

Minutes of the Work Session meeting of the Syracuse City Council held on February 9, 2010, at 5:30 p.m., in the Council Work Session Room, 1979 West 1900 South, Syracuse City, Davis County, Utah.

Present: Councilmembers: Alan Clark
Doug Hammond
D. Matthew Kimmel
Douglas Peterson (arrived at 5:35 p.m.)
Larry D. Shingleton

Mayor Jamie Nagle
City Administrator Rodger Worthen
City Recorder Cassie Z. Brown

City Employees Present:

Finance Director LaMar Holt
Police Chief Brian Wallace
IT Director TJ Peace
City Attorney Todd Godfrey
City Engineer Rick Hansen
Police Detective Corey Rowley

The purpose of the Work Session was for the Governing Body to review the agenda for the Regular Council Meeting to begin at 7:00 p.m., review the City Council Calendar, discuss Utah League of Cities and Towns (ULCT) Conference Attendance, review the City Claim Statement, discuss a proposal to construct a "No Child Left Out" facility at existing City park, review Councilmember assignments, review proposed Museum Board bylaws document, and discuss Council Business.

Agenda

Councilmember Hammond stated that during the special meeting of February 2, 2010 Mayor Nagle had provided each Councilmember with a copy of a letter she received from the United States Office of Special Counsel regarding some complaints that Mayor Nagle had violated the Hatch Act in her bid for Mayor of Syracuse City. He stated that he wanted everyone to know that he met with Mayor Nagle later in the week to reassure her that he was not one of the Councilmembers that had been involved in those complaints. He stated his intent is to work with the Mayor so that the City can move forward. He then asked that the letter from the US Office of Special Council be attached to the final minutes of the special meeting.

Calendar

Councilmember Shingleton reported that he will be out of town March 9; therefore he will be absent at the Council meeting scheduled for that night.

Councilmember Hammond reported that the Museum Board will hold its meetings on the second Tuesday of every month at 9:30 a.m. at the Museum.

Councilmember Shingleton reported that the Syracuse Business Organization Strategic Support (SBOSS) meeting is scheduled for tomorrow evening at 6:00 p.m. He stated that 36 businesses have confirmed that they will attend. Mayor Nagle added that McDonald's offered to provide refreshments for the meeting. She encouraged all members of the Governing Body to attend the meeting if their schedule permits. She stated it would be nice to show support for the businesses in the City.

Mayor Nagle reported that she will be out of town from July 18 through 24.

Councilmember Clark reported that he will be out of town July 14 through 17.

ULCT Conference Attendance

Councilmember Kimmel stated that he checked his calendar and he is available to attend the Utah League of Cities and Towns (ULCT) meeting in St. George. Councilmember Hammond stated that he also would not mind attending the meeting. He stated that he paid for himself to attend last years meeting. Councilmember Clark stated that the Council made the decision during their last work session that two Councilmembers could attend the conference if they were willing to share a room and transportation to the conference. He added that he would also like to add the stipulation that anyone that attends the conference be required to report to the rest of the Council about the things they learned. He then asked if the Council felt there was value in sending Mayor Nagle to the conference, even though doing so would double the cost. Mayor Nagle stated she would like to attend the meeting, but she recognizes there is a significant cost involved. She stated she will be happy to receive training from the ULCT in September as well as a report from the Councilmembers that attend the meeting. Councilmember Peterson stated that he would like to attend the meeting. He explained that the meeting will be held in conjunction with spring break from his employment and he would like to take his family. He stated he would be willing to pay his expenses with the exception of the conference registration. After a short discussion, all agreed that Councilmembers Kimmel and Peterson would attend the ULCT conference.

City Administrator Worthen stated that the Utah City Managers Association (UCMA) will hold their annual conference the week prior to the ULCT conference and he would like to attend that meeting. Councilmember Clark stated the UCMA meeting is an important meeting for Mr. Worthen to attend. Councilmember Hammond agreed and stated that there is much information provided regarding the most recent legislative session, which is valuable information for the City to have.

Claim statement

Councilmember Kimmel reported that he sent a list of questions regarding the claim statement to Mr. Worthen and he is currently awaiting a response to those questions. He then stated he had some additional questions regarding the claim statement. He stated pages eight and nine of the report include the same charge, for shop supplies and air filters, to two different accounts. Mr. Worthen explained that various expenditures are divided among different enterprise funds because various departments may be benefiting from the expenditure.

Councilmember Hammond inquired as to how the bank transition is going. Mr. Worthen stated that the transition is nearly complete; the City's account at Zion's Bank has been opened, but there are other services the City is waiting to receive. Mayor Nagle suggested that this topic be discussed later in the meeting as it did not qualify as a claim statement item.

Councilmember Kimmel stated that page seven includes an expenditure to install lights on Antelope Drive and he asked why the City was charged for those installation costs. Mr. Worthen explained that the City executed a betterment agreement with the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) that dictated that the City would participate in the cost of upgraded lighting fixtures. He stated that the initial plan was to install the lights along the entire length of the street, but the decision was later made to only install the lights at the intersection with 2000 West in order to cut costs. He stated he believed there are six lights total. Mayor Nagle added that the lights installed at the intersection are actually more energy efficient than the light typically used by UDOT; they are much less expensive to operate. Councilmember Clark added that the energy efficiency of the lights was analyzed and it was discovered that it would take 40 years of operating the lights and realizing the energy efficiency savings to recover the cost of the upgrade to install the lights along the entire length of the street.

Councilmember Kimmel stated page three of the report includes two expenditures to account 10-51-30; one to Vortex for a door repair and the other for re-keying services. He inquired as to the purpose of those expenditures. Mr. Worthen explained that Vortex repaired a door at the Public Works facility, though he was not sure what repairs were necessary. He then explained that the re-keying expenditure is in reference to the re-keying of all City buildings, with the exception of the Community Center, due to a loss of a grand master key. Mayor Nagle added that former-Mayor Panucci lost his grand master key and it was necessary to re-key all buildings that could be accessed by that key. She stated that she would like to discuss installing card readers on the outer doors of each City building to prevent the need to re-key City buildings in any future event of the loss of a key. She stated the cost to do so would be approximately \$3,000 and it would be possible to electronically discontinue access to any card if it is lost. She then stated the thing that was the most troubling to her about the loss of the grand master key was that it was actually lost in September, but the fact that it was lost was not discovered until the City asked that the key be returned at the end of former-Mayor Panucci's term in office.

Discuss proposal to construct "No Child Left Out" facility at existing City Park.

Mr. Worthen explained that the Council has heard from Tara Bennett in the past regarding a project she is working on that is specific to Syracuse City. He explained that Ms. Bennett is seeking to acquire a portion of a City park to be designated as a potential site for a park for disabled children. He stated that Ms. Bennett has taken on the challenge to seek grant monies and other funding sources to construct the facility. He stated he has provided some information about Ms. Bennett's proposal as well as a link to her website to each member of the Governing Body.

Councilmember Peterson asked Ms. Bennett how closely she is going to be working with a group called Unlimited Play. Ms. Bennett explained that she plans to partner with that organization. Councilmember Peterson stated that his cousin oversees Unlimited Play's operations and he wanted to disclose that relationship to the entire Council. He asked if he needed to remove himself from any discussions or decisions regarding this project. Mayor Nagle stated she felt Councilmember Peterson's disclosure of the relationship was sufficient.

Mr. Worthen then continued explaining that Ms. Bennett is seeking a two to three acre site and he has provided each member of the Governing Body with a list of the available park sites as well as the pros and cons for each of those sites. He stated some sites are able to accommodate more vehicles than others. He stated he is seeking direction from the Council regarding drafting a potential resolution to declare support of the project and dedication of park property. He explained that Legacy, Jensen, and Fremont Parks are among the top choices for the City and for Ms. Bennett.

Councilmember Kimmel inquired as to the liability the City will incur by providing park ground for this type of facility. Mr. Worthen stated there would be some liability issues, but they would be no different than the liability issues associated with any other City park; if a child is injured at any City park the child's parent could file a claim with the City's insurance company. He stated that the City conducts regular inspections of park equipment and the City's insurance company conducts a semi-annual inspection of City facilities. Ms. Bennett added that, for the most part, users of the park assume the risk associated by using the park equipment, unless the equipment at the park is faulty in any way.

Councilmember Shingleton explained that he believed Legacy Park may be the best site for the playground structure, depending on the amount of land that the City could make available to Ms. Bennett. He stated the park is located in

a quieter area and the water hazard at the park is much smaller than the pond at Jensen Park. He stated the park is one of the least used parks in the City and he asked how much ground is available there.

Mayor Nagle stated the first question that should be answered is how many parking spaces are needed for a park of this type. City Engineer Hansen stated there is a park of this type in St. Louis, Missouri; the park is three to five acres in size and there are 54 parking stalls at the park, 10 of which are Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliant. Councilmember Clark inquired as to the number of parking stalls currently available at Legacy Park, to which Mr. Hansen answered 28. Ms. Bennett stated that her original fundraising goal was \$800,000, but she has increased that goal to \$1 million to deal with issues such as this. She stated that she felt that additional infrastructure work would be needed at any park that is chosen for the project. Councilmember Peterson asked Ms. Bennett how she felt about the amount of parking available at Legacy Park. Ms. Bennett stated the parking area would need to be expanded.

Councilmember Hammond asked Ms. Bennett how she felt about Fremont Park. Ms. Bennett stated that she does not like the location of Fremont Park; therefore, she did not even visit that site prior to this meeting.

Councilmember Clark stated his concern about Legacy Park is the visibility of the park from the road; it is somewhat hidden and there may be a higher potential for vandalism as a result. He stated the other two park sites that have been identified are both visible from the road. He asked if Canterbury Park has been considered. Mr. Worthen stated that Canterbury Park is a storm detention basin and it was never designed to be a park. He stated that former-Mayor Thurgood requested that the LDS Church add some facilities to the park, but at no time has it been designed to be home to the type of structure Ms. Bennett desires to construct. He added that the park is somewhat secluded by the theater and there are parking issues there as well, especially during soccer season.

Councilmember Hammond stated he liked the location of Fremont Park because of its proximity to the fire station and the fact that it is much more open. Councilmember Shingleton stated that his concern about using Fremont is that it has been master planned as a soccer complex and he does not want to negatively impact those plans.

Councilmember Peterson asked how the addition of this type of structure at a City park would impact the City's capital facilities plan (CFP) for parks. Mr. Hansen stated that there is defined amount of acreage of open space parks ground included in the CFP and this type of park would fit into that category.

Councilmember Shingleton stated that the highest number of vehicles he has ever seen at Legacy Park is five. Mr. Worthen explained that there is room to expand the parking area to the west.

Councilmember Kimmel asked who would be financially responsible for redesigning the parking area and improving infrastructure at the park. Mr. Worthen stated that Ms. Bennett will include those costs in her total project cost. He stated they plan to make changes to the park so that it fits their need. He stated that the restroom at Legacy Park may already be ADA compliant since it is fairly new.

Councilmember Clark inquired as to whether there is sufficient lighting at the park currently. Mr. Worthen stated there are some light poles at the park. Mayor Nagle stated there is not enough light at night. Councilmember Clark stated he would be concerned about lighting the area properly. Mr. Worthen stated increasing the lighting capacity would be fairly easy to do. Councilmember Peterson asked Ms. Bennett if her playground plan includes increased lighting, to which Ms. Bennett answered yes, if necessary.

Mayor Nagle stated that one thing she likes about Fremont Park is the fact that those visiting the park would need to drive through the town center. She stated that those visiting Legacy Park would not need to go through the town center, which means the City will potentially be losing money that may have otherwise been spent here.

Finance Director Holt asked if anyone has considered the parcel east of the new City Hall building. Mayor Nagle stated she did not believe that site was a suitable location. Ms. Bennett added that she would like to use a park that is already developed in order to keep her costs low. She added that any money that she has leftover after finishing the project would be given to the City to use for maintenance of the park.

Mayor Nagle stated that she initially liked the idea of using Jensen Park for the project, but she has since become worried of the impact that the West Davis Corridor will have on that park. She stated that she loves the idea of having multiple uses at that park in order to create a larger draw. Councilmember Clark asked if it would be possible to have too many different uses at Jensen Park. He stated the park already draws a large number of visitors and those people might crowd the disabled children that are there to use the structure. Ms. Bennett stated that the goal is for disabled and non-disabled children to be able to play together side-by-side. Councilmember Clark stated he understands that, but he would worry about Jensen Park being too crowded at times.

Councilmember Clark stated he would prefer that the Council not consider Fremont Park for the reasons mentioned earlier by Councilmember Shingleton. He stated he felt Legacy and Jensen Parks are good options. He stated he likes the fact that those traveling to Jensen Park would need to travel through the town center, but he likes the idea of using Legacy Park for the simple fact that it is currently underused. Ms. Bennett stated that initially she wanted to use Jensen Park, but she has since talked to a lot of moms that were concerned about the large water feature there. She stated she is in favor of using Legacy Park. Councilmember Clark asked if the structure could be placed far enough from the water at Jensen Park to reduce that risk. He stated that there is a water feature at Legacy Park and he wondered if the structure would be too close to that feature. Councilmember Shingleton stated there is a big difference between the water features at the two parks. Ms. Bennett stated that she would prefer Legacy Park and she explained that she will add on to the existing park in order to create a sufficient buffer between the structure and the water feature.

Mayor Nagle stated that in an email Ms. Bennett sent regarding the project she explained that a firm that is helping her seek financing has dictated that they receive a fee in the amount of 10 percent of whatever funding Ms. Bennett receives.

Ms. Bennett stated the firm would only take 10 percent of the funding that they are able to bring to the project. She stated that the lowest amount of funding they have ever received is \$500,000. Mayor Nagle stated that Ms. Bennett has also asked that the City's lobbyist assist in soliciting funding. She explained that she wanted to ensure that the firm Ms. Bennett is working with would not anticipate receiving 10 percent of any funding that the City's lobbyist is able to bring to the project. Ms. Bennett stated that is the case as far as she knows. Mayor Nagle stated she would like to have that relationship confirmed in writing before the City dedicates lobbying services to the project. Ms. Bennett stated she is working on executing a contract with the firm and she will clarify that issue before moving forward. She added that she would provide the City with a copy of the contract once it is executed. Councilmember Kimmel stated that he felt that since this is a private enterprise endeavor the fundraising aspect should remain private. Mayor Nagle stated that the City has park land available to offer Ms. Bennett and after completion of the project the park will be dedicated to the City.

After a short discussion, Ms. Bennett and the Governing Body agreed that Legacy Park would be their top choice for the project. Mr. Worthen stated he would draft a resolution regarding the dedication of the park ground for the Council to consider at their next meeting.

Councilmember assignments

Mayor Nagle stated the Council discussed this issue January and there was a question about whether former-Councilmember Knight should be allowed to complete his term of service with the North Davis Sewer District (NDSB). She stated that since that discussion the NDSB's attorney has provided an opinion regarding the topic and she provided a copy of the opinion letter to each Councilmember. She explained there are only four reasons that someone can be removed from their position on the NDSB Board; one is if they are voted out of their position for cause; two is if they move outside of the City they represent; three is if they move out of the District they represent; and four is if they resign. She added that the letter articulates the definition of 'for cause' and no longer being an elected official does not fit the definition. She stated that her recommendation is that Mr. Knight be allowed to complete his term of service, which is scheduled to expire in December 2010. She stated that at that time the Council can have a more in depth discussion about who should be appointed to fill the position. She stated she did not feel the City should spend resources and time fighting with the NDSB over this issue, especially since they have already solicited a legal opinion regarding the fact that they want Mr. Knight to continue to serve in his capacity as a Boardmember. Councilmember Peterson agreed.

Councilmember Hammond stated that traditionally the person that has held this position has been an elected official. He stated that he knows that Mr. Knight has done a very admirable job, but since the NDSB is in the City's backyard the citizens should have an elected official representing them in that position. Mayor Nagle stated that is an argument that can be discussed and entertained in December 2010, but right now the City does not have cause to have Mr. Knight removed from his position on the Board. Councilmember Clark stated the City may burn some bridges in fighting the NDSB on this issue. He added that he would like to dictate that Mr. Knight be required to report to the City Council after attending NDSB Board meetings.

Councilmember Peterson asked if it would be a good idea to adopt a resolution clarifying that only elected officials of the City can serve in these types of positions in the future. City Attorney Godfrey stated that this is not a unique situation and several cities allow residents to serve in this type of capacity. Mayor Nagle stated that there is currently a member of the NDSB that was an elected official, but after his term with his municipality expired he continued to serve on the Board. She added that the Board has said that Mr. Knight is the most involved person currently serving on the Board; it is not possible to find fault in anything that he does in that capacity. She explained that there are a lot of members that just show up to the meeting and vote on issues, whereas Mr. Knight does extensive research into every issue the Board considers. Councilmember Kimmel stated that no one is questioning Mr. Knight's dedication. Councilmember Clark agreed and stated that he feels it is in the City's best interest to allow Mr. Knight to complete his term on the Board. He added that there have been several discussions about volunteerism lately and he felt that the City would be better off allowing citizens to participate in these types of activities.

Mayor Nagle reiterated that her recommendation is that Mr. Knight be allowed to complete his term of service, which is scheduled to expire December 2010. Councilmember Shingleton stated that prior to that time the Council should have a serious discussion about this topic.

The Council then began reviewing the remaining assignments included on their assignment list. Councilmember Clark stated that there are currently two Councilmembers appointed to serve on the North Davis Recreation District, but he was not sure that group had ever officially formed and he recommended removing those assignments from the resolution. He then stated that in the past the Council created a list to provide a rotation schedule for various appointments and there was some discussion about whether to use the rotation schedule at this time. Councilmember Shingleton stated the decision was made to use the rotation schedule. Councilmember Peterson stated he wondered if there is some value in allowing Councilmembers to serve a longer term in some capacities, such as department liaisons, to provide some continuity. Mayor Nagle asked Police Chief Wallace if he saw any value in having the same Councilmember serve as the liaison to his department for a period of time longer than one year. Chief Wallace he felt it would be better for Department Heads to be able to work with one person for a term of three or four years rather than having to train a new liaison every year. He stated that the flip-side to that is that the Council has felt it is more beneficial to them to give multiple Councilmembers the opportunity to become familiar with the workings of any given department. Councilmember Shingleton agreed and stated that it is valuable for the Councilmembers to learn about the workings of the different departments. He added that it is easier to create a working relationship with various departments while serving as their liaisons. Councilmember Clark stated that

no Councilmember should feel prevented from developing a working relationship with any Department Head simply because they are not the liaison to that department. Councilmember Kimmel wondered if rotations should be made every two years rather than every year. Councilmember Clark stated the key is that everyone is involved and that assignments and responsibilities are balanced. He suggested that department liaison assignments last for two years and that the Mayor Pro-Tem positions are rotated every year. He then stated that it may be possible to combine some assignments, such as Youth Court, Youth Council, and Architectural Review Committee since those three assignments are not as time consuming.

Councilmember Kimmel stated he would like to be the liaison to the Police Department.

Councilmember Hammond stated that someone should replace him as a Utah League of Cities and Town (ULCT) Policy Committee voting member since he has served in that capacity for a while. He suggested that Councilmember Kimmel assume that position since he has been attending the legislative policy committee meetings. Mayor Nagle stated that she also attends the meetings and she votes as well. Councilmember Clark stated he also votes at the meetings and that basically anyone attending the meeting has a vote.

Councilmember Clark stated that all assignments should be reviewed during the January following an election, but the Mayor Pro-Tem positions should rotate every year in January.

Councilmember Shingleton volunteered to be the liaison to the Arts Council. Councilmember Peterson stated he has been meeting with the Arts Council once weekly as a member of the Mayor Nagle's transition team and the Arts Council has expressed interest in having more of a relationship with the Recreation Department.

Mayor Nagle directed staff to update the Council assignment list and include an item on the next regular meeting agenda to allow the Council to consider adoption. Councilmember Hammond stated that he wanted to reiterate his feelings about Mr. Knight being allowed to continue representing the City on the NDSB Board and he will offer a dissenting vote regarding that appointment. Mayor Nagle stated that Councilmember Hammond's comments have been duly noted.

Review proposed Museum Board bylaws document

Mayor Nagle stated that City Attorney Godfrey has been invited to this meeting because of the complicated nature of this discussion. She stated that the City does not want to jeopardize the 5013C status of the Museum Board while at the same time preventing exposure of the City to any liability.

Councilmember Hammond stated that everyone has had an opportunity to review the draft bylaws as provided by the Museum Board and there has been a lot of discussion about the document. He stated that the Board simply wants to have their bylaws established and they are not worried about all the other issues relating to the relationship between the Board and the City. He stated that the Museum Foundation has already been established and the same needs to be done for the Museum Board.

Mr. Worthen stated that City Recorder Brown has done extensive research into the issue and has provided a lot of historical documentation regarding the Museum to each member of the Governing Body. He stated that last year Mr. Godfrey drafted an ordinance and a lease agreement to help define the relationship between the Museum Board and the City, but neither of those documents was ever adopted. He stated he has asked Mr. Godfrey to review the draft bylaws document and provide his feedback. Mr. Godfrey stated that he is not sure why the City is being asked to approve the bylaws document because it is not clear what the City's role is in this process. Mayor Nagle stated that the Museum Board has asked that the City approve the document, but she is concerned that if that happens the 5013C status of the Museum Board will be jeopardized. Mr. Godfrey stated these issues were discussed a year ago and were never resolved. He stated his recollection was that he drafted an ordinance that would have established the Museum Board as a formal committee of the City, but the Board did not want that ordinance adopted because they wanted to be independent of the City. He stated that if the Board were to become a committee of the City, the City Council would have the authority to appoint the members of the Board and the Board did not like that. He stated that a lease agreement was then drafted to clarify the relationship between the Board and the City, but there were several concerns regarding insurance and maintenance of the building and the artifacts and those issues were never resolved. He stated that he is now left to wonder why the Museum Board wants the City to approve their bylaws. He asked what the Museum Board is seeking via that approval.

Councilmember Hammond stated that the building itself belongs to the City, but the Board takes care of running the Museum. He stated that when the ordinance and lease agreement were discussed in the past there was a City employee assigned to work at the Museum and there were some questions about who was responsible to supervise that employee. He stated that the employee no longer works there and that is no longer an issue.

Mr. Godfrey explained that the City's approval of the bylaws does not add anything to the Board's legal existence. He stated that adoption of the bylaws would, however, jeopardize any non-profit status that the Board may have. He stated that if the goal is to establish the parameters of the relationship between the Board and the City, the bylaws are not very helpful. He stated that he feels it is necessary to consider the funding source for the Museum Board as well as the maintenance of the building; both of those issues can be addressed through an agreement between the Board and the City and the Board can then adopt the bylaws on their own. He stated the document he has been provided with is more of an operating agreement than a bylaws document and if the City were to adopt the document it could create a fuzzy relationship that could cause problems for the Board. He reiterated that he does not know why the Board wants the City to approve the bylaws. Visitor Gene Carlson, member of the Museum Board, interjected that the City asked the Museum Board to create a bylaws document. He stated that this process has been going on for at least two years. Councilmember Clark stated that at the end of the last discussion the decision was that the City owns the building and the artifacts and the City would agree to provide maintenance and utility service to the building via a lease agreement. Mr. Carlson asked what would happen if someone was

injured in the Museum and they tried to sue the volunteers working there. Visitor Phil Gooch, member of the Museum Board, added that the volunteers are required to adhere to the City's personnel policies.

Councilmember Hammond asked who would be named as the owner of the artifacts in the museum if a lease agreement were executed. Councilmember Clark stated the City would own the artifacts. Mr. Gooch stated that does not apply to artifacts that are simply on loan to the Museum.

Mayor Nagle asked for direction on how to proceed from this point. Mr. Godfrey stated he would give the same advice today that he gave last year and that is that the Board should either be totally independent of the City or completely under the City's purview. He stated that if they remain independent, he would recommend adopting a lease agreement for the building that also references funding for the Museum. He stated that would provide a distinct and separate relationship. He stated that if the Board wants to be under the City's purview, the Board should be formally created as a committee of the City and the members should also be appointed by the City. He reiterated that in the past the Board did not want to be a committee of the City. Councilmember Peterson asked why a lease agreement would be necessary. Mr. Godfrey stated that a lease agreement would address any liability issues.

After a short discussion among the Council and the present members of the Museum Board, Councilmember Clark recommended that a smaller group meet to discuss the issue and prepare a recommendation to be provided to the Council. Mr. Godfrey stated he felt that was a good idea. He stated that the Board needs to clearly understand what being an entity of the City would mean for them. He stated all members of the committee would be required to adhere to the City's personnel policies as well as the State's Open and Public Meetings Act. Mayor Nagle and Councilmember Hammond volunteered to meet and continue to discuss the issue with a few members of the Museum Board. Mayor Nagle asked Mr. Godfrey and Mr. Worthen to attend as well.

The meeting adjourned at 6:55 p.m.

Jamie Nagle
Mayor

Cassie Z. Brown, CMC
City Recorder

Date approved: February 23, 2010