

August 18, 2008  
6:00 P.M.  
Newport, Oregon

The City Council of the City of Newport met on the above date in the Council Chambers of the Newport City Hall. On roll call, Bain, Obteshka, Henson, Patrick, Sabanskas, and Bertuleit were present.

Staff attending was as follows: City Manager O'Neal, City Recorder Hawker, City Attorney Firestone, Community Development Director Bassingthwaite, Airport Director Reno, Finance Director Riessbeck, Public Works Director Ritzman, and Police Lieutenant Teem.

### **PROCLAMATIONS, RECOGNITIONS, SPECIAL PRESENTATIONS**

Bain issued a proclamation recognizing the 30<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Newport Farmer's Market, and proclaimed the week of August 24 – 30, as Newport Farmer's Week in the City. Carol Moore accepted the proclamation on behalf of the Farmer's Market.

Bain reported that the city received an "Above and Beyond" award from the Oregon ESGR (Employer Support of the Guard and Reserve), for the city's work with Pat Dodson during both his deployments to Iraq.

### **CONSENT CALENDAR**

The consent calendar consisted of the following items:

1. Approval of minutes from the City Council executive sessions of July 21 and August 4, 2008, and from the work session and regular meeting of August 4, 2008;
2. Police and Fire Department monthly reports;
3. Report of accounts paid – July 2008.

MOTION was made by Patrick, seconded by Bertuleit, to approve the consent calendar with the amendment to the work session minutes as noted at the noon meeting. The motion carried unanimously in a voice vote.

### **COUNCILOR'S REPORTS**

Bertuleit reported that he had attended a recent meeting of the Bicycle/Pedestrian Committee meeting. Ritzman reported on the status of the grant application approved by Council for the trail on Bay Boulevard, and the previously approved application for the

tunnel at 68<sup>th</sup> Street. The Committee is working on safe routes to schools, and determining where sidewalks need to be installed.

Obtshka reported on a recent meeting of the Senior Advisory Committee. He reported that there are two Committee vacancies. The Committee is evaluating the fee structure for use of the facility consistent with the structure at the recreation center. The issue of smoking near the building was discussed, and methods are being analyzed to correct the problem. It may result in a smoking ban around the building similar to that of the recreation center, city hall, and the library.

## **OFFICER'S REPORTS**

**Report of the City Manager.** O'Neal reported that the Council, at its earlier work session, had given the staff the nod to move forward with the Benson Road LID research and neighborhood meetings.

**Report of the City Attorney.** Firestone requested that Council rescind the portion of a motion from the last Council meeting relative to awarding the remainder of the water consulting contract to Civil West. MOTION was made by Patrick, seconded by Bertuleit, to rescind the award to Civil West on the remaining water consulting work to allow a competitive quote process to proceed. The motion carried unanimously in a voice vote.

Bain noted that the deadline for application to fill the City Council vacancy was at 5:00 P.M., today. He reported that the following folks applied: Jim Weir, Mark McConnell, Mark Fisher, Lon Brusselback, Jim McIntyre, and Richard Kilbride. He thanked them for applying, and noted that interviews will occur at the next Council meeting.

## **ACTION ITEMS**

**Special event permit application – fee waiver request – Farmer's Market.** O'Neal explained that the Farmer's Market has submitted the required application for a fee waiver for use of city resources. Carol Moore, representing the Farmer's Market, noted that she considers the Farmer's Market an integral part of the community. As a non-profit, she feels that they are eligible for the fee waiver. Obtshka inquired as to whether the Farmer's Market is registered as a non-profit. Moore noted that they are a registered non-profit corporation. Henson noted that the Newport Police Volunteers devote a lot of time to this project. MOTION was made by Bertuleit, seconded by Sabanskas, to approve the special event permit application and fee waiver request from the Farmer's Market. The motion carried unanimously in a voice vote.

**Approval of Ordinance No. 1962 granting a cable franchise and approving a franchise agreement with Broadstripe Cable (formerly Millennium).** Firestone explained the ordinance and franchise agreement. He reported that Broadstripe is willing to sign the standard cable franchise agreement with only one access channel, rather than two. He noted that they serve only a small customer base in the city. He recommended

adoption and authorization for the agreement to be signed. MOTION was made by Bertuleit, seconded by Patrick, to read Ordinance No. 1962, by title only, and place for final passage, and authorize the mayor to sign the agreement. The motion carried unanimously in a voice vote. O'Neal read the title of Ordinance No. 1962. Voting aye on the adoption of Ordinance No. 1962 were Obtshka, Bertuleit, Henson, Patrick, Sabanskas, and Bain.

At 6:30 P.M., Council recessed until 6:45 P.M.

Bain called the meeting back to order at 6:45 P.M., and called for public comment. There was none.

Council recessed until 6:57 P.M., when they received a request for public comment.

### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Rolla Cleaver inquired about the appointment process for the Council vacancy created by Neal Henning's resignation. Bain reported that interviews would be held at the next Council meeting, and that Council would select a replacement at that time. He noted that the deadline was 5:00 P.M., today, and that six applications had been received. Cleaver asked what would happen in the event of a tie vote, and whether there was any opportunity for citizen input. Bain noted that public comment should be submitted in writing. He noted that in the event of a tie, Council would continue with the balloting process until a replacement was found.

### **ACTION ITEMS**

**Public hearing on Resolution No. 3452 correcting Resolution No. 3443, a resolution adopting the 2008-2009 budget, making appropriations, imposing and categorizing ad valorem taxes.** O'Neal explained there was an erroneous assumption that all of the 1999 sewer bonds had been refunded. He noted that a principal and interest payment had not been included in the refinancing, and were discovered after the budget was adopted. Staff was told that the time frame for submitting the tax levy to the county tax department had passed, but thanks to further investigation, it was determined that the city still has time to amend and correct the error. To do so, this resolution needs to be adopted tonight. Riessbeck reviewed the revised budget numbers. MOTION was made by Sabanskas, seconded by Patrick, to adopt Resolution No. 3452, as presented. Bain opened the public hearing at 7:09 P.M. He called for public comment. Hearing none, the hearing was closed at 7:10 P.M. The motion carried unanimously in a voice vote. O'Neal thanked Patrick for following up on this matter.

**Public hearing to consider adoption of Ordinance No. 1963 - Files Nos. 1-CP-08 and 2-CP-08 as part of the Transportation System Plan Update.** Bassingthwaite reviewed the matter noting that information was included in the packet. He noted that this is a continued public hearing; and there have been a number of hearings before the

Planning Commission and the City Council. Bertuleit noted that it is nice to see identified sidewalks. Bain opened the public hearing at 7:14 P.M., and called for public comment. Hearing none, the hearing was closed at 7:15 P.M. MOTION was made by Sabanskas, seconded by Patrick, to read Ordinance No. 1963, by title only, and place for final passage. The motion carried unanimously in a voice vote. O'Neal read the title of Ordinance No. 1963. Voting aye in a roll call vote on the adoption of Ordinance No. 1963 were Bain, Bertuleit, Henson, Obtshka, Patrick, and Sabanskas.

**Consideration of denial of a petition, or of setting a date for a public hearing before the City Council, on a street vacation of the entire portion of SW Abbey Street within the 500 block between SW 6<sup>th</sup> Street and SW Elizabeth Street as requested by Robert A. Hays.** Bassingthwaite explained the request, noting that the Planning Commission recommended denial of a street vacation because it was not in the public interest and did not meet the criteria. He noted that City Council can set a hearing or deny the request. Mr. Hays, the petitioner, addressed Council noting that he needed the vacation for his project, and feels this is probably not the best way to connect the Bayfront with Elizabeth Street. He reported that he had talked with ODOT, and they don't care. He noted that the overall picture has changed since the project began. He recommended using Case Street to connect the Bayfront to Elizabeth Street. He noted that if the city wanted to install a bike or pedestrian path, he would be willing to deed back ten feet on each side for a path. He also talked about enlarging the small parking spot on Elizabeth Street that could be deeded back to the city. Bain inquired about the location of the property. Patrick reported that she manages property in that vicinity. Obtshka reported that he had driven by the property. O'Neal reported that he is the owner/occupant of a condominium that adjoins the property, but that he has no interest one way or another. Bain opened the matter for public comment. There was no comment. MOTION was made by Sabanskas, seconded by Patrick, to deny the petition for vacating the street based on the fact that it is not in public interest and does not meet the criteria. The motion carried unanimously in a voice vote. Bassingthwaite reported that there may be an opportunity for reconsideration at a later date.

**Local Contract Review Board – Consideration of award of contract for scheduled air service.** The City Council, meeting as the Local Contract Review Board, discussed the award of contract for scheduled air service. Firestone reported that there is a lot of material in the packet regarding this item. It includes the RFP, proposals, supplemental questions, responses from one proposer, and score sheets from evaluators. He reviewed the history of the project, noting that the city had issued the RFP, received two proposals, and interviewed two proposers. The interview panel consisted of seven people from the city (including four staff), and two representatives from the Port of Astoria. He noted that the city was looking for an airline to provide scheduled service between Newport and PDX and Astoria and PDX.

Firestone reported that the city has received correspondence from Seaport Airlines challenging the process. Seaport alleges that the city didn't provide notice to Seaport. Firestone noted that the city complied with all applicable regulations, noting that the only requirement is to publish the RFP in a newspaper of general circulation – the Newport News Times and the Daily Astorian are newspapers of general circulation in each

location. The city did comply with that requirement by publishing in both the Newport News Times and the Daily Astorian. It was also published in the Oregonian (which is also a newspaper of general circulation), the Seattle Times, and in a national trade publication, Air Transport World. It was also published on the city's website. Additionally, a hardcopy of the RFP was sent to several airlines, including Seaport Airlines. Firestone noted that Council is charged with deciding what is in the city's best interests – to move forward with the process, or reject all bids and do something else.

Firestone addressed the proposals and evaluations noting that the evaluation sheets are in the packet. He reported that each evaluator rated Cape Air significantly higher than Air Azul. He noted that Air Azul is simply not a realistic possibility, as it does not currently provide scheduled airline service anywhere. It has a possibility to provide one route in the southeastern U.S. Air Azul has one airplane that is currently used for charter services, and it does not have the aircraft or staff for this market. It does not have the resources to provide the requested service.

Firestone noted that he needed to modify the statement in his written memo, where it was written that all evaluators recommended awarding the contract to Cape Air. He noted that it is less than clear that some of the evaluators were recommending awarding a contract to Cape Air. He noted that it is important to discuss two items in detail. One is the cost item and the way it was listed on evaluation sheet; the lowest cost airline was to receive 25 points. He stated that he did not find Air Azul to be credible on this. Cape Air was the better of the two proposals because it was most realistic. It does not mean it is a good cost on an absolute basis; only on a relative basis. The Cape Air proposal suggests a subsidy of one million per year for two years. While the grants cover this amount, there will be other costs including those at PDX.

Firestone noted that it is also important to discuss the proposers' commitment to continuing service. He reviewed the evaluations. He reported that he had evaluated the two written proposals before the interview, and the score was not a passing grade. Based on the written proposals, he did not think that Cape Air had demonstrated this commitment. However, Cape Air did an excellent job in the interview in addressing its commitment to providing ongoing service in Oregon. He noted that he believes that Cape Air is committed to ongoing service, but he is concerned with the feasibility of ongoing service. Firestone reported that there is no set standard for a passing grade on the evaluations. One evaluator had significant doubts. It is something for Council to consider. It does not make sense to spend a lot of public money and not have the service continue after two years.

Firestone noted that most evaluators think the fares are too low for the airline to be profitable, and that they should be in the \$100 range. He noted that the fares are add-on fares. Even if through fares are published, the \$80 or \$100 is going to be added on to the fare to additional destinations. Cape Air lacks an interline agreement with Alaska and Horizon Airlines. A contract should be conditioned on an interline agreement with Alaska and Horizon Airlines. Cape Air, or other selected airline, needs to work with PDX to offer discounted fees for a year or some period of time.

There has been discussion of aircraft that Cape Air intends to use. Some discussion is subjective, some is objective. Cape Air plans to use the Cessna 402. Some of the cons are the age of the aircraft. The planes might have been manufactured in 1970, but they would have been maintained on a regular basis. They have to be airworthy.

Components with wear are replaced on a regular basis. Another issue is total payload. Cape Air responded that they have made FAA approved modifications to make sure its aircraft can carry a full load of passengers and bags. It is an improved aircraft. The size and configuration of the aircraft is an issue. It looks like a large private plane. Some of the pros are economic. The Cessna 402 costs less to operate than most nine passenger aircraft. The aircraft costs approximately \$300,000, while other similar-sized planes cost \$500,000 to \$1,000,000. The operating costs are lower than on several other aircraft that would fit this market. The Cessna 402 can be flown with one pilot. It is also a twin engine aircraft.

Firestone recommended that Council take public comment on this subject. He suggested that if Council awards a contract to Cape Air, they need to give serious thought to whether this is the right fit; whether it would work; and whether it would be here in two years.

Bain noted that he has been involved in the project from the beginning, and is a proponent of sustainable air service. He reported that he sat in during the interviews, but did not participate in the evaluation process. He noted that the City Council is under no obligation to make a decision at this meeting. He stated that Council could have others weigh in on the details, but that the goal is to provide a sustainable, commercial air service.

Henson reported that he went to airport this morning to view Seaport's landing. He noted that he has not read the newspaper reports on the RFP process, but that he did read something from Astoria. He noted that he participated when Cape Air came to Newport last year.

Firestone reported that he had met with Cape Air representatives once at PDX when Cape Air went to PDX to discuss security issues. He noted that he was present during parts of that meeting. He met with two representatives of Cape Air at that time, and mentioned that city would be going through a public process to award an airline contract. He reported that he was also present at a meeting in Portland where someone from Cape Air participated by phone to discuss the basics of providing service to PDX from Astoria and Newport. This discussion was mostly in the context of how any airline can provide service into PDX from Newport.

Bain reported that he had met members of Cape Air, and had met the principal of Seaport Air during his presentation at ODA.

Reno reported that he had nothing to add to what has been discussed. He noted that he wished the city had more proposals. He reported that he had met the principal from Seaport Airlines today. Bain asked Reno for a recommendation in respect to cost numbers and projections, and whether Reno thinks it would be helpful in the decision making process. Reno noted that because there is not a good competitive proposal along with the Cape Air proposal, the city does not have a barometer as to whether we are getting the best bang for our buck. Reno reported that Cape Air is pursuing the EAS contract in Pendleton. Reno suggested the city would need an agreement that defined parameters, including ticket prices.

Henson reported that he was talking to a person who said they were going to take ground transportation to Portland, and it cost \$400 one way. He noted that the numbers do concern him, although he does not want to rush into anything. He stated that he

appreciates what Reno said about competition. He noted that he does not think the city has two competitors.

Firestone noted that, of the seven evaluators, Council will have to look at the evaluations to determine whether they are solid evaluations.

Bain noted that the city needs to make sure this is a commercial airline model. He stated that he believes the vast majority of the market would not be commuters, but a connecting market to fly to other places. He noted that is the way the model has been structured. He urged Council to consider the matter thoroughly. He suggested that Council consider seeking help to analyze the proposals and make further recommendations. He recommended looking at the evaluations not as a recommendation to go forward; but which proposal to select, if we go forward.

Firestone noted that the city can negotiate with the best proposer, but can not change the basis of the proposal making it totally different.

Henson inquired as to whether a third option could be to reopen the process.

Firestone reported that a new RFP could be issued, and any previous proposer could stand on its proposal or submit a new proposal.

Bain noted that current proposers could be subject to someone sniping their proposal. If a new RFP was issued, the city would need to protect, or encourage current proposers, to participate a second time.

Firestone noted that he is concerned that someone could model themselves after the previous proposers and select areas in which they could be better.

Obtshka noted that he would like more proposers with an analysis by experts.

Bain inquired as to whether staff should be directed to find out what other questions should be asked in the process. He asked whether the city could refine the parameters of the program. He suggested that the city look at the RFP and find ways to improve it.

Obtshka stated that it is his preference to reopen the process.

Firestone noted that Council could reject all bids and start over. He suggested that staff could start with some advertising, although no national advertising, place the RFP on the city website, and send a hardcopy to various airlines. He noted that, realistically, this would take 30 – 45 days. He reported that the RFP was pretty comprehensive, but that it could be refined to require a better explanation as to how the proposer would ensure continued service after the subsidy runs out, and an indication that the proposer will be operating profitably at the conclusion of the subsidy.

Bain noted that a little more data in projecting costs over time, in addition to the proposers good business plan would be necessary to take the risk out at the end of two years.

Firestone suggested that public input should be sought on the subject. He suggested asking for as much detail as possible to show a successful, ongoing service.

Henson noted that he understands Bain's concern regarding the proposer's information being available. He noted that these are different airplanes. They have a different capacity, fuel burn, and cost factor.

Obtshka inquired as to whether the city should get a delivery confirmation and receipt if the process is reopened.

O'Neal noted that the process has been fair, but there is always room for improvement. He stated that air service is important to the overall economic development

of the city and region. He noted that it is a connector airline, and the right arrangement can improve jobs and the economy year round. He stated that it is all about economic development.

Michele Longo Eder, attorney for Seaport Airlines, a dba of Alaska Juneau Airlines, reported that her client is based out of Portland, and located next to Flight Craft. She thanked the people who came to the airport to see the Seaport aircraft and meet the CEO of Seaport Airlines, Kent Craford. She stated that the public perception needs to be that the bid process has been open and fair and that there was no predisposition in favor of an airline – mainly Cape Air. She reported that some of the preliminary grant documents only mentioned Cape Air, and that the public perception is that Cape Air was preferred. She added that the relationship of Cape Air to people in the Newport air community also shows a preference.

She noted that the second issue is if a public body is going to spend 4.5 million dollars of public money, it needs to determine which airline will not cut and run when the money runs out. She noted that there is a lot to learn about Cape Air, noting that it runs nine subsidized projects and 15 unsubsidized projects. She reported that Cape Air was unable to answer whether it would continue to operate after the subsidy.

She asked Council to reject the bids and reopen the bid process. She noted that Cape Air stated that it would not begin service until April of 2009, allowing time to reopen the process.

Eder reported that Seaport flies the Pilatus PC 12, a corporate plane that came into service in 1998.

Firestone noted that Seaport has not submitted a proposal, and this is not in the scope of the award. He stated that if it is in the best interest to not award, then do not award.

Council was polled on whether to hear further information regarding Seaport Airlines. Henson stated that he does not want to damage anyone's rights. Firestone noted that this is a question of relevance. Part of the decision is whether to award a contract based on submissions; was the process fair; is it in the best interest of the city; is there another viable airline out there. Bain inquired as to whether Eder could proceed by stating there is another airline that could provide service.

Eder noted that she could frame testimony in a more theoretical way rather than toward a specific airline. She agreed to refer to it as viable airline. She asked Council to reject the proposals and reissue the RFP. She suggested that Council might receive, if it rejected all current proposals and issued a new RFP, a proposal from a viable airline with nine-passenger aircraft, carrying two pilots, and the ability to carry a full load of baggage. She asked, "What is a load that it takes to approach profitability?" One might be an airline that is already constructed to carry passengers and freight that might also be ready to go, with a presence in Portland, with maintenance, baggage, ticket, online reservations, safety records, and staff in Portland.

Eder reported that there is not a good, competitive proposal to compare with Cape Air. She noted that Air Azul still does not have a certificate of financial security from the U.S. Department of Transportation. As it stands, the city is looking at a sole source bid for 4.5 million tax dollars. She thanked Council for being allowed to comment.

Henson inquired as to whether Cape Air is proposing to begin service in the tourist season of 2009. O'Neal noted that this is correct. Henson inquired as to the hurry.

O'Neal noted that his comments were intended for the Council to carefully consider the process.

Firestone noted that something like this will not happen overnight. If Council rejects all bids, there will be a period of time for the RFP to be revised and published, responses to be received, and the selection. It will take a couple of months. The selected airline will need time to ramp up. A fair bit of time is required. He asked how long it would take Seaport to submit a proposal.

Eder noted that Seaport could submit a proposal in less than four weeks from issue date of the RFP.

Bertuleit noted that both airlines have come up with a \$70 – \$80 one-way ticket price. He suggested that if he was bidding something, he would want to know how many seats it would take to break even.

Eder noted that Mark Sixel (airline consultant) advised not to start with bargain basement rates to bring people into the seats, noting that the break even point is closer to \$140 - \$150.

Bertuleit noted that certain airplanes cannot be flown for less than a certain cost per hour. Firestone noted that the price is not set and can be changed. It was noted that the airline should charge realistic prices up front, and the proposers should give us better details on their plan. Bertuleit noted that page 195 lays out Cape Air's operating expenses.

Eder noted that she cannot give specifics on cost. She stated that her focus today is to ask Council to reject the current bids and open up the RFP process, and ask each proposer to submit information relative to cost.

It was suggested that proposers be asked about their safety record and to provide documentation supporting it. Henson noted that neither Fedex nor UPS flew in today because of visibility, but the Seaport Airlines plane made it. Reno reported that the FAA had issued a notem that the ILS was not operational this morning.

Bertuleit stated that he does not want to reject everything tonight. He added that the city received two proposals, and one was not acceptable. He noted that he would like expert information. He noted that if Seaport's cost per hour is \$100 more, the airline can not be profitable.

Bain noted that when spending public dollars, we need to be mindful of whether we believe that this process will result in a sustained airline service. He suggested obtaining more information and moving forward from there. Henson noted that his concern is reliability. Bain suggested asking that Astoria run a parallel course.

Eder noted that it is not entirely clear what is being considered here.

Bain stated that before we can make a decision to reject all proposals, he believes we would do proposers a disservice not to run the numbers more intently. We could then make a reasoned decision that would hinge on the idea of rejecting all proposals, but we must proceed with caution and due diligence.

Eder inquired whether, in reference to running the numbers, it applies to Air Azul as well. Firestone noted that Council could decide not to consider Air Azul.

Henson suggested that the process is flawed, and that Council should reject all bids and start over.

Obtshka inquired as to what would happen if Newport and Astoria have different opinions. It was noted that the city would meet with the port and try to resolve the issue.

MOTION was made by Sabanskas, seconded by Obtshka, to reject all proposals, and initiate a new RFP process. Patrick stated that she read through all the information and thinks we followed the process completely, and that it was open to everyone. She stated that we have to rely on staff to do the right thing. She noted that she has heard all she needs to hear. She recommended going with Cape Air and instructing staff to get the best deal possible. Bertuleit noted that he is more in Patrick's camp, but would like to hear if Seaport has a better mousetrap. Patrick inquired as to whether the city has followed the guidelines for the RFP process. Firestone reported that we had. Patrick suggested the staff negotiate the best deal possible in the scope of the proposal. Sabanskas stated that she had questions as to whether Cape Air had met the criteria, and whether it is in the best interest of the city to try to get other airlines to step up to the plate. Patrick inquired as to whether Council is going to take this stance on all RFP's. Obtshka stated that he would like to see more competition. Henson stated that he wants what is best for the City of Newport, and that there appears to be sufficient evidence that there might be something out there. He recommended rejecting the proposals and starting over. Bain noted that he cannot support the idea of immediate rejection of all proposals. He stated that he would be satisfied if he had additional information understanding the sentiment of rejecting all proposals. He stated that he would oppose the motion because two weeks from now, he wants more information. Bain called for the vote. Voting aye were Obtshka, Sabanskas, and Henson. Voting no were Bertuleit, Patrick, and Bain. The motion failed.

MOTION was made by Bertuleit, seconded by Patrick, to request additional information from the staff and come back in two weeks. O'Neal inquired as to what specific information is being requested. Bain asked for the cost per hour and an analysis that would give us confidence that the service would still be there when the subsidy runs out, or there is sufficient evidence that it will not be there two years hence. Bertuleit noted that another component to that is if people fly in an airplane they like, it will fill more seats. It was noted that the staff could contact Cape Air for additional information. Henson noted that every point that was brought up is the reason he believes this process was flawed. O'Neal noted that as we start the analysis, additional items may be revealed. Firestone noted that he is concerned about Cape Air's financial information becoming available to competitors. There was no further discussion. Voting aye in voice vote were Patrick, Bertuleit, and Bain. Voting no were Obtshka, Henson, and Sabanskas. The motion failed.

It was noted that Council could spend more time looking at the issue; continue to discuss it tonight; recess the meeting; get a report on Astoria's position; and rethink the matter from there. Henson noted that Council will be interviewing prospective people for the Council vacancy at the first meeting in September, and he suggested settling the matter tonight. He noted that this would protect Cape Air as well as another viable airline. Obtshka recommended more competition. Firestone noted that Seaport asked to be sent an RFP, and one was sent, but they apparently did not get it. He inquired as to whether we could have done more, and noted that yes, and that is almost always true.

Bain declared an impasse noting that Council would take this matter up again at the next Council meeting. It will be on the agenda as a discussion item at 6:00 P.M., and an action item at 7:00 P.M.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Having no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:20 P.M.

---

Margaret M. Hawker, City Recorder

---

William D. Bain, Mayor