

MINUTES
Troutdale City Council – Regular Meeting
Troutdale City Hall – Council Chambers
104 SE Kibling Avenue
Troutdale, OR 97060-2099

Tuesday, July 22, 2008

1. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE, ROLL CALL, AGENDA UPDATE

Mayor Thalhofer called the meeting to order at 7:00pm.

PRESENT: Mayor Thalhofer, Councilor Kight, Councilor Ripma, Councilor Canfield and Councilor Kyle.

ABSENT: Councilor Thomas (excused) and Councilor Daoust (excused).

STAFF: John Anderson, City Administrator; Rich Faith, Community Development Director; David Nelson, Chief of Police; Debbie Stickney, City Recorder; and David Ross, City Attorney.

GUESTS: Mike Kreipe, Linda Kreipe and Steven Gothro.

Mayor Thalhofer asked are there any agenda updates?

John Anderson replied we would like to postpone Agenda Item #5 regarding establishing a Troutdale Graffiti ordinance.

2. CONSENT AGENDA:

- 2.1 ACCEPT MINUTES:** June 24, 2008 Regular Meeting and July 8, 2008 Work Session.
- 2.2 RESOLUTION:** A resolution accepting a perpetual, nonexclusive storm drainage easement across the Edgefield District Subdivision from Red Shed Properties LLC and Reynolds School District #7.
- 2.3 RESOLUTION:** A resolution accepting perpetual exclusive easements from Caswell Properties, LLC and Handy Investment Group, Inc. for the Troutdale Centennial Arch Monument.
- 2.4 RESOLUTION:** A resolution approving an Intergovernmental Agreement with Multnomah County for Inmate Work Crew.
- 2.5 RESOLUTION:** A resolution recognizing the completion of the public improvements associated with the Troutdale Airport Storage Commercial Development and accepting them into the City's Fixed Asset System.

MOTION: Councilor Kight moved to adopt the Consent Agenda. Seconded by Councilor Canfield. Motion Passed Unanimously.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT: Please restrict comments to non-agenda items at this time.

Mike Kreipe, resident on Jackson Park Road, stated I had to leave my house on Saturday morning around 10am and I tried to make it back before 11am because I knew the streets would be closed by that time for the SummerFest parade. I guess I was just a few minutes late and they had just pulled the barricade across the street and the officer said the street is closed because the parade is coming. I explained to the officer that I just live on Jackson Park Road and no one is coming yet and I have a bad knee so it would be difficult for me to walk home. The officer obviously wasn't going to do anything for me so I parked my car on the side of the street and I realized I really didn't want to walk that half mile back to my house. I continued to talk to the officer explaining that no one was coming yet and asked if he could help me. That discussion continued for 5 to 10 minutes and still no one was coming. One or two police vehicles went through that point and they continued down towards my house and I thought why couldn't one of them escort me home. Then the officer said he would call Lieutenant Pat (he didn't recall the last name). He came in a few minutes and still there was no one coming down the street and he said that we can't let you go, there is a parade coming. I said to him that there is nobody coming down the street; I have been standing here for 10 minutes and I could have easily gotten home. He still said that we can't let you go because the parade is coming. I asked for their names and said I would be talking to the City Council. I ended up walking home. The issue here is that I was really amazed that the police were not at all interested in helping me out. When I walked down the road to Jackson Park Road and looked up the highway there was still nobody coming and that was probably 12 to 15 minutes later. If I had been mobile I wouldn't have had a problem walking home but it is getting to the point where I can't do that now. Mostly, I am just amazed at the police officer's total disregard for people in that area, especially one that is not very mobile. I would like to ask the City Council to direct the police department to have some regard for the people who are locked in that area and make every possible consideration to get them home, especially if they are not very mobile. If that can't be done, or if that can't be changed, I guess I am also asking the Council to have the parade down another street in Troutdale. I am unhappy with our police department and I am amazed that they couldn't help me at all.

Mayor Thalhoffer stated the Chief of Police is here tonight and he is taking notes and our City Administrator has also heard your comments. I am sure that they will be discussing this and will be in contact with you.

Stephen Gothro stated I have sent a letter requesting to have a temporary waiver granted on the alcohol ban at the Sam Cox Building for my wedding ceremony and reception on August 8th. I would like to have a controlled serving of alcohol for this small party that we have planned. I understand this goes against the baseline of your ordinance but during SummerFest this last weekend there was a vendor serving alcohol in a beer garden, so I know that there are variances that can be made. There will be an off-duty City of Portland Police Officer in attendance. There will be a relatively small group of 30 to 45 people, adults and children both. Having reviewed the liability waiver that I had to sign to rent the building, I thought that was pretty much a global protection for your responsibility as a city for anything

that should happen. I don't plan on anything happening, in fact my best friend is a very well decorated Navy Seal of 26 years and he is pretty good at stopping problems. I would like to have the Council make a decision between now and August 8th for a waiver for a short period of time, not the entire six hours, but perhaps from 8pm to 10pm. We can control it if there are boundary conditions, such as was demonstrated on Saturday of a restricted beer garden type area for the adults.

Mayor Thalhoffer asked Mr. Ross, have you checked out our regulations on this at all?

David Ross replied no.

Mayor Thalhoffer stated we had allowed alcohol for many years, but now we just have a blanket prohibition. If the Council wants to discuss this issue now we can.

Councilor Kight stated we had a very long discussion on this subject. I am not comfortable opening up this discussion again at this point. Part of that is because if we make an exception for you then other people are going to want the same exception.

Councilor Ripma stated we had a lot of trouble with alcohol from groups that were no larger than yours. I am totally in favor of the rule we adopted. We did this for very good reasons and we had a very long debate about this. I am very sorry.

Mayor Thalhoffer stated this is one of those cases that makes this very difficult, and I am very sorry that we can not accommodate you.

Councilor Canfield stated we did debate this a long time and we came to a conclusion that alcohol and that park were just not a good mix. I don't wish to re-open this discussion.

Councilor Kyle stated this was a two year discussion and I don't want to open this back up either, but we can show you pictures of why we made this decision.

4. MOTION: A motion extending an offer to the selected candidate for the position of City Administrator and directing staff to negotiate a contract for Council's adoption.

David Ross, City Attorney, stated pursuant to Council's informal consensus and direction from the last meeting, we have had preliminary discussions with the number one candidate for the position. We have discussed some parameters for contract negotiations and we are on our way to further discussions and negotiations. We are here tonight so the Council can formally extend an offer to that candidate so that we can continue the negotiations and discussions and hopefully bring forward a contract to you at the next meeting.

MOTION: Councilor Ripma moved to extend an offer to the selected candidate, David Nelson, for the position of City Administrator and directed staff to negotiate a contract for Council's adoption. Seconded by Councilor Kight.

Councilor Ripma stated we did have an executive session where we met the candidates. David Nelson, our Chief of Police, was one of several in-house candidates who we interviewed and the consensus was reached. This is now the time to extend a formal offer and further the negotiations. I hope they are successful.

Councilor Kight stated I agree with Councilor Ripma.

Mayor Thalhofer stated as do I.

Councilor Canfield stated I will support the motion.

Councilor Kyle stated I will support the motion.

VOTE: Councilor Kight – Yes; Councilor Ripma – Yes; Mayor Thalhofer – Yes; Councilor Canfield – Yes; Councilor Kyle – Yes.

Motion Passed 5 – 0.

5. PUBLIC HEARING / ORDINANCE: An ordinance establishing the Troutdale Graffiti Ordinance, Section 8.34 of the Troutdale Municipal Code.

This item was pulled from the agenda.

6. PUBLIC HEARING / ORDINANCE: A ordinance amending Chapters 3, 5, 7, and 8 of the Troutdale Development Code pertaining to Industrial Zoning Districts, Stormwater Management, and Public Utilities.

Mayor Thalhofer read the ordinance title and opened the public hearing at 7:30pm.

Rich Faith, Community Development Director, stated this evening we are presenting amendments to the Troutdale Development Code (TDC) (Text Amendment #39). These amendments affect our Industrial Zoning District which includes the Industrial Park, Light Industrial and the General Industrial Zones. They also affect the stormwater management standards and they pertain to public utilities in the way of procedures, standards and provisions dealing with utility undergrounding. The industrial zoning amendments are brought to you primarily to comply with the requirements of the Metro Functional Plan, specifically Title 4. That particular title of the Metro Plan is identified as Industrial and Other Employment Areas and applies throughout the Metro area. Most of the lands in the Metro area that are impacted or affected by Title 4 are zoned industrial. It may apply to other employment lands such as commercial but in our particular jurisdiction it deals only with those that are zoned industrial. These amendments will bring us into compliance by limiting the amount and size of certain non-industrial activities such as retail and office uses within our industrial zones. The industrial zones were last amended in 2002 to meet requirements of Title 4. At that time we were required, as were other jurisdictions around the Metro area, to amend our code to prohibit big box retail within our industrial districts. We amended our code

at that time to prohibit any retail use in excess of 60,000 square feet. These proposed changes, now through Title 4, are brought about because of the amendments that occurred in 2004 which basically takes those restrictions a step further. It is not just simply prohibiting big box retail, but now the purpose and intent of Title 4, and of these amendments, is to further restrict non-industrial type uses in our industrial districts in order to reserve and protect those lands for more industrial type uses. Jurisdictions within the Metro area were required to meet or comply with Title 4 by amending their land use regulations. These amendments have been reviewed by Metro staff and have been found to comply with Title 4. We did receive a letter from Metro to that affect. We have approximately 1,500 acres within the city that are zoned in one of the three industrial classifications. Currently we have about 550 acres of vacant buildable land remaining within our industrial zones.

Rich Faith explained the proposed amendments, which are being regulated by Title 4. **Industrial Park Zone (IP):** In the Industrial Park Zone professional offices, business parks, restaurants, retail, wholesale, discount sales and service, banks, and medical/dental clinics are listed as either permitted or conditional uses. These are the specific uses in this district that are regulated by Title 4 and are going to be subject to the following restrictions: These uses cannot exceed a gross floor area of 5,000 square feet; multiple businesses in the same development project cannot exceed 20,000 square feet of gross floor area; and lot area standards have been added for land divisions for lots or parcels larger than 50 acres in size. What these standards allow is that if there is a lot or parcel that is currently 50 acres or smaller in size, it may be divided into any number of smaller lots; there are really no restrictions in terms of the number of lots that you create or the size of those lots. However, in hope of trying to set aside some larger blocks of property it does kick in if we are dealing with a parcel that is more than 50 acres in size. If you are subdividing or partitioning a lot that is greater than 50 acres in size then it may be divided into smaller lots as long as the resulting division yields at least one lot of at least 50 acres in size. These standards are going to carry through in our other two zones as well. With respect to the IP Zone, we have only one track of land in the entire city that is zoned Industrial Park and that is the back forty of the Mt. Hood Community College Campus. **Light Industrial District (LI):** In the LI zone professional offices, medical/dental clinics, restaurants, banks, retail, wholesale, and discount sales and service are either permitted outright or are conditional uses. These particular uses are going to be subject to the size restrictions as mentioned under the IP zone (5,000 square feet for an individual business or 20,000 square feet for multiple businesses that are part of the same development project or within the same building). The lot area restrictions mentioned in the IP zone also apply within this zoning district.

Mayor Thalhoffer asked is the Pig Farm property zoned LI?

Rich Faith replied that is correct. **General Industrial Zone (GI):** The GI zone is our most restrictive of the three industrial zones. We have the same uses as listed in the LI zone and they are also going to be restricted. One qualifier about the GI zone is that the commercial uses are only allowed within industrial flex-space buildings. We already had a built-in restriction but, in compliance with Title 4, we will be amending that restriction based on the size limitations in Title 4. The same lot area standards will also apply in the GI zone.

Rich Faith stated since our public hearing at the Planning Commission it came to my attention that there are some inconsistencies amongst these three industrial zones in terms of how we call out the size limitation standard. In the IP and the LI zones we refer to gross floor area in terms of the 5,000 square foot restriction and the 20,000 square foot restriction. In the GI zone we use the term gross leasable area. I felt that we should be consistent in all three zones so that there is no confusion about what that means and how it is applied. I felt that the term gross leasable area, which is the one we currently use in the GI zone works well and meets our needs. I am recommending that we modify the language in the LI and IP zones to speak to gross leasable area.

TDC 5.800 - Stormwater Management: The amendments to the Stormwater Management chapter are being proposed by the Public Works Department and are mostly housekeeping in nature. These amendments address three things: 1) they update certain citations within the chapter that reference documents that the Public Works Department uses in the administration of stormwater management standards; 2) they improve and clarify existing language; and 3) they improve the order and structure of the chapter. In these amendments we do have two new subsections that we are proposing. Section 5.840(i) will require the developer to be responsible for accommodating upstream drainage that drains across the property. From experience we are finding that drainage is becoming more and more an issue particularly when we are talking about developments on sloped areas. Concurrent with that is a new provision, Section 8.840(j), which places responsibility on the developer for obtaining a downstream drainage analysis when necessary to determine if runoff will overload an existing drainage facility.

TDC5.1100 – Public Improvements: This is a new chapter to establish clear procedures and standards for the installation of public improvements (public streets, water, sewer and stormwater). Those are the improvements not associated with land divisions. Most typically these public improvements occur in conjunction with a subdivision. However, there are also public improvements that can occur when we have a development on an un-platted piece of property that may be deficient in some particular utility and it becomes necessary for them to extend a public utility line to that property in order to serve it. We currently have a gap in our Code in that we have in the land division all of these standards and procedures dealing with public improvements for a land division, but we have nothing in the code that deals with improvements that are not part of a land division and so this addition is intended to fill that gap. This chapter will establish the procedures and standards for public improvements for any public improvement valued at \$10,000 or more when not part of a land division.

TDC 7.000 – Land Division: These amendments are limited to Section 7.180, which is our design requirements and they update and clarify what utilities are required to be undergrounded. We have updated the list of utilities that are subject to this chapter and these requirements, not only the city utilities like water and sewer, but we have mentioned things like natural gas, electric power and telecommunications facilities. All of those are required to be undergrounded and we wanted to be very clear about that. There is a new section being added that states that undergrounding is applicable to installation of new utilities and converting any existing overhead utilities when a subdivision is built. This particular language is being added for consistency with what is already in our Municipal Code in Chapter 12.11. Finally in this chapter we are addressing the front yard utility easement. Currently the code calls out a 5' wide front yard utility easement and Public Works has asked that this be expanded to 6' in order to accommodate all of the different utilities that go into that.

TDC Chapter 8.000 – Site Orientation and Design Review Standards: For consistency with

other provisions in the code dealing with utility undergrounding language in Chapter 7, the new language in Chapter 8 will also require utility undergrounding to apply to projects that are not done as part of a land division and therefore subject to Chapter 7, but would be done under site and design and subject to the standards of Chapter 8. Some developments occur on un-platted lots and are not going to be subject to the land division chapter so it is necessary to repeat the undergrounding requirements that are in Chapter 7 so that they will also apply to development projects that go through the site and design review process.

Rich Faith stated the TDC calls out certain criteria that must be addressed in the approval of any text amendments to the code. I have addressed this in my written staff report and have made findings that these criteria are met. Because the amendments to the industrial zoning district will limit or prohibit uses that were previously allowed, this triggers the requirement for what we know as the Measure 56 Notification to affected property owners. In compliance with the Measure 56 requirements we did provide notice to all property owners within the industrial zones back in May prior to the Planning Commission hearing. These amendments were taken through the Citizens Advisory Committee at their February and April meetings and they supported these amendments and forwarded them on to the Planning Commission for their approval. The Planning Commission held their public hearing on June 18th where they took public testimony and made their findings and recommendation, which is that the Council adopt these proposed amendments.

Councilor Kight asked what is the difference between gross floor area versus leasable gross floor area?

Rich Faith replied gross floor area means everything within the walls. That could include closet space, hallways, restrooms; everything within the exterior walls is gross floor area. The issue of gross leasable floor area was raised by the Port of Portland because of their concern about the Terminal Building at the airport and the 20,000 square foot maximum that is being imposed for multiple businesses that fall under these categories. They were concerned that by going to gross area they might run into some problems. They actually shared with me a sample of their lease agreements and they call out the square footage; they outline the actual rooms and actual square footage of what is being leased and it excludes things like the elevator, community restrooms, and hallways. That minimizes the area that would be subject to these size restrictions and so they thought it was an important point. I thought they made a valid point so we are dealing with only what shows up in the lease agreement. If you had someone who built a 10,000 square foot building and they lease the entire building for use, then obviously we would be looking at that entire floor area. In that case gross and leasable floor area would likely be the same. In a building like the airport Terminal Building, leasable space is very distinct from the gross area.

Councilor Kight asked do you see anything in here that would impinge, in a negative way, the Reynolds Metal site that is going to be developed by the Port of Portland?

Rich Faith replied not in terms of what I know is planned to be built now. The FedEx project is not subject to these restrictions. It does not fall under these categories.

Councilor Kight asked do you see anything that could impact our urban renewal area?

Rich Faith replied no, that does not fall under the industrial zoning and is not affected at all by these changes.

Councilor Kight stated in Exhibit C (page 8) testimony given by Tom Bouillion from the Port of Portland reads, "One could have an industrial subdivision in which each lot has to be developed separately and go to site/design review, but he said he would see that industrial subdivision as one development project, and he gave a few examples." Apparently you agreed with him on that point.

Rich Faith replied yes, that is my response to him. There was a question about how I would interpret single development projects and my interpretation is that a single development project could in fact be a full subdivision. In the Industrial Zone we have the I-84 Corporate Center and we have Spectro subdivision. The I-84 Corporate Center is a 12-lot subdivision and in my view that is one development project. There may be twelve individual lots each of which can be developed separately, but it is one development project that has an identity and a name, as does Spectro subdivision. When we talk about these size limitations like 20,000 square feet cumulative within the same development project, I would be applying that to any and all uses that go into a single commercial or industrial subdivision like Spectro subdivision or I-84 Corporate Center.

Councilor Kight stated if Spectro subdivision only developed half of that, what if the next developer came in and said he wanted 20,000 so you would have a cumulative of 40,000 between the two projects.

Rich Faith replied you wouldn't be able to do the second 20,000.

Councilor Kight stated so because of that particular parcel, even though it wasn't platted as one subdivision...

Rich Faith stated no, by definition if it is within Spectro subdivision and the original developer sells lots to other people, they are still lots within that development project and so that rule applies to all of the lots within that development.

Councilor Kight stated lets say he didn't develop the whole piece and he only bought half of that parcel of property, what if someone else develops the rest of the property and they wanted to add another 20,000 square feet of retail.

Rich Faith replied they can't. Once you have reached 20,000 square feet...

Councilor Kight asked even if it is separate owners?

Rich Faith replied that is correct.

Councilor Kight stated you talk about the developers having to accommodate for upstream runoff. If you have a parcel of property that is undeveloped and the property being developed is at a lower level and you have runoff from that upper piece of property, are you saying that not only does the developer have to be concerned about his own piece of property, but also the runoff from the property that is adjacent to his.

Rich Faith replied that is correct. When you plan and design your stormwater facilities, in terms of conveyance of stormwater from your site, and you have upstream drainage that has historically come across this property, by Oregon law you must allow that to continue to go across there. This is saying that you need to make sure that you size your culverts adequately not only to handle your own runoff from your property but from upstream areas as well that have historically run across the property.

Councilor Kight asked without going onto the adjacent property?

Rich Faith replied you are not allowed to go onto the adjacent property but you are going to be receiving that drainage and you have to anticipate that in your design.

Councilor Kight asked if that property were to develop later would there be any reimbursement from the other property owner?

Rich Faith replied that is not factored into this.

Councilor Kyle stated you can see where that could be a problem.

Rich Faith stated I think that if the property upstream develops they have to do an analysis as well and if the calculations show that they are going to create problems downstream because they can't adequately handle it then they will have to provide for storage and detention so that it can be released at a slower rate so that it does not impact the properties downstream. That is all taken into consideration when they do the stormwater calculations.

Councilor Ripma asked how many 50-acre parcels do we have?

Rich Faith replied we currently have two, but they are both several hundred acres.

Councilor Ripma stated those are north of the airport.

Rich Faith replied yes.

Councilor Ripma asked the Port, other than the limited comment at the Planning Commission, is not very objective to this?

Rich Faith replied their concerns were addressed at the Planning Commission level and have been incorporated into these amendments and they are now satisfied with the amendments as written.

Councilor Ripma stated I am worried about why professional offices are lumped in with retail. Metro has their theories about why they want everyone to do this. It seems like one of the things was to prevent large professional office buildings to “waste” industrial lands. They don’t seem the same to me. Retail is what creates all of the traffic and professional offices are high providers of employment. Did that receive any discussion?

Rich Faith replied not during the hearings on these amendments but my recollection, when this came up at Metro, was that the other piece to what they are trying to accomplish is to not only protect the industrial lands for industrial type uses but to also have the professional and retail uses locate in centers and areas where there is likely to be more transit service.

Councilor Ripma stated I take it that the guidelines that Metro has provided includes professional offices as falling under these restrictions; we are not just doing this voluntarily.

Rich Faith replied that is exactly why we are addressing this. Only those things that are specifically called out in Title 4 have been isolated under our code for this special treatment.

Councilor Ripma stated Lake Oswego’s Kruse Way is one of the most successful developments in the entire Metro area and it is being prohibited by these rules. We couldn’t have a Kruse Way in Troutdale even if we were lucky enough to get one. It doesn’t affect Lake Oswego’s Kruse Way because it is already there. It bugs me. What was so bad about Kruse Way. It violated all of the “Metro planning dreams” for some reason and it is the most successful and sought after place for folks to locate their professional offices. There is a disconnect somewhere in the thinking of the dreamers/planners who are trying to tell us how to live and they are missing out on what people actually want to do. I think an opportunity is lost by adopting rules that prohibit a Kruse Way from happening in Troutdale. I recognize that we are being forced to adopt these rules. Regarding the utility undergrounding; do these changes take care of the issue of whether a new service that is being installed, such as the fiber optic cable, having to be undergrounded even where existing utilities are above ground? That was an issue with Verizon and I wonder if that got addressed.

Rich Faith replied I honestly don’t know the answer to that.

Councilor Ripma stated it didn’t seem to be addressed. I don’t want to address it tonight.

Mayor Thalhoffer stated isn’t it true Mr. Faith that throughout the whole Metro area general industrial land especially is being jealously guarded so that we will have enough to accommodate the needs as they come about. There is a shortage of industrial land throughout the Metro area and it is going to get shorter and shorter if we put office buildings and Kruse Ways on them. We need industrial lands for industrial jobs.

Rich Faith replied that is clearly one of the goals of these Title 4 amendments.

Councilor Canfield stated I share Councilor Ripma’s concerns about Metro’s thinking that every municipality in the region fits the one size fits all dream of the highest and best use of land. That Kruse Way development is much preferable to any sort of industrial land and it is

unfortunate now that we won't have that opportunity. Again that shows how out of touch Metro is with the marketplace and with localities like the City of Troutdale who would much prefer to decide what to do with our lands.

Mayor Thalhoffer closed the public hearing at 8:15pm.

Rich Faith stated the second hearing on this ordinance will be held on August 26, 2008.

7. DISCUSSION: A discussion and action regarding the League of Oregon Cities (LOC) Revamped Policy Process for the 2009 Legislative Session.

John Anderson stated the League of Oregon Cities has established a new policy for setting legislative policy for the 2009 Legislative Session. The League received reports from the various standing committees of the League regarding proposed specific legislative actions. Those recommendations are shown in Exhibit A of my staff report (attached as Exhibit A to these minutes). They are asking each of the Cities to discuss those and to pick their four top policies priorities for the 2009 Legislative Session. Members of the Management Team have reviewed these and have selected their top four (Exhibit B of staff report).

Councilor Kight selected policies C, I, O and K.

Councilor Ripma selected policies I, C, J and K.

Mayor Thalhoffer selected policies I, Q, X and S.

Councilor Canfield selected polices C, I, Q and S

Councilor Kyle selected polices C, E, K and S.

John Anderson stated that the four top policies identified by the Council were: **C** – Initiate legislation to ensure that cities may collect franchise fees from all electricity providers that utilize city owned rights-of-way; **I** – Work towards an ethics policy that protects the interest of the public but is clearly understood by all and does not intrude into the private lives of Oregon's city leaders; **K** – Work with other stakeholders to pass legislation to make it more difficult for thieves to profit from metal theft; and **S** – Support a city transportation package for preservation funding shortfall.

8. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS

None.

9. COUNCIL COMMUNICATIONS

Councilor Canfield stated I have to backtrack. Previously I stated that the Corbett parade was the best parade, but after seeing Saturday's SummerFest parade I take back my words;

that was definitely the best parade I have ever witnessed. Many thanks to John Wilson and the folks at the West Columbia Gorge Chamber of Commerce.

10. ADJOURNMENT:

MOTION: Councilor Ripma moved to adjourn. Seconded by Councilor Kight. Motion passed unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 8:30pm.

Paul Thalhofer, Mayor

Approved August 12, 2008

ATTEST:

Debbie Stickney, City Recorder