AUTHORIZE THE MAYOR, CITY MANAGER AND CITY ATTORNEY TO SIGN THE DOCUMENT.**

Councilor Murphy asked if the project would be in the next fiscal year's budget.

Jan said \$40,000 was budgeted in the current fiscal year's budget and that it would be carried over to the next fiscal year's budget and additional funds would be added to it to bring the total to somewhere between \$50,000-\$75,000.

Councilor Murphy asked if any of the funds had been spent.

Jan said none of the funds had been spent.

Councilor Conrad said she knew the proposal was following the recommendations of the engineers but as she looked at the Tier 1 choices, she wondered if another golf course would be less expensive, such as Hidden Valley, because they would maintain itself, there wouldn't be the need for additional maintenance charges and we might not need all of the construction costs dealing with ODOT and I-5.

Jan said Hidden Valley was in the MSA's study as one of the potentials but it was in the Tier 2 or Tier 3 and they had looked at that as an option. The biggest problem was getting the effluent from the treatment plant to Hidden Valley as it had to cross the railroad tracks and there was quite a bit of pipeline that would be required to get it to that location.

Councilor Conrad asked if he was saying that pipe installation would be more costly than the ongoing maintenance of the land plus the cost from ODOT.

Jan said yes and the pipeline would have to cross the river. He said they were also looking at Bohemia Park and he had been estimated that 6800 feet of pipeline would be required to move effluent from the treatment plant down to Main Street and 10<sup>th</sup> Street to deliver the effluent to Bohemia Park. That was figured in their development cost as well.

City Attorney Sean Kelly said anytime the railroad tracks were crossed the cost was so expensive you couldn't calculate it. The railroad ran through the middle of town and the cost of dealing with them was astronomical and next to impossible to deal with. He said the agreement was entered into to allow the option to do it, it didn't mean that the City needed to move forward, so the thirty day cancellation, even once it was installed, if the City decided that it wasn't working the City could cancel the agreement at anytime. Having the agreement in place allowed the City the option and that was what was before Council.

Councilor Munroe asked if he understood that the City was eventually getting the license for the sewer plant therefore the City could follow through with this?

Jan said yes, the City was getting the new NPDES permit and was currently operating under the old permit which was issued in 1994. The new permit had been held up since 2007 due to several lawsuits against DEQ.

Councilor Munroe asked if there was an existing pipe already in place.

Jan said there was already a boring under the I-5 entrance ramp south bound and the exit ramp. He showed Council on a map exactly where he was talking about.

Councilor Clark asked if Jan had an idea of how much more money they would need for the project.

Jan said MSA came up with good estimates and if the City did the installation of the irrigation system, it shouldn't cost more than the \$50,000-\$75,000. If they had to contract with someone to do the irrigation system it could cost more. Ongoing maintenance would be an expense for mowing and it might be something the City may contract to have done.

Councilor Clark asked if the mowing could have been included in the project.

Jan said it could have been included but the City was close to the loan authority and there would have been a larger loan and cost involved and costs to the customers would have been higher.

The vote on the motion was as follows:

VOTE	Councilor Fleck	Councilor Gowing	Councilor Munroe	Councilor Murphy	Councilor Clark	Councilor Conrad	Mayor Williams
AYES	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
NAYS							
ABSTAIN							

(c) Economic Development Loan for the Village Green

Councilor Fleck recused himself and left the Council Chambers.

City Manager Richard Meyers said on April 7<sup>th</sup>, the Lane County Board of Commissioners approved the creation of an Overnight Stay Development Loan Fund for rural communities to encourage and develop economic development around tourism. Part of the money came from the economic development fund and lottery funds and part of it came from transient room tax funds. The purpose of the fund was to provide a loan to rural communities, cities, and jurisdictions to move forward with different kinds of economic development projects. The loan money was not going to the private parties, it was set up to go to the local jurisdictions. Commissioner Stewart worked hard on trying to put together a package to create the opportunity. The City was authorized as the first recipient of the loan fund from Lane County.

He said currently the Village Green owed about \$2.1M in debt and the current appraisal was \$3.525M, which had been done by a a third party. The appraiser said that if capital investment was made into the rooms, the appraisal would increase by that value. The Village Green had asked for a loan from banks but they have refused, not because the Village Green was necessarily a risk, but because of the current loan market that the commercial lending institutions were restricted by and their portfolios were limited. City staff and private investors had reviewed the books of the Village Green and found them to be in a good condition for a loan. Offers had been received for \$3M to purchase the property which was above the debt owed. The Village Green had grown in use since Moonstone Properties purchased the property and renovations that had occurred were done to create the current atmosphere to enhance and develop the property as a resort and destination. Current management had taken a broader approach in using the conference facilities and enhanced the tourism piece by using groups and conference stays to broaden the ability to generate more revenue. The rooms that were renovated were done because of previous stay numbers based on the use of the rooms in the past but with the new management they had demonstrated a need for the other rooms to be done and to fulfill the needs of addressing the conference facilities and other facilities that were on the property.

Travel Lane County had noted fifteen different conferences that had contacted them regarding

the Village Green and had visited the site but due to the number of rooms available had refused to schedule their conferences there, which resulted in a loss to the community of approximately \$449,000. In July, 2009, the Village Green identified a handful of conferences that couldn't or wouldn't come and went other places due to the lack of adequate rooms for a loss of approximately \$48,000 and a loss of \$4,000 in room tax funds.

The City was in the potential to receive the \$250,000 loan from Lane County. Staff was working with the private investor group to generate another \$250,000 and were asking Council for approval to move forward with negotiations. He said final agreements with private investors, Lane County, Village Green and Moonstone Properties would be brought back to Council, however there was work that needed to go into the negotiations. The loan program was not something new to the City, the City had a small business loan program for years. The City had also done things at the industrial park and this was a piece of economic development that fit into that area. It fit the same criteria as the small business loan program, except it was bigger than the typical small business. The County would loan the funds to the City at a rate of 2%, the City would then turn around and loan the funds to the Village Green at a higher interest rate for five years. The difference would go back into the small business loan program or it could be used in other areas. The agreement with the County would be a one year agreement that was renewed for four additional years and would be due in the fifth year. Additional language could be inserted in the agreement with the Village Green.

Mayor Williams recognized Commissioner Stewart in the audience.

Councilor Clark said he had a discussion with Commissioner Stewart regarding the Village Green. He asked Richard if there was a downside to the agreement.

Richard said there was always a downside, as with the small business loan program that had some businesses that did very well and some that were no longer around that the City lost the loan funds on. It was more of a secure loan than any of the other loans had been due to the fact that there was more capital and more existing value to the property than with some of the businesses that failed downtown on the small business loan program. There was always risk, it was economic development.

Councilor Clark said it wasn't a traditional pass through, the City was getting the money and was responsible for the loan and asked if the City had to pay the County back for the money.

Richard said yes.

Councilor Clark that was where the risk was.

Richard said it was the same risk that the City had with the small business loan program because the City's money disappeared. This would be the same because the City would have to pay it back.

Councilor Clark asked if the City would be third in line for security on the property.

Richard said yes. There was a loan on the property and the second was a revolving loan that would be paid off in June or July, it was only there for the winter months and if the rooms were renovated and with the conference and group stays, they would probably not need that revolving line of credit during the off months.

Councilor Clark said he had a difficult time with that because in the line of work he was in, it was all about risk management and trying to manage their risk for them was an interesting dilemma. He asked who paid the 2% to the County for the loan.

Richard said that would be part of the cost they would be repaying the City. If the City charged them 8% that would come from that and the City would get 6%.

Councilor Clark said in reality there was no way the City would be able to build the loan fund back up. It was an interesting revolving loan.

Richard said the interest would go into that loan fund.

Commissioner Stewart provided background information on how the City, County and private investors first became involved in the Village Green. He said after several meetings with the City and potential investors he realized that they may not be able to raise the entire \$500,000 needed for the renovations at the Village Green and that was where the loan from the County came to be. He said the County had transient room tax funds that they granted to organizations for tourist attracting endeavors. The other fund the County had was an economic development fund from lottery funds that the County used to grant approximately \$1M yearly to businesses with the stipulation to create jobs. The funds could be used because the renovation would immediately put people to work in the construction field and long term it could potentially put 10-50 people to work. The transient room tax funds would promote room stays and with the conferences that had been canceled, there was the opportunity to increase the City's transient room tax which also increased the County tax collection as well somewhere in the range of \$10,000 - \$20,000 a year depending on the use of the facility. He said he tried to get the funds as a grant so the City wouldn't have to repay the funds, but because of the limited amount the commissioners thought the County should create the fund and loan the money to the City to use for the project which would be repaid and then they would have the fund to provide to other cities. He said there had been due diligence among the private side because it was a public-private partnership that included capital from the private sector to help make the deal and they had done a great deal of looking in to the books and making sure it was a good investment for them as well. There was no formal agreement at the time from anyone but there had been earnest discussions that led him to believe that it was something that was doable in the future.

Councilor Conrad said she understood that the County would not give the funds directly to the Village Green because the County did not want to take the risk, the City would take the risk. She said he mentioned something about an economic development fund that the County did give directly to businesses and asked why that money couldn't be used directly to the Village Green and if the amount was too large, what lower amount might be acceptable.

Commissioner Stewart said he wasn't sure if he said that the County didn't want to loan the money directly to the Village Green because of the risk. He said what the County was trying to do was the Village Green did not say they wanted a grant of \$250,000 directly to him but when they were thinking of how to form the transaction, he was thinking of a way to leverage an immediate situation that needed help and create something that could help other ventures in the future and that was how the loan fund was created, it wasn't due to the amount of risk involved or anything like that, they could have stepped up and taken a request from them for a grant, but there were issues there about timing with the process through the County, and the situation needed answers fairly quick and there was a time line to benefit the community to try and bring revenue into the organization in a timely manner. They needed an answer fairly soon so they could get rooms renovated and ready for market

**IT WAS MOVED BY COUNCILOR MUNROE AND SECONDED BY COUNCILOR CLARK THAT THE CITY COUNCIL AUTHORIZE THE CITY MANAGER TO BEGIN NEGOTIATIONS WITH THE VILLAGE GREEN FOR A LOAN AGREEMENT FOR NO MORE THAN \$250,000 AND WITH THE PRIVATE INVESTORS FOR A PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT. THE AGREEMENTS WOULD COME TO THE CITY COUNCIL FOR THEIR REVIEW AND APPROVAL FOR THE NEXT CITY COUNCIL MEETING.**

Councilor Conrad said since the Village Green had buyers, why didn't they just make a business to business deal and sell and then the City wouldn't have to take out a loan..

Richard said of the buyers for the Village Green, one was to turn it into a truck stop and the other had some hotel/motel experience but were not experienced in conference facilities and didn't have the capital to make the renovations and their history hadn't been stellar with maintenance and upkeep of facilities.

Commissioner Stewart said the owner would prefer to keep the property. They tried to get a loan from the banking system and weren't able to. If the loan wasn't approved and moved forward to and created, that it was an option for them to take one of the offers.

Richard said it was important to note that the current owner only owed \$2.1M on the property and had put a huge investment of his own capital into the improvements that had already occurred and if he did not have a commitment to the community and to the quality and the resort, he could sell the facility for \$3M and walk away with \$900,000 in his pocket that he could reinvest in one of his other facilities.

Councilor Conrad said the Council had to do due diligence in their stewardship to tax payer money. She said they mentioned timing, that had to be done now and asked why the present owner continue as was and from profits from the business slowly improve the property.

Richard said the difficulty with that was there were renovations that needed to be done and it wasn't something that could be done a little at a time, it wasn't feasible to get the capital back in.

Councilor Conrad asked if it was known what the net profit of the Village Green had been in the last several years.

Richard said the net operating income was breaking even based on what they were doing now and as the other rooms were brought in that was where you would see the additional revenue come in.

Councilor Conrad said she understood that Travel Lane County gave a list of fifteen groups and wanted to affirm that those groups wanted to stay at the Village Green.

Richard said they were groups that actually looked at the Village Green and wanted to use it because of the location, price and quality there but when they found there weren't enough sleeping rooms they didn't book their conferences. It was the same for the ones that wanted to come in July that had been there before, they couldn't come back until the rooms were done.

Councilor Conrad asked Richard to explain the deal with the County and being year by year.

Richard said the agreement the County set up in the loan fund allowed for the loan to be repaid every year but was renewable every four years, it was a five year loan.

Councilor Conrad asked if during those five years the County was in dire financial straights if they could cancel the contract.

Commissioner Stewart said in the order it stated that the four renewals were basically automatic and the reason that was done wasn't for potentially not renewing it, it was because it was a new fund, County codes required it to be revised. The money could only be used for economic development and tourism enhancement, the County couldn't take it and use it for other services.

Councilor Conrad said the other concern for the City would be that the City would be discussing financial obligations that had to do with projects such as the Armory; the Bridge, which was six figures over budget at this point; the City pool; and any risk or status of the businesses already in the industrial park and wanted to know how the City would balance and achieve all these things where the Village Green was just one project.

Richard said the loan would be repaid by the Village Green. As far as the Armory the City would be applying for grants for cultural and historical preservation and for the Chambers Railroad Bridge, the City had applied for grants for the second round of stimulus money and other transportation funding. That project wasn't over budget except for the fact that it had to be pulled down early and the pieces of the bridge that were interpretive that didn't fit under the other grant to complete the park would come from the other grants. The pool was a funding project that was still undecided. The projects all have specific areas that pay for and take care of them. He said as far as the industrial park, it was taken care of by the funds and revenue from the park. There have been some rough times but also some really good times and that was the reason for a reserve that was taking care of the operation until it picked back up. It had not been a pull on the general fund, it had been taking care of itself.

Councilor Conrad said in the Memo it said the property could not be sold during the length of the loan and asked if it was not financially successful and they couldn't sell it, what was the recourse.

Richard said they were all suggestions for the terms as they were discussed with the owner and the private partnership as well and it could be better to say if there was a first right of refusal if he did have to sell. From discussions with the owner, he wasn't in any mind set to say no to any of those from what they had discussed.

Councilor Conrad said her last concern was the \$250,000 and that the total amount was split in half and asked if there would be discussions that the City could be less liable for less money.

Richard said the way it was worded they were asking the private investors to have at least \$250,000, they could come up with more, and that would minimize the amount for the City to borrow from the County.

Councilor Gowing said he had a lot of sleepless nights over the issue and had talked to a lot of people throughout the community, a lot of business owners, and one of the best things he had heard was it had to make sense on paper and he hadn't seen that to show it was a good thing. He said they had heard that it had been reviewed and was a good thing, but he needed to see something in writing and he wasn't convinced it was a good decision. He said it was in the paper that a couple of the County Commissioners voted for it with reservation and if he had reservations he wouldn't support it.

Councilor Clark said he was going to support it but he still thought the City should buy it and be first in line.

The vote on the motion was as follows:

VOTE	Councilor Fleck	Councilor Gowing	Councilor Munroe	Councilor Murphy	Councilor Clark	Councilor Conrad	Mayor Williams
AYES			X	X	X	X	X
NAYS		X					
ABSTAIN	X						

(d) Budget Committee Appointments

Finance Director Bert McClintock said the City had four openings on the budget committee and four people had been interviewed by the sub-committee. Staff supported the recommendation of the sub-committee.

Councilor Fleck, Chair of the sub-committee, thanked the applicants and said the committee recommended that Amy Callahan, Victoria Doyle and Lindsey Haskell be appointed for three year terms expiring December 31, 2012 and that Ivan Del Sol be appointed to complete the term

of Matt Parson expiring December 31, 2010.

**IT WAS MOVED BY COUNCILOR FLECK AND SECONDED BY COUNCILOR MUNROE TO APPOINT AMY CALLAHAN, VICTORIA DOYLE AND LINDSEY HASKELL TO THREE YEAR TERMS EXPIRING DECEMBER 31, 2012 AND IVAN DEL SOL TO A ONE YEAR TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 31, 2010.**

Councilor Conrad said she thought the Council would receive copies of the applications and wanted to table the matter until they could review the applications.

Mayor Williams said he didn't know if they had the time to defer it before the budget meetings started.

Councilor Fleck said the reason they didn't receive applications was because the interviews were on the Wednesday that the agenda was created and unfortunately they didn't have a report to offer at that time.

Councilor Conrad said in the future she hoped the Council would receive copies of applications for appointments.

Mayor Williams said there were four openings and four applicants and it was discussed if they should re-open the process for more applicants but because of time constraints the sub-committee had decided to select the four applicants to fill the vacancies.

The vote on the motion was as follows:

VOTE	Councilor Fleck	Councilor Gowing	Councilor Munroe	Councilor Murphy	Councilor Clark	Councilor Conrad	Mayor Williams
AYES	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
NAYS							
ABSTAIN							

(e) Concerns from the City Council

Councilor Clark said the leak at the pool had been found and was either plugged or in the process of being plugged.

**BUSINESS FROM THE CITY MANAGER**

(a) Report from the City Manager

Richard said Woodson Bridge would be closed for two weeks while it was being repaired.

Richard said the “If I Were Mayor.....” contest was going on and if anyone knew of anyone who was interested, there were applications at City Hall and on the website. He had volunteered the Mayor to go to classes at the school to do presentations if requested by the schools.

Richard reminded Council that the SEI reports were due April 15, 2010.

**BUSINESS FROM THE CITY ATTORNEY**

- (a) Report from the City Attorney

None

**PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA**

None

**CONSENT AGENDA**

- (a) Proclamation for Arbor Day
- (b) Proclamation for Public Safety Telecommunicators Week
- (c) Minutes from February 26, 2010 Council Work Session
- (d) Minutes from March 8, 2010 Regular City Council Meeting
- (e) Minutes from March 15, 2010 Council Work Session
- (f) Minutes from March 22, 2010 Regular City Council Meeting

**IT WAS MOVED BY COUNCILOR CLARK AND SECONDED BY COUNCILOR MURPHY TO APPROVE THE CONSENT CALENDAR.**

The vote on the motion was as follows:

VOTE	Councilor Fleck	Councilor Miller	Councilor Munroe	Councilor Murphy	Councilor Clark	Councilor Conrad	Mayor Williams
AYES	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
NAYS							
ABSTAIN							

**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, Mayor Williams adjourned the regular meeting of the City Council at 10:20 pm.

The next regular City Council Meeting will be held April 26, 2010, at 7:30 p.m. in the Council

Chambers at City Hall.

---

Trudy Borrevik, City Recorder

---

Gary Williams, Mayor