



City of Oregon City

625 Center Street
Oregon City, OR 97045
503-657-0891

Meeting Minutes - Draft

City Commission

Dan Holladay, Mayor
Brian Shaw, Commission President
Nancy Ide, Frank O'Donnell, Renate Mengelberg

Wednesday, November 1, 2017

7:00 PM

Commission Chambers

REVISED

1. Convene Regular Meeting and Roll Call

Mayor Holladay called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM.

Present: 5 - Commissioner Brian Shaw, Mayor Dan Holladay, Commissioner Nancy Ide, Commissioner Renate Mengelberg and Commissioner Frank O'Donnell

Staffers: 10 - City Manager Tony Konkol, City Attorney William Kabeiseman, Assistant City Recorder Jaime Reed, Captain Shaun Davis, Community Services Director Phil Lewis, Community Development Director Laura Terway, Christina Robertson-Gardiner, Library Director Maureen Cole, Finance Director Wyatt Parno and Human Resources Director Jim Loeffler

2. Flag Salute

3. Ceremonies, Proclamations, and Presentations

3a. Proclamation Honoring Oregon City's Fallen Officers Robert Libke and George Hanlon

Mayor Holladay played a Channel 12 news story on the Police Department.

Mayor Holladay read the proclamation honoring Oregon City's fallen officers Robert Libke and George Hanlon.

3b. Proclamation in Observance of Veterans' Day

Mayor Holladay read the proclamation in observance of Veterans' Day, November 10, 2017.

3c. Proclamation Declaring November 1, 2017 as Extra Mile Day

Mayor Holladay declared November 1, 2017 as Extra Mile Day.

3d. Letter Recognizing Judge Laraine McNiece

Mayor Holladay read a letter recognizing Judge Laraine McNiece for the Attendance Court Program.

3e. Metro Update Presentation by Councilor Carlotta Collette

Carlotta Collette, Metro Councilor, gave updates on the Willamette Falls Legacy Project, Regional Snapshots, transportation funding, Regional Transportation Plan, growth management, Regional Waste Plan, Metro South, and grants and partnerships. This was her last report to the Commission as she was retiring.

The Commission thanked Councilor Collette for her work.

4. Citizen Comments

There were no citizen comments.

5. Adoption of the Agenda

The agenda was adopted as presented.

6. Public Hearings**6a. AP 17-05: Appeal of the Planning Commission's Denial of TP 17-03 and ZC 17-02; Zone Change from "R-10" Single-Family Dwelling District to "R-8" Single-Family Dwelling District and a Subdivision of 77 lots (Wheeler Farm) Located near White Lane and Orchard Grove Drive**

Mayor Holladay opened the public hearing.

Bill Kabeiseman, City Attorney, read the hearing statement. The appeal hearing would be confined to the issues raised during the Planning Commission hearing. Only the applicant and those who participated in the Planning Commission hearing could participate. No new evidence would be allowed, and the testimony was limited to the issues raised in the appeal. He asked if any Commissioner had ex-parte contacts, conflicts of interest, bias, or other statements to declare. There were none. Commissioners Ide and Shaw, along with Mayor Holladay had visited the site.

Christina Robertson-Gardiner, Senior Planner, presented the staff report. This was an appeal of the Planning Commission's denial of a proposed zone change from R-10 to R-8 and 77 lot subdivision. She added two exhibits into the record, a letter from Don Wheeler and a letter from the applicant to extend the 120 day period to December 8, 2017 contingent on the Commission making a tentative decision at tonight's meeting and not leaving the record open. She explained the subject site and the zoning surrounding the site, which was R-8 and R-10. She then discussed the conceptual layout of the subdivision that included a 1.35 acre open space, on-site stormwater management system, and 1.3 acres that would not be part of the subdivision but part of the neighboring property. There were power line easements along the bottom half of the subdivision. Structures could not be built on the easement area, but landscaping was allowed. The Planning Commission determined that the application did not meet Criteria A for a zone change under Municipal Code Chapter 17.68. They thought it was not consistent with the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan. Most of the public comments had to do with lot sizes, neighborhood compatibility, transportation, schools, and sewer capacity. The Planning Commission findings concluded that the criteria could not be met because the proposed zone change could result in a lot layout that was not cohesive and compatible with the existing surrounding

developments, particularly the Hazel Creek Farms development to the west. They also found that the existing level of traffic congestion within the City, most notably the intersection of Warner Milne, Warner Parrott, and Leland/Linn, was unacceptable and adding density, no matter how modest, would contribute to this concern; a lack of capacity within the school system; and a sewer pump station was needed to accommodate the additional development. The subdivision was an R-8 design and because the R-8 zone change was denied, so was the subdivision. The applicant submitted an appeal stating the Planning Commission misconstrued the evidence presented. They incorrectly interpreted and applied Comprehensive Plan Goal 2.4, relating to neighborhood livability, and failed to balance these policies against other applicable plan policies. They erred by relying on Municipal Code Chapter 17.68.020, the lot averaging standard, to deny the zone change. They incorrectly interpreted and applied Comprehensive Plan goal 11.1, public facilities; failed to give proper effect to Municipal Code Chapter 17.68.020, zone change criteria; incorrectly considered school capacity under ORS 195.110; and erred by finding sanitary sewer inadequacy based on lack of pump station details. Staff did an analysis of the Planning Commission's findings, appellant's grounds for appeal, and public comment. Staff found that the sewer and transportation facilities and services were adequate as conditioned. ORS 195.110(13) limited local government's ability to deny an application for "residential development based on a lack of school capacity." School capacity concerns were not raised by the School District.

Mr. Kabeiseman said there were additional policy implications regarding this denial. The Planning Commission thought the additional lots would add too much of a burden on services, and staff had thought the facilities were sufficient per Code with conditions. It created a gap between what the Comprehensive Plan required and what the Code required. Staff was unclear how much of a gap there was and if the Code provisions fully implemented the requirement for adequate public facilities. The Planning Commission relied on neighborhood livability to find that the 20% lot size reduction based on lot averaging was not consistent with the neighborhood. There were other Comprehensive Plan goals that encouraged a variety of housing opportunities as well as increased density. Staff thought R-10 and R-8 were both low density residential uses and if the City found them to be incompatible, it raised the question of what kind of zone changes would be allowed. They had to balance the need for neighborhood livability and the need for a variety of housing opportunities and increased density.

Ms. Robertson-Gardiner said if the City Commission agreed with the Planning Commission's findings, staff recommended the City Commission deny the appeal and provide staff any additional findings. If the City Commission thought the Planning Commission erred in its deliberations and findings, staff recommended the City Commission approve the appeal, reverse the Planning Commission's decision, and approve both the zoning map amendment and subdivision application with the conditions of approval recommended by the Planning Department. The Comprehensive Plan designated this as low density residential, and there were three zones in low density residential, R-10, R-8, and R-6. Planning Staff had as a policy said if the facilities could be met or conditionally met, because they were in the same Comprehensive Plan designation, the zones were inherently compatible. If the City Commission determined that was not the case, staff would like some policy direction for future zone change applications. Staff also followed the policy that if an application met the Development Code, by de facto it met the Comprehensive Plan policies.

Mr. Kabeiseman clarified the School District did not submit a letter in opposition, and if they did not raise an issue, it was off the table for the City to consider.

Ms. Robertson-Gardiner said lot averaging was allowed as a by right use in the Subdivision Code and there was no cap for how many lots could be below that average as long as all the lots on average equaled the zoning district. This was not part of the Planning Commission's denial. She confirmed that the land in the power line easement could be counted as part of the averaging.

There was discussion regarding the intent of the lot size averaging.

Mayor Holladay watched the videos of both Planning Commission meetings where this application was discussed. Commissioner O'Donnell watched the video of the second meeting.

Mike Robinson, representing the applicant, said the Wheeler family had owned this property since 1963. If the Commission wanted to change the Code, that would be a different process. The criteria to be used was what was in effect at the time the application was submitted. They were proposing only four more lots than what was allowed in R-10.

Don Wheeler, applicant, said his parents purchased this property in 1963. At that time there were only four homes adjacent to the property. Now there were 260 homes. His family did not resist any of these developments or zone changes because they understood the purpose and value of the Portland Metro Urban Growth Boundary. The highest and best use for this land was housing, not farming. It was his family's wish to develop 77 lots on this property. They planned to preserve open space with five old growth Douglas Fir trees. It would provide a place for recreation and a reminder of the history and previous use of the land as a Christmas tree u-cut farm. The Wheeler family was in support of the zone change to R-8 as supported by the Municipal Code.

Mr. Robinson stated currently the property was zoned R-10 and the applicant was requesting it be rezoned to R-8. Both zones implemented the Comprehensive Plan low density residential designation. Three of the five surrounding subdivisions were zoned R-8, two were zoned R-10, and one was both R-8 and R-10. They were proposing 77 lots, four more than the R-10 zone, and 11 fewer lots than allowed in the R-8 zone. He read the lot averaging requirements in the Code. Most of the surrounding lots had used lot averaging and were similar to what was being proposed. Most of the lots in this area were R-8. The Planning Commission did not think there was capacity for the traffic, schools, and sanitary sewer. The applicant's traffic impact analysis showed the intersections would be adequate. Mr. Replinger's report agreed that all five studied intersections would continue to meet the standards with the proposed subdivision. The Planning Commission acknowledged that the application met this standard. The Commission was concerned about the additional congestion. Regarding school capacity, the School District did not raise an issue and it could not be a basis for denial. The Planning Commission misconstrued a comment made regarding the sanitary sewer pump station. The applicant was going to rely on gravity sewer. He thought the application had met the approval criteria. This was a balancing issue and there were a number of Comprehensive Plan policies that this application met, such as sense of place, connectivity, development of parks, diversity of housing types and densities, and affordable housing. Regarding the idea that they had to have R-10 to be compatible, a diversity of housing types and lots added to the richness of Oregon City and these lots would also be single family homes built on single family lots. There would be no lack of cohesiveness or compatibility. If the City Commission affirmed the Planning Commission's decision, it would be difficult to implement the policies in the future. The Planning Commission's decision was not supported by substantial evidence and he thought the application should be approved. The decision needed to

be based on whether or not they met the Code, not whether or not the neighbors supported the application. The Planning Commission speculated that the school bond showed a lack of capacity. The only evidence in the record regarding school capacity was the fact that the School District did not comment.

Chris Goddell, AKS Engineering, clarified the intention of the open space was to be available to everyone. The Homeowners Association (HOA) would own and maintain it, but it would be open to the public.

Brenda Spidal-Wheeler, resident of Oregon City, grew up in West Linn and cared about the livability of the area. She lived near this area that had a wide variety of lot sizes. The subdivision proposed had small, uniform lots. She was concerned that there would not be sufficient parking. There was no nearby public transportation and no employment that neighbors could walk to. The neighbors all had cars and toys in their driveways and the lots would not be wide enough for a three car garage. She thought there would be a problem with the public using the park that was paid for by the HOA. She was not against the development, but she wanted variety and mostly 8,000 square foot lots.

Bob Kelly, resident of Oregon City, was concerned about the additional traffic congestion and lot sizes. Orchard Grove Drive had an S curve and people raced through the curve. The application would include four extra lots as R-8. He thought the Planning Commission did a good job analyzing the testimony that was brought before them. He understood there were laws that had to be followed, but livability and the intent of those laws should be taken into account.

Mayor Holladay disclosed he and Mr. Boyd were friends.

Terry Boyd, resident of Oregon City, stated the Commission had to follow the intent of the law. The lot size averaging proposed by the applicant did not follow the intent. A large portion of lots 53, 52, and 51 were not buildable due to the canyon. He thought they should uphold the Planning Commission's suggestion to run from Skellenger Way back towards Hazel Dell as R-10 and change the zoning from Skellenger Way forward. That would allow for a smart transition, would only change about four lots, and would be just as profitable and all the neighbors would sign off on it. It felt like there had been deception through this process as 84% of the lots would not meet the R-8 requirements. He thought the City Commission should set an example.

Brenda Martin, resident of Oregon City, said the applicant stated going from R-10 to R-8 would only be a 20% reduction, however most of the lots were going to be 6,000 square feet which was a 40% reduction. Lots 50-40 were small lots around 6,000 square feet. Two or more of those lots could fit on her lot, and she would like the property adjacent to her at least to be the same. She asked that if the zone change was approved, that a condition be added to include a different design as proposed by Mr. Boyd. She had 88 signatures of neighbors who were opposed to this application. This was her forever home and she would like it to be cohesive.

Leah Sundquist, resident of Oregon City, read a letter from Virginia Hokkanen dated October 30, 2017. Ms. Hokkanen did not understand how the Planning Commission misconstrued the evidence just because the applicant disagreed with what was presented. The Planning Commission correctly interpreted neighborhood livability. Those in Hazel Creek Farms were not asking for a large buffer, just larger lots connecting to theirs. The neighbors and Planning Commission asked the applicant to relook at the area between Hazel Creek Farms and Skellenger Way and increase

those lot sizes. She did not think the school capacity was misconstrued as there would be children in the 77-lot subdivision who would need to use the schools. If a school bond was passed, it would increase her taxes.

Alice Hayden, resident of Oregon City, said no one was objecting to the property being developed. This land was annexed as R-10 and this request was to rezone it to R-8. However, it was designed as R-6 as many lots were 6,000 square feet. She thought the intent for lot size averaging was to be compatible with the neighborhood. There were three or four large lots on this property that skewed the whole average. She did not see a variety or diversity of housing. These were small lots. Senior citizens were looking for new single-story homes with enough room for family to visit.

West Rictor, resident of Oregon City, said Hazel Creek Farm was one of the older developments and was built to the R-10 zone. This neighborhood was being joined by other neighborhoods that were zoned for smaller lots. The City wanted a diversity of lots and home sizes. There had not been an R-10 development since her neighborhood was built almost 15 years ago. She was asking that the new neighborhood be cohesive to her development and create diversity from the newer, smaller lots and keep the plan of an R-10 neighborhood. She questioned whether this would be affordable housing, as the prices looked to be \$350,000 to \$450,000. There was no bus service in this area for those that did not have cars and there was no place to walk to get groceries. It was a rural area with topography that was hard to develop. There were six lots that abutted lots in her neighborhood. It was stated that the abutting lots in the development were of similar size. Her lot was 12,600 square feet with extra property behind her house. The lot next to her was proposed at 7,248 square feet. This was over a 5,000 square foot difference. The continuation of the lots down the street of Orchard Grove Drive from her house was 6,000 and 7,000 square foot lots. The lots on Hazel Dell were all 10,000 square feet. Abutting them were proposed lots that were 7,000 to 8,000 square feet. Two of her neighbors would have two lots behind them and one of her neighbors would have three lots behind them. This was not similar size. It was stated the setbacks of the development were virtually the same, but changing from a 20 foot setback in the front to a 15 foot was a 25% decrease. Orchard Grove Drive was to become the main arterial street out of the neighborhood. The street had two curves in it and was not conducive to a lot of traffic. The development would also increase traffic on other nearby roads as there were not many roads to get out of this area.

Mr. Kabeiseman said several Planning Commissioners were interested in talking, but the City's Code had a specific requirement that only those who participated before the Planning Commission were allowed to participate in front of the City Commission. Also State law said that decision makers could not participate in the next level.

Mr. Robinson gave rebuttal. The applicant waived his final written argument. The two criteria the Planning Commission found not met were Comprehensive Plan Goal 2.4 nd 11.1. There was adequate traffic, sanitary sewer, and school capacities. This was not R-6; if it was it would be down another couple 1,000 square feet and they could add another 20% through lot averaging. What the applicant was doing was allowed in the Code. Regarding the lots adjacent to Hazel Creek Farms, the applicant never said they would be the same size just that the number of lots matched up. Lots 34-37 were 7,900 square feet and Lot 39 was 7,000 square feet. He thought it was close to what the R-8 allowed. The application met the City's off-street parking standards. He thought the Planning Commission made a wrong decision, did not follow the law, and ignored the plain evidence before them. He asked the City Commission to reverse the Planning Commission's decision and approve both the zone change and subdivision

application.

Ms. Robertson-Gardiner entered another exhibit into the record, Ms. Rictor's written comments.

Mayor Holladay closed the public hearing.

Mayor Holladay thought it was clear that the School District had the opportunity to comment, but chose not to, and therefore State law said the Planning Commission could not use that as a criteria to deny the application. There was consensus that school capacity was not a basis for denial.

Mayor Holladay said regarding transportation, the applicant's traffic study and the City's review of the study supported the project. They had to make a judgment on what the Code or law said and there was no evidence that this application would cause a need for traffic mitigation. There was consensus that the application complied with the transportation standards in the Code and the Planning Commission misinterpreted this issue.

Mayor Holladay asked for clarification on the sewer infrastructure. Ms. Terway stated the Planning Commission finding was the sanitary sewer was inadequate based on a lack of pump station details, and the applicant was not doing a pump station. The pump station did not prove there was a lack of capacity. City staff did not believe there was a capacity issue.

There was consensus that the Planning Commission erred in saying there was a sewer capacity issue as a reason for denial.

Mayor Holladay said the last issue was livability. Ms. Terway said the Planning Commission found a lack of compliance with a Comprehensive Plan policy about neighborhood livability and compatibility. The 20% lot averaging allowed lots as small as 6,400 square feet next to the adjacent Hazel Grove subdivision. The lots in the Hazel Grove subdivision were at least 10,000 square feet. The Planning Commission found that the smaller lots were not compatible with the minimum 10,000 square foot lots. They were the same Comprehensive Plan designation and staff would need policy direction about how to implement the Plan moving forward because staff viewed the same designations as compatible. The question was how these were not compatible and how were they weighing these policies against other Comprehensive Plan policies.

Tony Konkol, City Manager, read the goal in question. The focus had been on neighborhood livability, but they also had to decide if the application negatively impacted the sense of place and identity for residents and visitors and if it did not protect or maintain neighborhoods as the basic unit of community life in the City while implementing the goals and policies of the other sections of the Comprehensive Plan.

Commissioner O'Donnell thought it did impact livability. There was a difference between one lot abutting a property and three lots. It was a valid consideration and weighed heavily.

Commissioner Mengelberg said there was a reason for flexibility in the Comprehensive Plan. There were power lines and slopes on the property that made it difficult to develop. She thought the applicant proved that on balance they were consistent in lot size with the surrounding subdivisions. The applicant was contributing open space. She was in support of the application.

Commissioner Ide did not see enough difference between the proposed development and the current neighborhood when it came to a sense of place.

Commissioner Shaw did not want to have to expand the Urban Growth Boundary and was in favor of higher densities in some places. He thought the R-8 would be a good balance. The applicant had followed the guidelines.

Mayor Holladay said this was a difficult decision, but he did not have a choice except to follow the rules. He thought the application met the requirements. It was not about whether or not he agreed with the 20% lot averaging. He did not see how the Planning Commission could have denied the application other than based on emotion. He suggested adding a condition that the open space be recorded as a public open space in perpetuity and that it would be maintained by the Homeowners Association.

Commissioner Shaw did not take this lightly and he commended the Planning Commission for their work.

Commissioner O'Donnell understood why the neighborhood felt deceived about the lot averaging and how it modified the R-8.

A motion was made by Commissioner Mengelberg, seconded by Commissioner Ide, to tentatively approve AP 17-05: appeal of the Planning Commission's denial of TP 17-03 and ZC 17-02; Zone Change from "R-10" single-family dwelling district to "R-8" single-family dwelling district and a subdivision of 77 lots (Wheeler Farm) located near White Lane and Orchard Grove Drive with the amended conditions of approval as discussed by the Planning Commission and adding a condition of approval for Tract A to be accessible to the public in perpetuity with maintenance by the Homeowners Association. The motion passed by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Commissioner Brian Shaw, Mayor Dan Holladay, Commissioner Nancy Ide and Commissioner Renate Mengelberg

Nay: 1 - Commissioner Frank O'Donnell

7. General Business

- 7a.** Second Reading of Ordinance No. 17-1012, Amending the Comprehensive Plan (Planning files PZ 17-01), Zone Change (ZC-17-04), Minor Site Plan and Design Review (SP 17-114) Allowing the Relocation of the Oregon City Community Development Offices

A motion was made by Commissioner Ide, seconded by Commissioner Shaw, to approve the second reading and final adoption of Ordinance No. 17-1012, amending the Comprehensive Plan (Planning files PZ 17-01), Zone Change (ZC-17-04), Minor Site Plan and Design Review (SP 17-114) allowing the relocation of the Oregon City Community Development offices. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Commissioner Brian Shaw, Mayor Dan Holladay, Commissioner Nancy Ide, Commissioner Renate Mengelberg and Commissioner Frank O'Donnell

- 7b.** Letter of Support for the Sale of Oregon City View Manor at 200 Longview Way

Chuck Robbins, Executive Director of the Housing Authority, requested a letter of support for an application to the US Department of Housing and Urban Development to sell the Oregon City View Manor property. It was 22 acres of public housing on Holcomb Boulevard. This property was expensive to maintain. The plan was to sell 17-19 acres at fair market value and the remaining 3-5 acres to a non-profit for affordable housing probably using the cottage cluster plan. HUD would have the final say on the sale and they would be going through a Section 18 process. If it was sold, all of the residents would receive a Section 8 voucher. It would take about a year to relocate the residents and then the property would be sold.

Commissioner Ide was in support. She hoped that 5 acres would be sold to a non-profit.

Commissioner Shaw thought the 100 units that would be lost should be replaced.

There was no objection to signing the letter of support.

7c.

Resolution No. 17-26, Declaring an Emergency and Exempting Clackamas County Modular Tiny Home Assembly from Planning Code Requirements and Processes on a Temporary Basis until February 28, 2018

Mr. Robbins said the tiny homes project for Veterans was a high priority and ten homes had been completed, and 5 more would be built. They planned to move the homes once they had been built, which should be by the end of February. The preparation of the site to where they would be moved was underway.

A motion was made by Commissioner Shaw, seconded by Commissioner Mengelberg, to approve Resolution No. 17-26, declaring an emergency and exempting Clackamas County modular tiny home assembly from Planning Code requirements and processes on a temporary basis until February 28, 2018. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Commissioner Brian Shaw, Mayor Dan Holladay, Commissioner Nancy Ide, Commissioner Renate Mengelberg and Commissioner Frank O'Donnell

8. Consent Agenda

A motion was made by Commissioner Shaw, seconded by Commissioner Mengelberg, to approve the consent agenda. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Commissioner Brian Shaw, Mayor Dan Holladay, Commissioner Nancy Ide, Commissioner Renate Mengelberg and Commissioner Frank O'Donnell

8a.

Personal Services Agreement with Murraysmith for the Water Distribution System Capital Improvement Program Update (PS 17-019)

8b.

OLCC: Liquor License Application- On-Premises Sales, New Outlet, Applying as a Limited Liability Company, Toki Sushi, 19061 S Beaver Creek Rd, Oregon City, OR 97045

8c.

Minutes of the October 3, 2017 Regular Meeting

8d. Minutes of the September 20, 2017 Regular Meeting

8e. Minutes of the September 12, 2017 Work Session

9. Communications

a. City Manager

Mr. Konkol reminded the Commission of their upcoming meetings on November 7 and 9, 2017.

John Lewis, Public Works Director, discussed the spider projection on the Elevator for Halloween. He thanked Cyrus Zamani from the Party Factory for providing the projection. The Highway 99E bluff waterline replacement project won an award from the American Public Works Association (APWA) as the Environmental/Water Project of the Year. The 10th Street median signage installation was complete and the median installation was scheduled for November 6, 2017.

b. Commission

Commissioner Ide reported on the Tourism Strategic Plan. There were two more meetings to discuss the Plan. The Downtown Oregon City Association Board hired a volunteer/public relations staff person. The Economic Improvement District (EID) process had begun and there was a new volunteer program at the Elevator. She attended the first Equitable Housing Advisory Team meeting, Ribbon Cutting for Fred Meyer's grand reopening, Clackamas County Affordable Housing Panel, Clackamas Cities Association Dinner, and policy meeting at Clackamas County regarding the creation of a Housing Leadership Committee.

Commissioner Shaw attended the Library's one year anniversary, Oregon City Business Alliance presentation on the Willamette Falls Providence Hospital, OC Together presentation at the high school, and a meeting on river assets.

Commissioner Mengelberg attended the Fred Meyer grand reopening and Willamette Falls Legacy Project partners executive session meeting.

c. Mayor

Mayor Holladay attended the Willamette Falls Legacy Project partners executive session, hosted the meeting of the Clackamas County Mayors, City Managers, Clackamas County Board Chair, and County Administrator. This group would be meeting bi-monthly. He met with Chair Bernard and Administrator Krupp regarding the first steps of moving the Courthouse from Main Street to the new facility on the top of the hill. He had gone downtown with his grandchild for Halloween.

10. Adjournment

Mayor Holladay adjourned the meeting at 9:36 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Kattie Riggs, City Recorder