

MINUTES
TROUTDALE CITY COUNCIL - REGULAR MEETING
TROUTDALE CITY HALL
104 SE KIBLING AVENUE
TROUTDALE, OR 97060-2099

7:00 P.M. -- MARCH 12, 1991

ITEM #1: PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE, ROLL CALL, AGENDA UPDATE

Mayor Cox called on Councilor to lead the pledge of allegiance.

City Recorder, Valerie Raglione, called the roll.

PRESENT: Bui, Cox, Fowler, Jacobs, Schmunk [7:10], Thalhofer [7:10], Thompson

STAFF: Christian, Cline, Farr, Gazewood, Raglione, Wilder

PRESS: Web Ruble, Oregonian
Dave Pinson, Outlook

GUESTS: James Wakeman, Sally Wakeman, Kris DeSylvia, Joanna Moyer, Ron Opitz, Ralph Tahran, Michael Zitek, Paul Rodgers, Connie Register, Robin Garey, Mathew Abraham, E. Teddersen, Doris Bourne, Mike Bourne, Pieter Van Dyke, Maynard Link, Frances Pino, Stan Sumich, Victoria Zander, Tyree Zander, Mark Jacobs

Mayor Cox asked City Administrator Christian if there were any agenda updates. There were none.

ITEM #2: CONSENT AGENDA

Mayor Cox called this agenda item.

MOTION: Councilor Bui moved to approve the consent agenda as written [2.1 - City Council Minutes 2/26/91; 2.2 - Business License Report Month of February; 2.3 Bills Month of February]. Councilor Thalhofer seconded the motion.

YEAS: 5
NAYS: 5
ABSTAINED: 0

Bui - Yea; Fowler - Yea; Jacobs - Yea; Schmunk - Yea; Thalhofer - Yea; Thompson - Yea

ITEM #3: PUBLIC COMMENT

Mayor Cox called for public comment on non-agenda items.

Kris DeSylvia, 1371 SW McGinnis, Troutdale asked Council to consider an amendment to 565-0 An ordinance passed which Created an Urban Renewal Agency. She stated that she had begun a referendum process on this issue. She understood the pro's and con's of an Urban Renewal Agency and asked Council if they would consider amending it to restrict it by not encompassing the County Farm Property. DeSylvia stated that the City could lose a lot if the opportunity to lose the downtown districts resulted from it going to the voters.

ITEM #4: ORDINANCE: Granting a Non-Exclusive Gas Utility franchise to Northwest Natural Gas Company, and Fixing Terms, Conditions and Compensation of Such Franchise. Second Reading (567-0) Tape 1, Side 1 3:25

Mayor Cox called this agenda item and read the ordinance by title.

Christian stated that the first reading of this ordinance had been at the 2/26/91 meeting. At that time Council raised concerns regarding increasing the franchise fee. After further research which included the Oregon Administrative Rules and discussions with PUC representative, it was confirmed that any additional charges over 3% would appear as a surcharge on customer billings.

Options were to assess the 5% with 2% showing up as a surcharge by the City of Troutdale; or 2) go back to original 3% [cost of doing business in the rate].

Christian stated her support of 10 year franchise was in part due to the changes in circumstances with bills before the legislature that would allow counties to charge franchise fees - to date, they haven't been allowed to charge fees. That could seriously change the rate setting process.

Christian stated that her recommendation would now be to approve the franchise renewal for 10 years, as presented and approve the franchise renewal fee of 3%.

Councilor Bui stated Councilor Fowler had previously asked how many cities go beyond the 3% franchise fee, he again was asking that question.

Christian stated that there were some that were considering it. The PUC representative stated there had been a rash of calls over the past few weeks regarding the process and how it would show up on customer bills. The additional revenue, profit, that utility companies would be enjoying since the property taxes have been limited to \$10/1,000. However, he stated that there were considerable cities/counties that were under the \$10 limit and they all get averaged in for the entire state. The PUC looks at the average state-wide. It could be as little as 1/4% up 3% in specific regions in the state. The PUC would be looking at that but not until the hearings in July.

Councilor Thompson asked if the ten year franchise was granted at 3% - was the City locked into that if the PUC allowed something of a greater rate, the City couldn't prevent it - Christian unless they would agreed to open up the franchise.

Councilor Thompson asked if the fee was 5% and the additional 2% showed up as a surcharge for City of Troutdale, that wouldn't constitute a tax would it?

Christian stated no. Franchise fees were actually a rental/leasing payment to the cities for using public-right-of-way that the cities actually own - a fee for service in effect.

Councilor Thompson asked if there was any plan to give rebates to cities in regard to property tax savings that they would realize from passage of Measure #5?

Christian stated not to her knowledge, according to the PUC there is no proposal. However, the PUC stated that in recognizing the windfall, they will recognize the event in review of the new rate. If it is an insignificant amount [average over the state] they could be required to establish a special account or fund to set aside monies to be considered when they address future requests to the PUC. There was no willingness to commit but they would recognize the additional revenue.

Councilor Thompson asked if the City collected property taxes for Northwest Natural Gas?

Christian stated not to her knowledge, they didn't have any owned property by the company in the City of Troutdale.

Councilor Bui asked if the ordinance was passed at 3%, could it later be raised based on the PUC findings?

Christian stated there was nothing to stop re-opening it if mutually agreed to do so.

Councilor Bui stated that a 2% increase on the bills was unfair.

Mayor Cox read the ordinance by title.

MOTION: Councilor Bui moved to pass the ordinance with a change setting the franchise fee at 3% rather than 5%. Councilor Jacobs seconded the motion.

YEAS: 5

NAYS: 0

ABSTAINED: 0

Bui - Yea; Jacobs - Yea; Schmunk - Yea; Thalhofer - Yea; Thompson - Yea

ITEM #5: RESOLUTION: Authorizing the Award of a Construction Contract for the Purpose of Road Reconstruction -- Sweetbriar Lane Reconstruction - Phase II (880-R) (Tape 1, Side 1 16:550)

Mayor Cox called this agenda item and read the resolution by title.

Wilder stated there were two bid options presented 1- full depth asphalt and 2) traditional asphalt and rock base. The different options were chosen due to the unusual subsurface conditions and the potential savings that one method may have over another.

Bids were opened on March 11 at 1:00 p.m. with the apparent low bid from Parker Northwest Paving of Oregon City - \$140,175. There were 5 bids received and ranged to \$178,741.57.

MOTION: Councilor Thompson moved to award the bid to Parker Northwest Paving in the amount of \$140,175.00 Councilor Bui seconded the motion.

YEAS: 5

NAYS: 0

ABSTAINED: 0

Bui - Yea; Jacobs - Yea; Schmunk - Yea; Thalhofer - Yea; Thompson - Yea

ITEM #6: RESOLUTION: Authorizing the Award of a Construction Contract for the Purpose of Extending and Looping Water Services -- Halsey Street (881-R)

Mayor Cox called this agenda item and read the resolution by title.

Wilder stated that bids were opened on March 11 at 2:00 p.m. 7 bids were received which ranged from \$38,518 to \$69,815. Colt Construction of Troutdale, Oregon was the low bid at \$38,518. Staff and the consulting engineer recommended that the project be awarded to Colt Construction.

MOTION: Councilor Bui moved to award the bid to Colt Construction for \$38,518 and authorize the Mayor to execute the contract. Councilor Thompson seconded the motion.

YEAS: 5

NAYS: 0

ABSTAINED: 0

Bui - Yea; Jacobs - Yea; Schmunk - Yea; Thalhofer - Yea; Thompson - Yea

ITEM #7: RESOLUTION: Accepting Storm Sewer Easement/Mountain Vista Subdivision [LID91-002]

Mayor Cox called this agenda item and read the resolution by title.

Wilder stated the purpose was accepting utility and access easements. One for a temporary easement for construction of a storm water facility and the permanent easement allows for maintenance, repairs... of a public storm sewer system after construction. The easements abut the Mountain Vista

subdivision and were necessary to provide storm drainage facilities to that subdivision. Dedication by the property owner was included in Council materials.

MOTION: Councilor Thompson moved to adopt the resolutions as written. Councilor Thalhofer seconded the motion.

YEAS: 5

NAYS: 0

ABSTAINED: 0

Bui - Yea; Jacobs - Yea; Schmunk - Yea; Thalhofer - Yea; Thompson - Yea

RECESS: Mayor Cox called a 5 minute recess.

ITEM #8: PUBLIC HEARING: RESOLUTION Adopting Findings of Fact and Granting Approval of a Tentative Plan and Program for a 248 Unit Planned Development. Tape 1, Side 1 22:00

- .1 Public Hearing Opened: Mayor Cox opened the public hearing at 7:30 p.m.
- .2 Declarations, Challenges, Ex Parte Contact: Councilor Thalhofer stated he had a conflict of interest and removed himself from the bench.
- .3 Summation by Staff: Cline gave background information. The Planning Commission recommended approval and this was now before Council. The PD [Planned Development] through the Development Code was an overlay zoning district which permits different types of housing units - a mixture of land uses over and above what the underlying zoning would allow. There are certain restrictions and conditions which can be placed on the development if Planning Commission or Council deem necessary. Cline gave further comment outlining process.

Cline stated that after a public hearing on the application before the City Council, Council may approve the request by resolution as recommended by Planning Commission; modify the conditions for approval as recommended by the Commission; or may deny the request.

- .4 Public Testimony: Proponents [Tape 1, Side 2 17:00]

Ralph Tahran, 17355 Boones Fy. Rd., Lake Oswego, OR. Project Architect - OTAK Architects Incorporated., representing Norris Development. Staff had outlined project. He stated that the density wasn't the reason for going through the process, the reason was for the flexibility a PD allowed in housing developments. It was found that there was an extremely low vacancy rate in Troutdale and was very unlike multi family choices. There were 60'/50'/100' setbacks between buildings.

Tahran stated that staff had made them aware of the sensitivity of the area from the beginning in that there were single family neighbors and two family dwellings on two sides of the proposed development. In doing a single family development the lots

would be 7,000-8,000-10,000 with predominately two story houses with 7-10'sideyard setbacks. It had been consolidated so there were more units per building, fewer buildings and therefore able to open up the amount of open space. There was 70% open space on the site.

There had been considerable discussion of access onto 257th. There are two phases [phase I being 160 units]. The 160 units are about where the property breaks at the steep point so the first phase would be below that. There are only a few places where a road could be provided up and around -because it was in two phases it has been developed so that each one could act independently - phase I has a loop system because it was felt there would only be one access onto 257th and not an access out to Cherry Park Rd. in Phase I. The traffic study indicates that most traffic that was generated would most likely go out onto 257th. An emergency access out to Cherry Park Road wasn't on the property being purchased for the first phase and caused a problem. Tehran discussed complications with the lending institutions to cut across property that wasn't owned by the developer at this time.

Tahran stated concern over conditions 9 and 10 and asked if they could be reviewed. if resolved by the fire district in meeting their turning radiuses and maybe a second emergency access in another fashion and not cut a corner off a piece of property in the second phase which isn't yet owned [Condition #9]. Tahran discussed the condition of a light on 257th [Condition #10]. He asked if this could be done at the time traffic warranted.

Tahran stated there were no other problems or concerns about the other conditions placed at the time of Planning Commission approval.

Tahran discussed more specifics of the project and where the buildings would be placed and what type of construction they were expected to be.

- .5 City Council Questions: Mayor Cox asked about two buildings 60' back from Cherry Park? He asked where the lip of the hill began and if back yards of existing residences would be viewed from some of the deck areas.

Tahran stated that the decks would be patio level and wouldn't overlook the single family residential area at all. The decks would be faced the opposite way from the existing homes. He stated that the two buildings on Cherry Park Road would be accessed internally rather than driveways off of Cherry Park Road.

Councilor Thompson asked about the height of the buildings. Tahran stated they would be 26' to the peak. [Tape 2, Side 3]

Councilor Bui asked about the property purchase for the 2nd phase?

Tahran stated that neither phase would be purchased until there was approval for the project. The immediate phase/project was the 160 units. At this time, with discussions from the lenders 160 units was about it.

Councilor Bui asked when it was expected to begin construction?

Tahran stated June, however, it depended on the lender.

Councilor Thompson asked about the initial stage no confirmation of signalization on 257th nor access onto Cherry Park Road?

Tahran stated that it would be difficult to do an access onto Cherry Park Road in the initial phase, as shown. The condition would be more for emergency access and having a secondary emergency access...not an access for the units - that would be through 257th. It could be modified onto the property in Phase I. It could be done through an easement.

Walt Postlewait, 1624 SE 20th Court, President Planning Commission. Reported that this came to Council from Planning Commission with recommendation for approval with conditions. He was prepared to respond to questions.

Councilor Schmunk asked if there had been considerable discussions regarding new signalization on 257th.

Postlewait stated that there had been considerable discussion, yes.

Councilor Thompson asked about the access onto Cherry Park Rd?

Postlewait, not speaking for the Commission, stated that he believed it to be the intent that there be two accesses into Phase I. He believed that was the attitude of the Commission back to Sandee Palisades Phase IV. There was reluctance for single access to any development.

.6 Public Testimony: Opponents

Maynard Link, 1006 SW Cherry Park Road. [Tape 2, Side 3 4:21] Discussed zoning concerns; reason he purchased his home was partially for view; preference to see R10 \$100,000-\$150,000 homes built on property; rather see owner owned homes; concerned about traffic into area and know one knew yet where the Mt. Hood Freeway was going

Mike Bourne, 1224 SW Hewitt - [Tape 2, Side 3 9:38] concerns were: 1) view would like the condition set to go back 100' and reduce height to less than 20'; 2) property values would decrease because rentals lower values; 3) traffic volume increase.

Councilor Bui asked what it would do in terms of view?

Bourne stated it would take out the river view.

Pieter Van Dyke, 1221 SW Hewitt - [Tape 2, Side 3 12:00] stated concerns as: 1) crime increase because apartments in neighborhoods then crime follows; 2) no pride because they wouldn't be owners; 3) disagreed with using the high school grounds as playground or recreational areas; 4) traffic increase; 5) renters wouldn't be committed to the City or the schools. Owners are willing to do something in their areas but renters don't have a vested interest in the community.

Michael N. Zitek, 904 SW Cherry Park Road - [Tape 2, Side 3 15:46] stated he would rather see R10 than lower down the hill place apartments. He asked about easements? He was opposed to apartments over single family dwellings.

Tyree Zander, 542 SW 8th Circle - [Tape 2, Side 3 18:38] stated that his interest was 'just give me the facts' to support this type development. He stated there wasn't compliance with the Comprehensive Plan. He asked why they wanted to stick A2 down throats of the people in an R10 project? He was concerned about the quality of life and felt that apartments were severely different. He stated the property values would diminish due to increased crime. There were no studies, no impact statements...no facts to substantiate this type development in this location. He stated there was a 4 year window in which a project was to be substantially completed in Troutdale. There was no addressing that issue. There was no idea of a timeline. He could guarantee that starting in June was unlikely.

He was concerned about whether or not the developers were financially capable of completing this project. When a condition is set about the signalization - they waffle about the cost, the additional road also appeared to be a problem for them.

There was no comment from the School District? What's the impact there? Increased class size would happen, not expansion of classrooms. He stated when moving to Troutdale his children were in private school and were taken out for public school because he was so impressed with the Troutdale public school. He was impressed with the area and didn't want to see it degraded. The project may be good, but not in this location. There was considerable open space for a development such as this without putting this area in a box.

.7 City Council Questions: There were none

.8 Rebuttal: [Tape 2, Side 4 3:37]

Postlewait, Walt, Planning Commission Chair, stated that in the 3-4 years served on the Planning Commission schools were always a problem. Troutdale City has no school district but lies within the Reynolds School District and makes up 3-4% of population and area of this school district. The concern for the schools should be in that same proportion. Postlewait being involved with the school district for a number of years, it was his understanding that the school district seeks people to use the facilities so that they can be reserved for a particular time. The school district didn't discourage the use of the facilities - they encourage it. They ask permission be sought by organized activities so space can be set aside.

Postlewait stated that regarding this project, adequate city services were available and connection to those services weren't at the cost of the city but rather the developer. Services into a multi-family is less expensive for the city than single family. The project doesn't alter the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning of the city as dictated by the Metro Housing rule for equal access at all types of housing; nor did it alter the fact that the city is in a 50-50 situation for single family and multi family development.

Postlewait stated that he moved to Troutdale 13 years ago when he built his home here, the population was 3500 people. People that buy view lots over empty land and expect it to remain is quite unrealistic. The City is growing and will continue to grow.

Councilor Bui asked about A2 land in the City and why must the complex go on land that isn't necessarily A2?

Postlewait stated that the Planning Commission made the decision that the project met the criteria. Having done so, the Commission had no alternative but to approve it. There was A2 available in the City but in small pockets. The project in question had a density much less than A2 development.

Tahran stated if doing an A2 project it would be at 16-18 units per acre which is a typical density on multi-family. This project was roughly half of that. The physical characteristics of the site is a part of the reason for that. They felt it was the best way to have the units enjoy part of that view also and open up the maximum amount of open space. He didn't feel 70% open space would be achieved by any other type housing.

Tahran discussed the issue of 257th. He stated he represented the property owner on the other side of 257th and there were few places where access could be taken off of 257th. Unrestricted access ran with the deal on the property. In discussions with the County, there is a need for accesses if the properties along 257th are to be developed at all. Tahran stated that better than 3/4 of the frontage could be taken care of with this property and the property on the other side. It is a difficult access question due to the grade. However, if you increase the turning distance and slow down movement of a left/right turn lane. Whatever the development it will require some type of access. We have tried to address this by taking this 29 acres and the other 16 acres, while under a

common ownership. In discussions with the County we are asking when is there the need for the traffic signal, there will need to be one if both sides of 257th are developed. We don't know that 160 units would warrant a signal. The County wouldn't be in favor of another stop from Cherry Park Rd. to Columbia - we will condition that on their opinion.

Mayor Cox called for further questions. There were none.

.9 City Council Questions:

Councilor Schmunk stated that north/south routes are a problem in east county. When we do, we want limited access and we want development. When the I84/26 route goes through, that would relieve some of the congestion on 257th. But, that was still a big 'if'. Also, when Graham Road is widened that should alleviate some of the backup.

Councilor Thompson asked Tahrán if this were developed as R4, R5 how many units were possible on the property?

Tahrán stated they didn't feel they could be competitive if 5,000 sq. ft. lots were done but if done approximately 8 units to the acre = 210+. But he stated they wouldn't do that if that were a choice.

City Attorney Jennings asked if a development condition were imposed that at such time as Multnomah County require that 257th be signalized, how did he propose that development be conditioned to be attached to the property so that a subsequent owner to the property would be required to follow that condition. [i.e., your client sells the property, what assurance does Council have that the subsequent owner would be mandated to follow the condition?]

Tahrán referred to property on Cruise Way - trip generation requirements. He stated they would be open for discussion.

Jennings asked if Council proposed that as a condition of development which would travel with the land after that, he assumed Tahrán's client wouldn't be opposed. The condition being that at such time as Multnomah County demanded signalization they participate in the cost of putting that signal in.

Tahrán stated it wouldn't be a problem. He stated signalization was anticipated, it was more a case of when would the signalization go in.

.10 Recommendation by Staff: Cline clarified this would not be lifting or waiving any other conditions of the Development Code; by coming through the process it was being subjected to additional or further review. Cline stated that there appeared to be misunderstanding between Phase I and Phase II of the development. If the plan was

approved for both Phase I and Phase II, even though construction may take place on Phase I, Phase II will be bound by that same plan. The only way to build anything other than what has been approved through the PD would be to go back through the entire process again for both parcels.

Cline stated the 10 conditions attached and recommended by the Planning Commission are recommended for Council to grant approval of this tentative plan and program for the 248 unit planned development as conditioned.

.11 City Council Questions Mayor Cox called for questions.

Councilor Schmunk asked about condition #10 - signalization. She was concerned about the wording.

Cline stated that the intent was to enter into agreement for the joint construction of a traffic light if it is deemed necessary by the County Traffic Engineers and/or the Troutdale City Council.

Wilder stated that the County often required project agreements that may not come to fruition for 5, 6, or 8 years depending on the need and those project agreements do run with the land.

Mayor Cox clarified that sewer/water were available to the property? Cline agreed they were.

.12 Close Public Hearing Process: Mayor Cox closed the public hearing at 9:04 p.m.

ITEM #8a: RESOLUTION: Adopting Findings of Fact and Granting Approval of a Tentative Plan and Program for a 248 Unit Planned Development. 884-R [Tape 2, Side 4 21:27]

Mayor Cox called this agenda item and read the resolution by title.

MOTION: Councilor Bui moved to approve. Councilor Schmunk seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION:

Councilor Bui was mixed on the issue due to the issues brought up. He stated there was considerable traffic and to widen Cherry Park Road would require digging up peoples yards; or the other way would require getting into private property, if there is no easement it would get into properties next to this project. He agreed that apartment complexes do, sometimes, bring in not the best of citizens. On the other hand the City's Comprehensive Plan called for this type of construction and for this type of

population to occur - we have to get the multi dwelling up to meet with the single family dwellings. He stated from that respect, it should be approved.

Councilor Thompson stated that it would be nice to please everyone but that isn't available. This particular area is zoned R4 and R5 and could be developed to nearly the same density without any hearing at all - permits could just be issued. That wouldn't give anyone the opportunity to comment and this way, there has been the opportunity. He stated that the Plan presented goes a long way toward mitigating any kind of impact that single family or attached single family would have. There were only two buildings across Cherry Park that essentially obstruct the view and there could be many and they could be a full 35' in height. He stated that the developer had shown sensitivity to residents on the opposite side of Cherry Park Road in restricting the height to 26'. Phase II was desirable in that it had the least impact on any kind of development that could occur on the view.

Councilor Thompson stated there was no need for a zone change. This wasn't a zone change request, only a planned development on the current zoning. Zoning in this case is followed through in that multi-family or higher density had access to a major arterial -- 257th. The project itself followed good zoning guidelines. The property will eventually develop and there was no way the City could prevent that from happening. Any area within the Urban Growth Boundary will develop in the future unless it is greenway area. The question is what is the most desirable development for the area. This development is as desirable for the property and would have the least impact on the residents across from Cherry Park Rd. We are under constraints by the State to provide multi-family housing - this property is zoned R4 and R5 for multi family housing that is the proposal. It is not A2, the apartments being proposed is taking what is allowed and grouping them together into buildings and the overall density is within what is allowed. There is no reason to deny the proposal.

YEAS: 4

NAYS: 0

ABSTAINED: 0

Bui - Yea; Jacobs - Yea; Schmunk - Yea; Thompson - Yea

ITEM #9: DEPARTMENT REPORTS:

Mayor Cox called this agenda item.

Public Safety: Councilor Bui expressed appreciation for the Police Department involvement in a recent apprehension of murder/rapist suspect.

Community Development: Cline discussed remodel of the Police Facility and stated that they would be moving in within the next month and shooting for the end of March. Lots of volunteers had been helping out to get the project done at a minimal expense to taxpayers.

Executive: Christian stated there was a request from PDC regarding nuclear free zone. She asked for Council direction. Mayor Cox wanted to drop the issue and didn't want Council to pursue a statement.

Councilor Schmunk stated she wasn't too favorable. Councilor Thompson agreed to leave it alone. Councilor Jacobs and Councilor Bui agreed.

ITEM #10: COUNCIL CONCERNS AND INITIATIVES

Mayor Cox called this agenda item.

Mayor Cox discussed a letter from Gresham's Richard Ross, who is also on Columbia Highways Commission was asking for a letter of support on biketrail/walking trail, cleaning out tunnels on the old highway to use as walkways.

Councilors agreed that since the highway passed through Troutdale it was a good idea to support the efforts. **CONSENSUS**

Councilor Schmunk stated that if all 5 routes fell out they would go back and review 282nd. [Troutdale Road]. She stated that the open house went well for the I84/26 routes and was well attended.

Councilor Thompson stated that Wilder had mentioned the TAC stated the route had been ignored due to the Troutdale Council resolution against it.

Councilor Schmunk stated the 282nd route wasn't out because of the Troutdale Council, it was out because of the public hearings.

Wilder stated that the State Environmental people didn't think it was given proper consideration and the lack of consideration may present a flaw in the environmental impact statement. Not that it will but that it may.

Councilor Thompson asked if it was the one that would go out and join 282nd?

Wilder stated no, as Councilor Schmunk stated, it was taken out through the public hearing process. That wasn't a 'flaw' to the process. He stated 257th may not be either. The environmental people were concerned and felt that the federal people may look at it and wonder why it wasn't considered and ask for additional information.

Councilor Bui stated there was a Fire Task Force meeting on March 25 at 7:00 p.m. at Wood Village City Hall.

Public Works: Wilder stated the paintings around manhole covers was in preparation of an aerial to be done later in March.

ITEM #11: ADJOURNMENT

Mayor Cox called this agenda item.

MOTION: Councilor Thompson moved to adjourn the meeting. Councilor Bui seconded the motion.

YEAS: 4

NAYS: 0

ABSTAINED: 0

Sam K. Cox, Mayor

Dated: _____

ATTEST:

Valerie J. Raglione, CMC

City Recorder

F:\MINUTES\031291CC.MIN