

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING
NOVEMBER 2, 2016
SALMON, IDAHO**

Mayor Leo Marshall opened the regular City Council meeting at 6:00 p.m. Those in attendance were:

COUNCIL MEMBERS: **Jim Baker**
 Jim Bockelman
 Russell Chinske
 Ken Hill
 Rob Jackson
 Neal James

CITY ATTORNEY: **Fred Snook**

Decisions/Action Items

- 1) The Transportation Plan was tabled.
- 2) Salmon Whitewater Park Association Agreement, Phase I approved.
- 3) Council asked Mayor Marshall to send a letter to the County Commissioners letting them know they want to negotiate and cannot meet their timeframe.
- 4) Council approved changes to Title 5, Chapter 3, Article C. of the City Code. An Ordinance will be drafted.
- 5) Ken Hill announced that he will purchase History Park and donate it to the City.
- 6) Council accepted Resolution 2016-4, Beers/Slavin property exchange.

Consent Agenda

- a) Minutes of Special Meeting October 19, 2016
- b) Bills for approval

A motion to approve the consent agenda was made by Council member Jackson and passed unanimously in a roll call vote.

Public Comments

- 1) Robin Phillips, 1000 Leadore Avenue, said she supports Whitewater Park Association with the amendments as proposed at the last council meeting. As a small business owner herself, she is aware of how difficult it is to start up a new business. She does not think the council would want to go on record as being an obstructionist type of government agency that discourages new people. She encouraged Council to approve the project.
- 2) Bob Wiederrick, 1403 Cleveland Avenue, stated that he thinks Salmon could get financial support from the citizens for History Park. He would certainly be interested. He also said that he thinks the Whitewater Park Agreement should be tabled until there is a public vote. He is going to contact ICRMP concerning the

removal of it being the City's desire to "increase safety on the Salmon River" from the agreement.

Island Park Bridge Update – Mary Cerise

A lot has been happening. There is now a footer on the west side and they will be pouring the west wall tomorrow. Current plans are for the deck to arrive November 16th. The Island side slope is taking shape. She stated that a lot of elevation has been added to meet 100 year flood requirements with a two foot variance for debris. The Norton ditch diversion was pulled last week. Also, riprap is being placed and it will all be in place prior to the deck installation. She noted that Doug Westfall and his crew are doing a great job.

Transportation Plan Presentation, Input, Accept or Revise – Mary Cerise

Mary Cerise said in the beginning a Transportation Advisory Team was established to work on the plan. She said as she is directed to go for funding, the City should always refer back to their Transportation Plan. It also gives Council an idea of what grants and funding are available. She gave Council an overview of the proposed plan.

Council member Hill said he would like more time to study the Plan.

Council Member Baker said he has read the document in detail. There are a number of comments concerning traffic on Main Street. It appeared as though Main Street is very congested, which is a perception that he does not have. The problem with terming it congested and then moving towards an alternate bridge sight and continuing to dump traffic on to Main Street is not congruent.

The last plan was 2003 and then this plan calls for an annual revision. He does not think it's realistic to conclude that we need it renewed annually.

There have been several comments that we have a plan that was approved by council, then things are brought up later and council cannot deviate much from that plan. Especially where he sees that is in the Capital Improvement Plan. He would like to propose that Council address the Capital Improvement Plan annually during the budget process. He has concerns of having the funding amounts in the Plan itself and then not having the ability to change it quickly because they would have to go through the whole plan. He does not want to tie Council's hand in the future. He would like wording that the Capital Improvement Page should not or cannot replace Council function to establish budget levels.

Concerning the referenced Council decision on 12 project priorities, he is not aware that council has discussed or approved those by priorities. Much of what the Transportation Plan is doing is indirectly addressing the necessity for the alternate bridge. What he finds is happening with the proposal for the alternate bridge is an

area of non-agreement of what we are going to build. He thinks that Council is not addressing the bridge's function as an alternate route which should be addressed at this point by Idaho Transportation Department.

It is suggested that the east/west river crossing is a cause of large traffic delays and motorist frustrations during peak traffic. He would like to soften that language. He said occasionally, once or twice, we have had congestion but it is not a continual ongoing problem.

There is a statement that says we are improving Elks Road because of industrial/commercial zoning in that area. He is not sure how Council is going to handle that zoning. It has yet to be determined in the draft Development Code.

As for the reference to "currently existing congestion on Main Street" if he was a consultant or Idaho Transportation Department and a major bridge is going to be put down river, he does not think taking Main Street traffic to where Highway 93 turns south will make a significant difference in people stopping in town.

As far as the alternate bridge, if the county and city put it in the state can and will use it as a bypass for a considerable amount of time while they repair the existing bridge. He said we have been neglecting the discussion as to access to and from that bridge. There will be a lot of dollars committed that have not been discussed.

Mary Cerise said the alternate bridge is a separate topic. It is recognized in the plan as a priority that has been determined by the constituents, but there is no money allocated from the City of Salmon. She suggested putting language in the plan indicating that the plan can be adjusted as needed.

Council member Baker said he does not want the council (either now or in the future) to be committed to the plan as written because at some point council accepted it.

Mary Cerise said as for improvements to Elks Road, the Plan says the City has identified an area near the top of Elks Road for future business development. The reason that is in there is because of the Salmon Valley Business and Innovation Center. There is no industrial. The biggest reason is because it is a safety issue.

She said the only place congestion is referred to is on the levels of service and your wait times. Two places that were identified were Highway 93 at South Challis Street and Courthouse Drive and Highway 93.

Council member Jackson said we have a little work to do on the alternate bridge discussion before it is decided how important it should be in the Transportation Plan. Also the document mentions three bridges crossing the Lemhi River. We do

not have three. The reference to an annual budget dedicated to sidewalk repairs and replacements was questioned as to whether we actually have one. Amy said there is some for 2016 and 2017 but we cannot budget for future Councils.

He said the snow removal plan in the document does not make sense to him. He thinks it should be better thought out in the Plan.

Harry Shanafelt said by removal, they mean actually picking up the snow. They do plow Courthouse Drive when there is less than two inches.

Mary Cerise said she could rewrite it to make it less confusing.

Mary Benton asked why there are two policies on snow removal. There is the one that was inserted in the Transportation Plan and the resolution passed by Council last year. Mary Cerise said it is because "this is what happens on the ground". Mary Benton said then we have two conflicting plans.

Council member Jackson said the one in the Transportation Plan is more specific. If we are going to have one that is more specific then we should have it right.

Also, the questionnaire in the back of the Plan; is he reading it right that only 10 people answered it? Mary Cerise said she did two different surveys. One was online that 10 people answered and the other one 34 people picked up and returned.

Council member James said this is a Transportation Plan, to him a plan is a guide; we are not passing an ordinance that says we have to do this. It is a suggestion of what needs to be done.

Council member Jackson made a motion to table the Transportation Plan for further discussion at the next regular meeting. All voted aye and the motion carried.

Salmon Whitewater Park Association Agreement With the City of Salmon for Phase I With Council Recommended Amendments

Council member Baker thanked Evalyn for participating and submitting many of her concerns. He went through her letter that he felt had an extensive analysis of the project. He would like to ask Fred Snook the following: If Council moved into the next phase of the agreement and the City went to an easement would that relieve the City from a financial obligation or liability? He would also like to know what our classification is currently.

Council member Chinske said he does not understand what this has to do with the Phase I Agreement.

Council Member Baker said what Council is responsible to do is to take questions from however means they wish and to address those questions either with the proponents of the questions, but preferably the questions reach Council so that each one voting can have some feel for what the questions and concerns might be of the project.

Council member Chinske said again, this has to do with permitting, that's it.

Council member Baker said that is correct but that is part of another question he has. He has questions as to our liability.

Council member Chinske said we do not have any liability for the permitting, which is what the agreement is about. The permitting is up to the organization and that is what the agreement is for, the permitting process.

Fred Snook said what Russ is saying is that is beyond the agenda. The agenda is just approval or disapproval of the proposed Phase I Agreement.

Council member Bockelman said he thinks if a member of the Council objects and says we need to adhere to the agenda, then we need to adhere to the agenda. It's wide open to discuss then I think it is a good discussion, whether it happens now or later. He sees Evalyn's letter for future reference. This is an agreement that has been discussed and is before council to decide if they will approve the permitting agreement.

Council member Jackson read the agenda item and asked what it meant? It was noted that it was the recommended amendments from the last meeting. Council asked to see the document with the changes before making a decision.

Council member Baker said the open meeting laws tie council's hands. He would like to be able to discuss public input.

Council member Chinske said if the group ends up functioning past permitting he would love to see public comment with as many people talking about the project as possible. When we get to that point he would like to see the room packed.

Council member Baker asked Fred Snook if Council passes the Agreement and an accident occurred in the future would Council members be personally liable. Fred said they would not.

Council member Chinske reminded council member Baker that he was one of the ones that voted to take out the reference to safety. Council member Baker said he did not have a problem with his course of action. He just questioned whether or not it affected personal liability of the council.

Fred Snook said what the council is voting on is to approve or disapprove the proposed document.

Council member Hill made a motion to approve the new agreement for Phase I as presented. In a roll call vote, Hill, Baker, James, Chinske, and Bockelman all voted aye and Jackson voted no. The motion carried.

Interagency Agreement for New River Crossing in or Near Salmon, Idaho

Council member Chinske stated that in his mind the main reason is to have an optional route for when the bridge is repaired. Has there been any discussion on any other plan or alternative for this bridge rather than build a new one down the road?

Council member Hill said he thinks that has been discussed a lot in the past at the County and City levels. The idea is for emergency use if something were to happen to the bridge. Emergency services are trapped on one side and grocery stores are trapped on one side. He thinks there are a lot of problems particularly in the financing of it. It doesn't make sense to proceed on a 70/30 basis. Idaho Transportation is expressing an interest and said if the city and county are building the bridge it will help them a lot, but they are not willing to jump in and be a partner.

Council member Bockelman said he thinks it's a good idea for the city as an agency to commit to working with them but he is not for committing to 70/30.

Council member Jackson said he does not feel that the city is at a point to make a decision.

Council member Bockelman said the meeting dates have not been coordinated with the City.

Council member Chinske said he feels that the whole project is an incredible waste of taxpayer time and energy. He does not understand how the project will pencil out. The money could be put into fixing the junction. There are other ways to take a look and to see what is possible.

Amy Fealko said the meeting was extremely beneficial to her and she wishes more of the council could have attended, but she understands the circumstances. She encouraged the council to read the detailed minutes from that meeting.

Council member Baker said he would like to clarify the money split for Council. At the last meeting he commented that it was double taxation. That may have been inaccurate. The monies that come to the city and county for roads come as gas tax money. The county receives approximately \$1,000,000 for our county roads; we are also counted in that. In addition to that the city receives \$100,000 of gas tax money.

We put that money in the roads and bridges account. In addition to that the city has elected to put \$300,000 of property tax money in to run our road system for improvements and maintenance. The 70/30 split was apparently developed by their engineer. He would say to the county, we are in the negotiating phase. The county is way beyond where we are.

At this point the State is not included in this agreement. He thinks they need to be involved due to the major benefit to the State. If they get involved they come under more stringent rules on how to pick an engineer, so it may not be the County's engineer.

There has been a lot of discussion on the bridge but no discussion on the access. The Council has a big concern on what will be done there and it could possibly incur a financial obligation.

The engineer appears to be the decision maker. The political arena is the final decision makers. The votes have been divided 1 and 1 and he is not comfortable with that.

The State mentioned that the current work in-kind is not legal in some aspects of the project. That needs to be researched because there is a lot of work in-kind in the agreement.

The County wants to do a 10-year maintenance agreement, which is extremely limited.

If the State was involved in the agreement they may make an argument for moving the access down slightly so it would not come up North Saint Charles Street because of traffic. Their traffic engineers would be involved and they deal with these types of projects.

Right now we have not discussed with the County what would be built. Before an agreement is made we need to define what will be built and what the needs of the city, county, and state are.

Council member Bockelman questioned who would pursue the available grants.

Mary Cerise said the grant would be administered through the county. It would all be done by the county as the lead agency. She said she thinks it should be broken down into phases with the environmental study to be done first. That will most likely determine where the bridge will be.

Council member Jackson said he just heard the \$10,000 estimate double.

Mary Cerise said she thinks just for starters for an environmental feasibility it would probably be around \$300,000. She said there are funds available for that but they are not guaranteed.

Council member Baker made a motion to stay in negotiation mode at this point. All voted aye and the motion carried.

Council member Bockelman made a motion to amend the agenda to discuss the negotiation process and how to proceed; Item 8.a.

Council member Bockelman said Mary Cerise recommended proceeding in stages. Phase I should be that we agree to be an agency involved, but we are not going to agree to 70/30 or 10/90, we just agree to be part of the system.

It was recommended that the minutes be read before proceeding with a decision.

Council member Baker said he does not believe a decision has been made as to what Council's position might be.

Council member Chinske said the County wants to have everything resolved by November 16.

Council member Jackson said in a letter from the County they state that if the Council acts favorably on items listed they recommend a negotiation meeting on November 10. However, Council has not even talked about those items.

Mary Cerise said one reason they are pushing is because the grant deadline is January and it will take them every bit of two months to write it.

Council member Baker said that type of language puts council under stress. That sets up a potential to make errors and he objects to that.

Council member Jackson made a motion to have the Mayor draft a letter to the County Commissioners stating that we are willing to negotiate but that we cannot meet their timeline and we will further discuss this at our November 16 meeting. All voted aye.

Amendments to Title 5, Chapter 3, Article C. Livestock; Wild Animals – Approval to Draft Ordinance Making Proposed Changes

Council member Jackson made a motion to approve the changes to chapter 3, Animal Control, Article C. Livestock; Wild Animals with the change of 5-3c-1 Permit section f. Change it from 10 successive days to 10 days in a calendar year. Roll call vote: Council Members Hill, Baker, James, Chinske, Jackson and Bockelman all aye.

Maude and T.R. Benedict Trust, Offer of selling History Park to the City of Salmon Discussion and Possible Decision of Purchase – Tom McFarland

Council member Hill said he has talked to Tom McFarland and the Benedict Trust, the County and Building Department concerning lot adjustments so the land splits are not necessary. He will buy History Park and donate it to the City of Salmon.

Harry Shanafelt researched the water line and the possibilities of getting another water line in. We will have to get an easement from a few of the property owners. It will cost around \$800 to \$1,000 in materials.

Informal Discussion/Round Table

Council member Chinske reminded everyone to vote on Tuesday.

Council member Jackson asked Council member to drive down Mary Street.

Council member Bockelman said he is sure it will be chipped and sealed as money allows.

Council member commented on the weeds at Shopko, looks like they are dying.

Resolution 2016-4, Beers/Slavin Exchange of Property with City of Salmon

Fred Snook said Mary Benton prepared the resolution. The deeds have been prepared and he is waiting for Tom Taylor to get some other descriptions for Beers and Slavin to sign quitclaim deeds to the actual Snook Drive that still exists.

Motion by Council member Baker to pass Resolution 2016-4 by title only. Roll call vote: Council members Bockelman, Jackson, Chinske, James, Baker, Hill all voted aye. The motion carried.

Resolution 2016 - 4

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SALMON, IDAHO TO EXCHANGE REAL PROPERTY LOCATED AT WEST 2ND AVENUE, MONK STREET, AND SNOOK DRIVE, SALMON, LEMHI COUNTY IDAHO, OWNED BY THE CITY OF SALMON AND MIKE BEERS AKA MICHAEL JUAN BEERS AND MILTON A. SLAVIN AND ROBERTA A. SLAVIN; AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the City of Salmon's street inventory includes West 2nd Avenue, Monk Street, and Snook Drive; and

WHEREAS, said three streets have been in place at their current locations for many years; and

WHEREAS, said three streets border certain real estate property owned by Beers at Block 2, Riverside Addition to Salmon City; and

WHEREAS, a 2013 land survey has revealed that a portion of Monk Street and Snook Drive is actually on the Beers property; that certain City Water and/or sewer lines are on the Beers property and that certain landscaping/parking areas used by Beers are actually on West 2nd Avenue; and,

WHEREAS, part of Snook Drive is available to complete a trade with Beers to resolve part of these issues; and,

WHEREAS, when Snook Drive was created many years ago, it resulted in one very narrow point on Snook Drive that will be impacted by this resolution; and,

WHEREAS, all three parties met on site on August 9, 2013 and reviewed the history of the issues, began negotiating, and met on site again in 2015. During an open meeting between Mike Beers and the City Council in 2015, verbal agreements were made and both parties desired to enter into a written agreement to make a permanent record; and,

WHEREAS, a public hearing was held on September 7, 2016.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED BY THE MAYOR AND COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SALMON, IDAHO:

Section 1. That said exchange of property under terms and conditions determined by the City Council is determined to be in the City's best interests.

Section 2. The city council shall exchange or convey, by good and sufficient deed or other appropriate instrument in writing, properties listed in Exhibit A attached hereto.

Section 3. This resolution shall take effect and be in force immediately upon its passage and approval.

Passed and approved this 2nd day of November, 2016.

EXHIBIT "A"

**A PORTION OF AN ALLEY AND A STREET KNOWN AS SNOOK STREET
LOCATED IN BLOCK 2 OF RIVERSIDE SUBDIVISION BEING A
RESUBDIVISION OF BLOCKS 11, 12, 14 & 15 AND SOUTH HALVES OF
BLOCKS 9 & 10 OF TINGLEY'S ADDITION TO NORTH SALMON
(City of Salmon to Beers)
PARCEL "A"**

A portion of an alley and a street known as Snook Street located in said Block 2 Riverside Subdivision located in a portion of, Section 6, T. 21 N., R. 22 E., Boise Meridian, City of Salmon, Lemhi County Idaho, more particularly described as follows:

Commencing at the North Corner of Lots 3 & 4 of said Block 2 Riverside Subdivision from which the North Corner of Lots 9 & 10 of said Block 2 Riverside Subdivision bears S56°23'29"W, 299.39 feet the Basis of Bearing of this description run thence S33°29'10"E, 122.50 feet to the northerly right-of-way of Snook Street said point being the Point of Beginning;

Thence along said northerly right-of-way N56°23'29"E, 101.65 feet;

Thence continuing along said right-of-way S89°40'07"E, 13.91 feet;

Thence leaving said right-of-way S60°19'01"W, 113.46 feet to the Point of Beginning.

Said parcel contains 0.009 acres (394.81 Sq. Ft.)

**A PORTION OF AN ALLEY AND A STREET KNOWN AS SNOOK STREET
LOCATED IN BLOCK 2 OF RIVERSIDE SUBDIVISION BEING A
RESUBDIVISION OF BLOCKS 11, 12, 14 & 15 AND SOUTH HALVES OF
BLOCKS 9 & 10 OF TINGLEY'S ADDITION TO NORTH SALMON
(Beers to the City of Salmon)
PARCEL "B"**

A portion of an alley and a street known as Snook Street located in said Block 2 Riverside subdivision located in a portion of, Section 6, T. 21 N., R. 22 E., Boise Meridian, City of Salmon, Lemhi County Idaho, more particularly described as follows:

Commencing at the North Corner of Lots 3 & 4 of said Block 2 Riverside Subdivision from which the North Corner of Lots 9 & 10 of said Block 2 Riverside Subdivision bears S56°23'29"W, 299.39 feet the Basis of Bearing of this description run thence S33°29'10"E, 122.50 feet to the northerly right-of-way of Snook Street; thence along said right-of-way N56°23'29"E, 101.65 feet; thence S89°40'07"E, 13.91 feet to the Point of Beginning;

Thence leaving said right-of-way N60°19'01"E, 16.96 feet;

Thence N56°25'00"E, 27.49 feet to the easterly line of Lot 1 of said Block 2 Riverside Subdivision;

Thence S00°23'33"W along said easterly line 23.84 feet to a point on the northerly right-of-way of Snook Street;

Thence N89°40'07"W along said right-of-way line, 37.51 feet to the Point of Beginning.

Said parcel contains 0.010 acres (431.13 Sq. Ft.)

**A PORTION OF AN ALLEY AND A STREET KNOWN AS SNOOK STREET
LOCATED IN BLOCK 2 OF RIVERSIDE SUBDIVISION BEING A
RESUBDIVISION OF BLOCKS 11, 12, 14 & 15 AND SOUTH HALVES OF**

**BLOCKS 9 & 10 OF TINGLEY'S ADDITION TO NORTH SALMON AND A
PORTION OF SECOND STREET LOCATED IN THE CITY OF SALMON**

**(SLAVIN TO THE CITY OF SALMON)
PARCEL "C"**

A portion of an alley and a street known as Snook Street located in said Block 2 Riverside Subdivision and a portion of Second Street located in a portion of Section 6,

T. 21 N., R. 22 E., Boise Meridian, City of Salmon, Lemhi County Idaho, more particularly described as follows:

Commencing at the North Corner of Lots 3 & 4 of said Block 2 Riverside Subdivision from which the North Corner of Lots 9 & 10 of said Block 2 Riverside Subdivision bears S56°23'29"W, 299.39 feet the Basis of Bearing of this description run thence S33°29'10"E, 122.50 feet to the northerly right-of-way of Snook Street; thence N68°41'46"E, 103.03 feet to the North Corner of Lots 28 & 29, said Block 2 Riverside Subdivision, said point being the Point of Beginning:

Thence S89°40'07"E along the northerly line of said Lot 29, 29.96 feet;

Thence leaving said northerly line S60°20'45"W, 125.88 feet to a point on the westerly line of Lot 27 said Block 2 Riverside Subdivision;

Thence along the westerly line of said Lot 27 N33°29'10"W, 7.94 feet to the NW Corner of said Lot 27;

Thence along the northerly line of Lots 27 & 28 said Block 2 Riverside Subdivision N56°19'53"E, 100.71 feet to the Point of Beginning.

Said parcel contains 0.031 acres (1,342.05 Sq. Ft.)

**A PORTION OF AN ALLEY, PORTION OF A ROAD KNOWN AS
SNOOK STREET AND PORTION OF SECOND STREET IN BLOCK 2 OF
RIVERSIDE SUBDIVISION BEING A RESUBDIVISION OF BLOCKS 11, 12,
14 & 15 AND SOUTH HALVES OF
BLOCKS 9 & 10 OF TINGLEY'S ADDITION TO NORTH SALMON AND A
PORTION OF SECOND STREET LOCATED IN THE CITY OF SALMON
(The City of Salmon to Slavin)
PARCEL "D"**

A portion of an, a portion of an alley, a portion of W. 2nd Street and a portion of a road known as Snook Street located in said Block 2 Riverside Subdivision and a portion of Second Street located in a portion of Section 6,

T. 21 N., R. 22 E., Boise Meridian, City of Salmon, Lemhi County, Idaho, more particularly described as follows:

Commencing at the North Corner of Lots 3 & 4 of said Block 2 Riverside Subdivision from which the North Corner of Lots 9 & 10 of said Block 2 Riverside Subdivision bears S56°23'29"W, 299.39 feet the Basis of Bearing of this description

run thence S33°29'10"E, 122.50 feet to the northerly right-of-way of Snook Street; thence N68°41'46"E, 103.03 feet to the North Corner of Lots 28 & 29, said Block 2 Riverside Subdivision, thence S89°40'07"E along the northerly line of said Lot 29, 29.96 feet the Point of Beginning:

Thence leaving said northerly line N60°20'43"E, 3.61 feet;

Thence N56°25'00"E, 80.28 feet to a point on the easterly right-of-way of Second Avenue;

Thence along said easterly right-of-way S00°19'53"W, 46.59 feet;

Thence along the northerly line of Lots 27 & 28 said Block 2 Riverside Subdivision N89°40'07"W, 69.74 feet to the Point of Beginning.

Said parcel contains 0.037 acres (1,614.89 Sq. Ft.)

Committee Meetings / Public Information

- a) Public Works Team – November 9, 2:00 p.m.
- b) Parks and Recreation Team – November 9, 3:30 p.m.
- c) Finance Team – November 9, 11:00 a.m.
- d) Public Safety Team – November 9, 4:30 p.m.
- e) Special meeting with Planning and Zoning Commission – November 9, 5:30 p.m.

Public Comments

Bob Wiederrick, 1403 Cleveland Avenue, thanked Ken Hill for his generous offer to purchase the park for the City. It is an important part of our community.

Future Council Meeting Agenda Items

- 1) Steve Frazee and Dale McAtee, Proposal for Vacation of Copper Street and Land Exchange
- 2) Request to Camp in City Park August 2017 – Ride Idaho
- 3) Ordinance to change Title 5, Chapter 3, Article C. Livestock; Wild Animals
- 4) Transportation Plan

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:16 p.m.

Mayor, Leo Marshall

City Clerk, Mary Benton