PARK CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION NOTES
SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH
MAY 6, 2010

Present: **Mayor Dana Williams; Council members, Alex Butwinski, Candace Erickson, Joe Kernan, Cindy Matsumoto, and Liza Simpson**

Tom Bakaly, City Manager; Mark Harrington, City Attorney; Kent Cashel, Transportation Manager; Brian Anderson, Parking Manager; Bret Howser, Budget Manager; and Lori Collett, Finance Manager

Alison Butz and Ken Davis, HMBA

1. Council questions/comments. Cindy Matsumoto reported on participating on a School District task force. Alex Butwinski spoke about the HMBA annual meeting and relayed that the North Silver Lake MPD was approved by the Planning Commission. He also attended Recycle Utah and the Arts Council meetings. Candace Erickson indicated that the Chamber is predicting good numbers for lodging for March. She spoke about Steve Jenkins retiring from the Board of Health and the recruitment process. The Recreation Advisory Board is working on the City Park Master Plan and Creekside Park which should be completed in mid-July. She discussed the Recreation Department's outreach program. Liza Simpson spoke about attending Steve Jenkin's retirement luncheon and a Lodging Association meeting. Joe Kernan reported on the HMBA and the interagency task force meetings and attending the Genius Award dinner where Park City was recognized. The Mayor commented on The Follies, discussions with MIDA and attending a Prospector Home Owners Association meeting.

2. Parking enforcement update. Kent Cashel explained that the Old Town parking program must address diverse parking needs for a variety of user groups and paid parking is a part of that program. Time limited spaces, time limit zones and employee permits are monitored in the area. He indicated that a financial plan for additional parking revenues and special event parking will not be covered today and will be discussed at a future time. The mission of the parking enforcement program is to provide for a reasonable level of regulatory compliance within a customer friendly environment accomplished through education (signs and published regulation maps). The enforcement officers are also ambassadors by providing information on the parking system and to assist visitors. Mr. Cashel explained the $3 first ticket, the graduated fine schedule and immobilization. Over 350 people are on the late fee list ranging from outstanding payments of $300 to $1,400.

Through a PowerPoint graph, Mr. Cashel pointed out that Council's parking priority direction is matched with the enforcement program demonstrated by fine amounts and number of patrols. He described frequency of patrols for paid parking and time limited lots and areas in the Main Street area. In response to a question from Liza Simpson about not needing to begin enforcement until 11 a.m. on Main Street, Mr. Cashel explained the 8 a.m. sweep. Staff believes that current enforcement practices produce a reasonable level of compliance. Ms. Simpson suggested adjusting the plan seasonally which Mr. Cashel felt is possible.

He displayed a ten year history of citations issued within the Historic District from the period December 15 to April 15, pointing out the lack of compliance at the beginning of the program initiated in1998 but in 2005, the number stabilized at 5,000 to 7,000 tickets a year, averaging about 50 a day. Staff was directed that enforcement needed to be stepped up, an adjustment was made, and more tickets were issued in 2010. The number of citations is directly related to patrol time, patrol efficiency, degree to which regulations are enforced, and level of compliance. He emphasized that there are no quotas or incentives for employees to write tickets. Change in priorities affects the enforcement program. Mr. Cashel described the patrol times for residential parking in the Historic District, streets around PCMR and associated ticket history. There are no changes suggested here.

Kent Cashel stated that the City directs its officers to provide a 15 minute grace period for just expired violations, which staff believes is an adequate amount of time. The $3 first ticket has been successful because people visit Public Works to pay the fine and the parking program is then explained. The HMBA recommends a $0 first ticket which he agrees makes sense. Staff agrees with the HMBA to use the three prior calendar years for the sixth ticket calculation of the graduated fee schedule and maintain other fine structures. Common sense enforcement on snowy days was discussed.

Alison Butz, Executive Director, explained that the HMBA has a parking management committee and will be looking at all components, not just enforcement. They are not interested in the turnover of parking spaces but the ease and friendliness of the parking program. Paid parking has gone from a necessary evil to a bit of a disincentive. Members continue to hear that the 15 minute grace period is not being followed. The enforcement officers really need to be ambassadors of the City and staff should manage Ampco to make sure they are following policy.

Joe Kernan understood that turnover is not important to the HMBA and asked about the three hour time limit. Ms. Butz responded that it was not specifically addressed but will be. The Mayor acknowledged that he has received complaints about enforcement recently. He liked the first ticket being forgiven and supports the 30 minute leeway, regardless if there's a ticket on the windshield. Red curbs are hard to see on snowy days and parked cars shouldn't be ticketed. Candace Erickson stated that 30 minutes is too long in her opinion and 15 minutes is sufficient if the policy is being followed, but she has heard similar complaints recently. She also favored the $0 first ticket as a courtesy and common sense enforcement during the winter.

The adjudication process was addressed. Cindy Matsumoto asked if the 15 minute policy is being followed and Kent Cashel assured her that this will be monitored and implemented consistently. Discussion ensued on the challenges of the Mayor's suggestion of forgiving a written ticket on the windshield. Ms. Matsumoto suggested that enforcement be decreased in April and May when it is slow. The City could save some money and the policy could be loosened. Mr. Cashel explained that this could be accomplished but regulations are better understood and less frustrating to the public if they are consistently applied. In response to the suggestion of an in-house program because of the ambassador component, Kent Cashel felt this option would be very expensive and explained that the industry is competitive and able to control costs.

Ms. Simpson spoke about being harassed by an enforcement officer while unloading deliveries on Main Street. She stated that she supports the 15 minute grace period (over three years) and a free first ticket. In response to a question from Joe Kernan, Brian Anderson explained that enforcement officers must have 40 hours of training. Mr. Kernan felt it would be helpful if enforcement officers had handbooks with clear instructions on what to enforce and exemptions to the regulations. He supported the 15 minute grace period and the $0 first fine. Alex Butwinski commented on the quality of the staff report. He didn't feel that writing 20 tickets a day is excessive and felt that ordinances should be enforced. The $0 first ticket is a great idea. Mr. Butwinski stated that he is not inclined to change time limits or to change regulations seasonally. Consistent enforcement is important.

The Mayor summarized that members agree with the $0 first ticket and 15 minute grace period and added that many Ampco employees are great ambassadors for the City. Members were not interested in changing the fee schedule or the level of enforcement at this point.

Ken Davis, HMBA, stated that tickets have tripled recently and were being written on Easter Sunday. Enforcement should be friendlier.

2. Presentation of tentative budget. Bret Howser displayed PowerPoint slides to guide the discussion and better illustrate information. He noted that during Visioning in January, long-range financial projections were discussed. Revenues tend to level off over time while expenses continue to increase at a steady pace, or at least the rate of inflation. Cities that adopt the certified property tax rate, or no property tax increase rate, adjust their rates downward as assessed values grow and over time the rate diminishes the revenue stream. He explained that the City receives increased property tax dollars from new growth but not from existing properties where the same dollars are collected as the previous year. There is no inflationary component which means that over time, purchasing power diminishes. He warned that property tax is a significant portion of the City's revenues but the revenue curve levels off over time. Joe Kernan pointed out that although there is no inflationary component; cities in Utah are not losing revenue because of decreased assessed valuations like other communities in other states.

Mr. Howser stated that in April, staff presented a plan for long-range financial projections linked with short term budget balancing to create a revenue mix analysis. The analysis has been distributed to Council and is available on-line. As taxing entities adopt the certified property tax rate, the rate has gone down while assessed values have increased. Property taxes include two components, the general levy which covers services at 14% and the debt service levy which covers general obligation bonds at 9%. He displayed a graph illustrating property and sales tax comparisons. In 1994, property tax was at 52% and in 1998, 44% which is a trend that will continue without a property tax increase. Sales tax eclipsed property taxes as a primary revenue source and the problem is that sales tax is inherently volatile. Mr. Kernan pointed out that sales tax revenues more than doubled over 14 years which is a good thing. Alex Butwinski emphasized that some of the property tax revenue is a function of new product coming on line but excludes the expense side for providing services. He believes Mr. Howser is on the right track by diminishing the volatility of relying too heavily on sales tax which is a good management decision. Mr. Kernan believed that since most of the infrastructure is built in town and much of future development will be commercial, providing City services should not be excessive. Mr. Butwinski stated that the City's disproportionate reliance on sales tax will intensify without a change in policy.

Mr. Howser clarified that state statute requires cities to have no less than 5% and no more than 18% in reserves. Rainy day funds are not allowed. This approach reduces the risk of relying on volatile upside revenue streams like sales tax even if the intention is to maintain service levels through recessions. In response to a question from Joe Kernan about moving CIP funding to the General Fund, Mr. Howser explained that CIP funds have to be dedicated to capital projects and money in the CIP can not be transferred to the General Fund unless the capital project is completed. Lori Collett agreed and explained that CIP balances have traditionally been allocated to other capital projects. Under state law if a project is completed or if a capital facilities plan is changed, remaining funds can be transferred back to the General Fund. Mr. Howser interjected that moving project funding is not allowed if a project is funded with associated impact fees.

Another approach at arriving at a balanced revenue mix is to look at the expense side of providing services. He explained that the goal of this year's budget is to recommend a revenue stream mix of 32% sales tax and 35% property tax which would alleviate the dependence somewhat on building, planning and engineering fees which are extremely volatile. Joe Kernan asked for the volatility reduction percentage for the year which was not available. Mr. Howser continued that the revenue action plan is a long term plan. He reiterated that the reason for the recommendation relates to long term issues associated with the property tax revenue stream. The budget must be balanced this year but the primary consideration today deals with establishing a solid 15 year plan.

He stated that staff is recommending a 6% increase in property tax every other year or 3% per year, which is roughly equivalent to the Consumer Price Index. Staff is also recommending revisiting planning, building and engineering fees regularly and user fees every other year. The reason for the tax increase every other year is to provide enough time to evaluate circumstances, revisit the plan and adjust it accordingly. Mr. Howser emphasized that this is not an effort to balance the budget this year, but to craft a stable revenue mix program for the long term. Mayor Williams acknowledged the vulnerability of sales tax distribution with the state legislature.

Joe Kernan continued to argue that Park City has experienced a lot of new growth over the past 20 years and there may be more prosperity. Imposing a property tax increase is a choice and may not be necessary. Bret Howser responded that it is possible that redevelopment activity will be adequate to mitigate the rate of inflation, but based on the best data on hand, it is not likely. The inflationary component contributes to decreased purchase power levels.

Candace Erickson pointed out that the Police and Public Works Budgets combined total is $8.8 million which isn't covered by what is collected in property taxes today at $6 million. Property tax revenues should cover basic services and Park City is not even close and at some point, growth will stop. Mr. Howser pointed out that studies show that providing services for new commercial costs $.50 of every dollar collected for property tax while residential costs more than the property tax collected. He is uncertain about the numbers for redevelopment projects.

Mr. Howser displayed a graph relating to the current year's budget and budget options which are divided into three categories. Options reflect a level of service increase and many are Council directed; they and will be further reviewed on May 20. The largest expenditure in the options is relocation costs associated with the Recreation Center remodel. Budget issues include a state retirement system contribution increase of $72,000 and staff is also recommending creating a lump merit pool. In the past, they were paid out departmentally. Debt service will be affected by the Recreation Center Project and all changes to the CIP are offset by alternate decreases. The City has committed to about $1 million in budget reductions and some are in the form of personnel cuts. Four vacant full-time regular positions are recommended to be cut as well as seasonal hours, representing 2.5% of the man hours reflected in the General Fund. By comparison, Salt Lake City is cutting 3.9%. In response to a comment from Alex Butwinski, Mr. Howser described tying debt service to related funding sources.

Bret Howser presented a graph of what measures Park City has taken compared to AAA bond-rated municipalities and other cities like us. Capital projects have been deferred. He acknowledged that the City has not laid off staff, but has cut positions. Cuts in expenditures have been analyzed and targeted as opposed to across-the-board cuts. Salaries were frozen that would have typically been addressed last year in a two year budget cycle. He stated that travel budgets have been significantly reduced and vacant positions will remain unfilled. Some service levels have been reduced and fees have been analyzed. In addition to these measures, and in relation to the long-term interest in maintaining a healthy revenue mix, staff is recommending a property tax increase.

Twenty-three percent of a property tax bill goes to the City and of that 23%, 14% is for services and 9% represents voter-approved debt. The 6% increase will affect only the 14% allocated for the general levy or for City services. Mr. Howser discussed the analysis of the primary property tax burden to median income over a ten year period and compared tax levies of other cities in Utah where Park City ranked as one of the lowest. Moab imposes no property tax and is heavily reliant on sales tax revenue. He relayed that the average Park City home owner pays $2,700 in property tax while the average in Breckenridge is $2,400; Aspen $3,800; Telluride $4,100; Sun Valley $3,400; and Jackson $5,500. He emphasized that the property tax increase per year is $33 on average; non-primary $52; and commercial $54. He admitted being asked about the timing of the property tax increase and explained the potential for declining purchasing power. Bond rating agencies are extremely impressed with Park City's forward thinking financial policies, specifically the recession plan. Park City has a reputation for planning well ahead of time and making tough financial decisions long before being forced to make even tougher financial decisions and he felt that the staff recommendation is in line with this tradition.

Prepared by Janet M. Scott, City Recorder

PARK CITY COUNCIL MEETING
SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH
MAY 6, 2010

I ROLL CALL

Mayor Dana Williams called the regular meeting of the City Council to order at approximately 6 p.m. at the Marsac Municipal Building on Thursday, May 6, 2010. Members in attendance were Dana Williams, Alex Butwinski, Candace Erickson, Joe Kernan, Cindy Matsumoto, and Liza Simpson. Staff present was Tom Bakaly, City Manager; Tom Daley, Deputy City Attorney; Tommy Youngblood, Special Events Coordinator; Max Paap, Special Events Manager; Kirsten Whetstone, Planner; Bret Howser, Budget Manager; and Diane Foster, Sustainability Manager.

II COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES FROM COUNCIL AND STAFF

Alex Butwinski disclosed that he is sponsoring a team for Running with Ed and Liza Simpson noted that she will be participating in the event. Joe Kernan stated that he has recycling contracts with Summit County and the City.

III PUBLIC INPUT *(Any matter of City business not scheduled on agenda)*

None.

IV WORK SESSION NOTES AND MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF APRIL 15, 2010

Alex Butwinski pointed out a minor grammatical correction to the minutes. Liza Simpson, "I move we approve the work session notes and minutes from April 15th as corrected". Candace Erickson seconded. Motion unanimously carried.

V CONSENT AGENDA *(Items that have previously been discussed or are perceived as routine and may be approved by one motion. Listed items do not imply a predisposition for approval and may be removed by motion and discussed and acted upon under "Additional Discussion – Agenda Items")*

1. Consideration of a Letter of Intent with the Park City School District for the SR248 Tunnel - and

2. Consideration of a professional services agreement in an amount not to exceed $51,505 with Brown & Caldwell for the purpose of preparing an application for a Utah Pollution Discharge Elimination System Permit - and

3. Consideration of a Resolution declaring May 15, 2010 as Arbor Day in Park City, Utah – Joe Kernan, "I move we approve Consent Agenda Items 1, 2 and 3". Liza Simpson seconded. Motion unanimously carried.

VI NEW BUSINESS *(New items with presentations and/or anticipated detailed discussions)*

1. Consideration of a Master Festival License for the Park City Mini-Trail Series to be held in Round Valley on June 26, July 10 and August 14, 2010 – Run Events – Tommy Youngblood explained that this is a trail series run held once a month during the summer. Parking will be

available at Quinns Junction but if more than 400 applicants participate, there will be contingency parking at Richardson Flats. The Mayor opened the public hearing; there were no comments from the audience. Liza Simpson, "I move we approve the Master Festival License for the Park City Mini-Trail Series to be held in Round Valley on June 26, July 10 and August 4". Alex Butwinski seconded. Motion unanimously carried.

2. Consideration of a Master Festival License for Running with Ed to be held on May 22, 2010 – Park City Education Foundation – Max Paap explained that this first year event is a fund-raiser for the Park City Education Foundation. It's a 41 mile relay race that reaches every school in the District and staff has been working with the County and Basin Recreation to mitigate traffic at exchange spots and to make sure the event vehicle does not mingle with any of the runners. Amplified music in City Park triggers the MFL and staff recommends approval. Applicant Tim Chesley interjected that there are currently 100 teams and 250 volunteers. The Mayor opened the public hearing; there were no comments. Cindy Matsumoto, "I move that we approve the Master Festival License for Running with Ed on May 22nd". Liza Simpson seconded. Motion unanimously carried.

3. Consideration of an Ordinance approving a one year extension of the approval of a plat amendment for the Main Street Mall, located at 333 Main Street, combining Lots 7-15 and 18-26, Block 11, Amended Park City Survey, Park City, Utah – Kirsten Whetstone explained that the applicants received approval in March 2009 with a condition to record the plat within one year. In March 2010, a request was received for a one year extension to March 26, 2011; the lot combination memorialized on the plat has not changed. In response to questions from Liza Simpson and Cindy Matsumoto, Ms. Whetstone explained that the applicants were interested in the pending LMC HR-2 zone amendments. The design plans received a two year approval or until 2011 and any revisions would have to comply with current provisions. Alex Butwinski suggested a shorter extension and Kirsten Whetstone explained that typically, extensions are for a year. Ms. Matsumoto asked if anything unfavorable to the City will be grandfathered by approving the plat and Ms. Whetstone indicated that she did not think so. The Mayor opened the public hearing; there was no public input.

Candace Erickson, "I move we approve an Ordinance approving a one year extension of the approval of a plat amendment for the Main Street Mall, located at 333 Main Street, combining lots 7-15 and 18-26 on Block 11". Liza Simpson seconded. Motion unanimously carried.

4. Consideration of a Resolution adopting a tentative revised budget for fiscal year 2010 and the budget for fiscal year 2011 for Park City Municipal Corporation and its related agencies – The Mayor announced that this is the first public hearing on the budget, one of many scheduled now through June. Bret Howser referred to the work session presentation. He pointed out that the primary driver of the proposed property tax increase is the goal of achieving a better revenue mix; the revenue mix analysis is available on-line. Park City's main revenue stream is funded with property and sales taxes and over a 15 period, the property tax portion has dropped to 44% from 52%. Sales tax is a more volatile revenue source than property tax which means over time, the City's revenue mix as a whole has become more volatile which makes it difficult to deliver continuous service, especially during a recession.

He explained that an analysis was conducted on the volatility of the revenue stream and another on the desired stability of the services provided by the City. Staff then crafted a proposed revenue mix which is slightly weighted toward property tax at about 35% and 32% for sales tax.

In order to accomplish this, staff is recommending a 15 year action plan which would begin with a 6% property tax increase every other year beginning this upcoming year, and raising building, planning, engineering, and other fees. Mr. Howser emphasized that the property tax increase is intended to keep up with inflation. In Utah, cities that are not adopting a property tax increase are required to adopt the certified property tax rate which produces the same amount of dollars from existing property as the previous year. New growth represents new dollars, but as assessed values increase, the certified tax rate goes down. He stated that the lack of an inflationary component diminishes the City's purchasing power. The property tax increase would equate to 3% every year comparable to the Consumer Price Index. A graph was displayed outlining long range financial projections.

A good revenue mix also ties into short term budget balancing. Mr. Howser acknowledged receiving criticism about the City not cutting expenses. He stated that the City is planning on about $1 million in expenditure reductions for 2011 as was the case in 2010. Included in the list of budget reductions is the elimination of 5.25 full-time equivalent positions but Park City is trying to avoid lay-offs. This represents about 2.5% man hours in the General Fund; Salt Lake City is cutting 65 positions, representing about 3.9% of its General Fund man hours. He reviewed what other cities and AAA bonded municipalities are doing to manage budgets, many of which the City has implemented. He emphasized that the property tax increase is mostly related to the long term strategy associated with the property tax revenue stream by considering an inflationary component. Through a displayed graph, Mr. Howser pointed out the other taxing entities on a Park City property tax bill. The City's portion is about 23% of the total property tax bill and of that amount, 14% is allocated to City services and 9% represents voter-approved general obligation debt. The 6% property tax increase would only apply to the 14% relating to the provision of City services.

He compared property tax amounts with median household income over a 10 year period which shows that people are paying roughly the same proportion of their income today toward property taxes as they were 10 years ago. When compared to the property taxes of other cities on the Wasatch Front and other mountain resort communities, Park City is among the lowest. The increase on an average primary residence valued at $860,000 would be $33 per year, non-primary would be $52 and commercial $54. He felt that the proposal is timely because of the loss of purchasing power over time. Park City has a good history and reputation for making solid financial decisions and he quoted bond rating agencies about Park City's practices. Imposing a property tax increase is a hard thing to do but the right thing to do. Mr. Howser relayed that input was received from Bill McCullough objecting to a tax increase during a recession and John Halsey who indicated his support of the property tax increase.

The 35%/32% stability ratio was discussed and Mr. Howser explained that the 6% property tax increase would be re-evaluated every year and the plan adjusted accordingly. In response to a question from Joe Kernan, Mr. Howser described current bonds and debt service levy projections. Mr. Kernan expressed that he would feel more comfortable imposing a property tax increase when debt service obligations decrease and asked for a graph detailing when bonds come on line and when they retire. The Mayor opened the public hearing.

Teri Whitney, Snowflower Condominiums, acknowledged the amount of work on the budget but expressed her opposition to imposing a property tax every year. There is no plan for cutting personnel costs by way of wage reductions or lay-offs and she encouraged the Council to look at all aspects of operations. Maybe the City needs to do things differently. The positions being cut are vacant and she understood that sales tax revenue projections are good.

Mary Wintzer, resident and Iron Horse commercial property owner, stated that she feels *we're all in this together*. She spoke about losing seven of 20 tenants due to the economy and business owners have been forced to lay off long term employees. She felt the economic recovery will take longer than first envisioned and asked Council members to do the hard things that the business community has had to do so it feels like we're in this together.

With no further input from the audience, the Mayor requested a motion to continue. Liza Simpson asked that staff explore property tax relief like a circuit breaker for people on fixed incomes. Alex Butwinski asked for alternatives to a tax increase, specifically examples where a decrease in level of service could be recommended. Liza Simpson, "I move we continue the tentative revised budget for fiscal year 2010 and the budget for fiscal year 2011 to the 20th of May". Alex Butwinski seconded. Motion unanimously carried.

5. Consideration of a Memorandum of Understanding with the Military Installation Development Authority and Summit County – Diane Foster explained that for the past 13 years, the City has been working with the Air Force and the past two years with MIDA to find an appropriate location for the military recreational facility. The military can not use its general funds to build a recreational facility and must identify other ways to generate revenue. Senate Bill 216 provided MIDA with the ability to operate in the community and not just at defunct military facilities. She stated that the City and County experienced a productive relationship with MIDA who has helped the process along and has been a good partner.

The MOU provides the City and County with a level of control that they would not have otherwise because by law MIDA does not have to comply with local zoning. Under the MOU, the City and County gain many of these control measures and in return offer up the Triangle Parcel for commercial development. Ms. Foster pointed out that the Triangle Parcel is already located in a commercial zone at Silver Creek Junction, which would provide supplemental funding for the hotel. The Triangle Parcel was purchased for future City and County needs at $42,000 per acre in December 2008 and the current selling price is $70,000 per acre. While the City and County had planned to use the property for future public works needs, it was determined that none of those needs are immediate and it is possible to offer the land without impacting the public in the near term. The agreement also details how the property tax increment and the resort sales tax will be shared between MIDA and the County. Staff urges approval of the MOU specifically because the hotel and the commercial property will both be built in areas that are appropriate for these types of development as opposed to other pieces of land considered in the past. Ms. Foster reiterated that the City and the County will have a level of control over the future hotel and commercial development that they wouldn't otherwise have and it is a proactive agreement benefitting not only the City, County and MIDA but also the men and women of the military.

The Mayor pointed out that the MOU is dated November 2009 and the City Manager explained that Council is basically ratifying the document. The Mayor invited public input; there was none. Candace Erickson, "I move approval of the Memorandum of Understanding with the Military Installation Development Authority and Summit County". Liza Simpson seconded. Motion unanimously carried.

VII ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION – AGENDA ITEMS

VIII ADJOURNMENT

With no further business, the regular meeting of the City Council was adjourned.

MEMORANDUM OF CLOSED SESSION

The City Council met in closed session at approximately 7:30 p.m. Members in attendance were Mayor Dana Williams, Alex Butwinski, Candace Erickson, Joe Kernan, Cindy Matsumoto, and Liza Simpson. Staff present was Tom Bakaly, City Manager; Tom Daley, Deputy City Attorney; Kathy Lundborg, Water Manager; Michael Kovacs, Assistant City Manager; and Jonathan Weidenhamer, Economic Development Manager. Candace Erickson, "I move to close the meeting to discuss property and litigation". Joe Kernan seconded. Motion carried unanimously. The closed session adjourned at approximately 9:00 p.m.

The meeting for which these minutes were prepared was noticed by posting at least 24 hours in advance and by delivery to the news media two days prior to the meeting.

Prepared by Janet M. Scott