

A regular meeting of the Astoria Common Council was held at the above place at the hour of 7:15 pm.

Councilors Present: Nemlowill, Herzig, Warr, Price, Mayor LaMear

Councilors Excused: None

Staff Present: City Manager Estes, Police Chief Johnston, Community Development Director Cronin, Special Projects Planner Johnson, Parks and Recreation Director Cosby, Finance Director Brooks, Fire Chief Ames, Library Director Tucker, Public Works Director Cook, and City Attorney Henningsgaard. The meeting is recorded and will be transcribed by ABC Transcription Services, Inc.

REPORTS OF COUNCILORS

Item 3(a): Councilor Warr had no reports.

Item 3(b): Councilor Price reported that these dark days of winter are lean times for downtown shops. There are people who have not been downtown in a while and she had seen comments on Facebook indicating there was nothing downtown. However, downtown Astoria has everything. She encouraged people to shop at local businesses more often during the winter.

Item 3(c): Councilor Herzig reported that he attended the quarterly Columbia River Estuary Study Taskforce (CREST) meeting. The City pays CREST an annual fee in exchange for some services and he serves as the City of Astoria's representative on their board. He noted County Commissioner and CREST Chair Scott Lee had asked Mayor LaMear to confirm him as the City Council liaison. In his absence, Director Cronin or Planner Ferber would attend. The Astoria Warming Center would be open that night and he would be there after the City Council meeting. The previous night, the center had 22 overnight guests including a young local woman who was 20 weeks pregnant. This indicates there is a serious need in Astoria and the center is doing what it can to fill a gap in the services in Clatsop County.

Item 3(d): Councilor Nemlowill had no reports.

Item 3(e): Mayor LaMear reported that she has participated in the Clatsop Community College (CCC) Presidential Search Committee. The Committee has chosen four excellent candidates and whoever is selected will be a great president and a great addition to the community. She also attended the County Manager Candidates Meet and Greet and she looks forward to the County's selection of a new manager. The annual Chamber of Commerce meeting was held on Saturday, January 30th, where Dan Arnoth and Norma Hernandez were presented with the George Award. She explained that the George Award is given to those who never "let George do it."

CHANGES TO AGENDA

City Manager Estes said Shirley Krepky was unable to attend this meeting, so he requested Item 5(a) be removed from the agenda and rescheduled for another meeting. The agenda was approved with changes.

PRESENTATIONS

Item 5(a): Shirley Krepky 25 Year Service (Police)

This item was removed from the agenda during Item 4: Changes to the Agenda.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The following items were presented on the Consent Calendar:

- 6(a) City Council Minutes of 1/4/16
- 6(b) Boards and Commission Minutes
 - (1) Library Board Meeting of 12/8/15
- 6(c) 2016 Trestle and Track Inspection – Personal Services Contract (Public Works)**
- 6(d) 2016 Trolley Trestle Repair Project – Authorization to Award Construction Contract (Public Works)**
- 6(e) Salary Resolution Establishing Basic Compensation Plan Cost of Living Wage Adjustments for the Astoria Public Safety Association and Police Sworn Management (Finance)
- 6(f) Oregon Library Association Resource Sharing Committee Passport Program Agreement (Library)**

City Manager Estes requested Items 6(c) and (d) be removed and Councilor Herzig requested Item 6(f) be removed for further discussion.

City Council Action: Motion made by Councilor Warr, seconded by Councilor Herzig, to approve Items 6(a), (b), and (e) of the Consent Calendar. Motion carried unanimously. Ayes: Councilors Price, Warr, Herzig, Nemlowill, and Mayor LaMear; Nays: None.

- Item 6(c): 2016 Trestle and Track Inspection – Personal Services Contract (Public Works)**
- Item 6(d): 2016 Trolley Trestle Repair Project – Authorization to Award Construction Contract (Public Works)**

City Manager Estes explained that the trolley tracks along the waterfront need repair work. A detailed analysis of the work that needs to be done for the trestle will allow the trolley to continue running. The City's previous rail inspection consultant, Andy Cyrus, has recently retired. After evaluating several options, Staff selected OBEC Consulting Engineers to assist with track and trestle inspection services. The inspection is necessary to keep the line open and operating. ODOT Rail has jurisdiction over the rail lines and requires the lines be kept to a certain standard. The City's purchasing code allows the direct appointment of a consultant who is part of a qualified pool. In this case, OBEC is a member of an ODOT qualified pool, so Staff can make the direct appointment. Staff recommends OBEC because they worked with ODOT on prior rail inspections in Astoria and they are the design engineers for Astoria's street end project. Additionally, OBEC provided cost effective solutions for addressing deficiencies in prior years. OBEC also has experience working on the Willamette Shore Trolley, which is similar to Astoria's trolley. OBEC has provided a proposal for the comprehensive inspection of the trestles and the track from the trolley barn to 39th Street for an estimated cost of \$37,067. Promote Astoria Funds have been budgeted for this work and for construction repairs. Staff received quotes from two bidders for the construction repairs and both were under the engineer's estimate. The low bid was \$37,350. The total costs for the personal services contract and the construction contract are just within the budgeted amount of \$75,000. However, additional trestle and trolley repair work will be necessary, bringing the total estimate for work done this fiscal year to \$101,717. Staff recommends City Council approve the personal services contract for \$37,067 and the construction contract for \$37,350. Staff proposed to take the overage from the Promote Astoria Fund within the line item for Tourism Related Facilities Expenditures, which has an available budget of \$225,000. Only \$15,000 in expenditures from that line item is expected for the remainder of this fiscal year. He noted that the contract with OBEC will allow Staff to budget more efficiently for repairs in future years.

Councilor Herzig said any time Promote Astoria Funds are spent, it must be done very publicly because there is distrust about how the City disposes of those funds. The trolley is a great tourist draw and many Astorians use it. Making sure the trolley continues to operate safely is a good use of Promote Astoria Funds.

Councilor Price thanked City Manager Estes for the financial analysis of the Tourism Related Facilities Expenditures line item in the Promote Astoria Fund and said the information helped her make a decision.

City Council Action: Motion made by Councilor Price, seconded by Councilor Nemlowill, to approve Item 6(c) of the Consent Calendar. Motion carried unanimously. Ayes: Councilors Price, Warr, Herzig, Nemlowill, and Mayor LaMear; Nays: None.

City Council Action: Motion made by Councilor Warr, seconded by Councilor Price, to approve Item 6(d) of the Consent Calendar. Motion carried unanimously. Ayes: Councilors Price, Warr, Herzig, Nemlowill, and Mayor LaMear; Nays: None.

Item 6(f): Oregon Library Association Resource Sharing Committee Passport Program Agreement (Library)

Councilor Herzig said the Passport Program was a pilot program that allows Astoria Library cardholders to check out materials at other participating libraries. The pilot program was so successful that it is being turned into an ongoing program, which is a great asset to the community. The Library has worked hard to keep the program going.

City Council Action: Motion made by Councilor Herzig, seconded by Councilor Warr, to approve Item 6(f) of the Consent Calendar. Motion carried unanimously. Ayes: Councilors Price, Warr, Herzig, Nemlowill, and Mayor LaMear; Nays: None.

Mayor LaMear introduced Lauren Williams, who was job shadowing her for the day. Ms. Williams is a student at Tongue Point studying finance.

REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS

Item 7(a): Revised Findings of Fact for Appeals by Ron Zilli (Community Development)
(1) AP15-01 – New Construction Permit NC15-03 for Verizon Wireless
(2) AP15-02 – Variance V15-03 for Verizon Wireless
(3) AP15-03 – Wireless Communications Facility Permit WFC15-03 for Verizon Wireless

Verizon Wireless LLC applied for a New Construction permit (NC15-03) to the Historic Landmarks Commission (HLC) to construct a new wireless communication facility at 1580 Shively Park Road within Shively Park as well as a Variance permit (V15-03) to the Astoria Planning Commission (APC) to construct a new wireless communication facility at 1580 Shively Park Road within Shively Park with a height of 150' which exceeds the 45-foot maximum height, and a Wireless Communications Facility permit (WCF15-03) to the Astoria Planning Commission (APC) to construct a new wireless communication facility at 1580 Shively Park Road within Shively Park. On September 15, 2015, the HLC held a public hearing and approved the New Construction request with conditions and on September 16, 2015, the APC held public hearings and approved the Variance V15-03 and Wireless Communications Facility WCF15-03 requests with conditions. Notices of Appeal on the HLC and APC decisions were submitted by Ron Zilli on September 30, 2015.

A complete record of each of the requests has been compiled and was provided for Council at the January 19, 2016 meeting. A public hearing on the Appeals were advertised and held November 16, 2015. At the request of Verizon, City Council continued the public hearing to December 7, 2015. At its December 7, 2015 meeting, Council continued the public hearing to January 4, 2016 due to the holidays to allow for greater public participation in the hearing. At its December 17, 2015 meeting, the City Council continued the public hearing to the January 19, 2016 meeting at the request of Verizon.

The appellant asserts that the NC15-01, V15-02, and WCF15-03 permits for the proposed 150-foot tall, metal wireless communications facility tower should be denied. The specific issues for denial on each of the permits appealed by Mr. Zilli were summarized and submitted to the Council for the public hearing. On January 19, 2016, the City Council held the public hearings and closed the public portion of the hearings. At that meeting, the Council voted 3 to 2 to tentatively deny the three requests and uphold the appeals pending adoption of revised Findings of Fact for denial. The Council decision on each appeal will need to be done with separate motions. Suggested Forms of Motion will be available for Council consideration at the Council meeting on February 1, 2016. It would be in order for the Council to adopt the revised Findings of Fact for the following three appeals: Appeal AP15-01 on New Construction Permit NC15-03, Appeal AP15-02 on Variance Permit V15-03 and Appeal AP15-03 on Wireless Communication Facility Permit WCF15-03.

City Attorney Henningsgaard said following Council's tentative decision to approve the appeals at the last City Council meeting, he had several conversations with representatives from Verizon who are scrambling to figure

out how to fill their communication needs in Astoria. Several times during those conversations, representatives indicated that Verizon might have the ability to redesign the facilities they had planned for Shively Park. New designs could include a different size or shape of the tower, or a different location for the tower. However, at this point, Verizon still believes that Shively Park presents the best location for the proposed facility. Verizon representatives asked him to suggest that City Council consider remanding the decisions back to the Planning Commission instead of approving the appeals. This would allow Verizon to provide a revised scope to the Planning Commission and repeat the process. If Verizon is required to choose a location other than Shively Park, a new application must be submitted. However, if Verizon is allowed to locate a facility within the general confines of Shively Park, only an amendment to the current application would be necessary. There would be no point in a remand if City Council opposes any wireless communication facility in Shively Park. But, Verizon is optimistic that they can present an acceptable solution.

Councilor Price indicated this could be perceived as the City Attorney working for Verizon. City Attorney Henningsgaard said he volunteered to offer this alternative to City Council to keep the discussion more open as opposed to having Verizon make a presentation. This is an opportunity for Council to ask him questions about the ramifications of their decision. He believed presenting the concept himself would be less adversarial and a decision could be worked out in public.

Councilor Warr confirmed that Verizon's lease at the Column expires in August. He asked if building a single tower above Reservoir Three leaves the south slope and areas in Williamsport without coverage. City Attorney Henningsgaard understood that the south slope area would lack coverage or have very impaired coverage if the lease at the Column is not extended and the only tower was at the reservoir.

Councilor Price asked why the City and Verizon would not renew the Astor Park lease in August. City Attorney Henningsgaard said City Council must decide if the lease should be renewed. However, until the City has a new location for its emergency communications facilities, the tower will remain at the Column. Councilor Price said she did not want a tower in Shively Park because the entire facility would be inappropriate for that park. She was not making a statement about whether Verizon should continue their service in Astoria. She was in favor of renewing the lease in August.

Councilor Nemlowill said she was uncomfortable having this discussion after the public hearing had closed without giving the Appellant the opportunity to speak. She could not evaluate a new construction proposal by Verizon at Shively Park with the current proceeding. The land use process does not allow City Council to consider anything besides the appeals. City Attorney Henningsgaard explained that City Council needed to decide which disposition was acceptable, a denial or a remand. He brought this up because the Applicant believes it would be more economical and more beneficial to the City and Verizon to remand the decisions.

Councilor Herzig said City Council considered and rejected a remand. He did not believe City Council could change its decision unless the public hearing was reopened. This discussion was not legitimate and the citizens who spoke were opposed to a tower in Shively Park. Moving the tower a little bit would not change the citizens' viewpoints. During the hearing, the Verizon representative said the tower must be of the shape and at the location they had proposed. Suddenly, this has changed, which means Verizon has been bluffing. Verizon will not walk away from this market and if Astoria stands firm with its denials, they will begin to explore other options. Verizon can submit a new application to the Planning Commission for a new design and a new location.

City Attorney Henningsgaard said he understood City Council's decision.

City Manager Estes said the revised Findings of Fact upheld the appeals and denied the permits. Councilor Price had previously submitted proposed amendments to the draft Findings so Staff would be prepared to include her changes if the rest of the Council concurred.

Mayor LaMear believed Council should make a decision on City Attorney Henningsgaard's proposal before discussing the Findings. She asked Council if they wanted to remand the decisions back to the Planning Commission.

Councilors Nemlowill, Herzig, and Price believed the appeals should be approved and Councilor Warr believed the appeals should be denied. Mayor LaMear confirmed that Council would move forward with approving the appeals.

Councilor Price said as a professional editor, she read Staff's proposed Findings very carefully. The changes she has proposed are not really amendments, just revisions that clarify the tower is not a structure. The words facility, structure, and tower were used interchangeably, but she wanted to clarify several sections of the Findings to indicate that Council did not approve of the height of a monopole, the entire facility, the buildings, the retaining walls, its location, its width, the service vehicles, and many other elements. She reviewed her proposed changes with Special Projects Planner Johnson earlier in the day.

Planner Johnson confirmed that most of Councilor Price's issues were with clarifications of the language. She had used the words facility and structure interchangeably. Also, the width of the pole was mentioned at the last meeting, so she added language about the width. In many sections, Councilor Price has recommended Shively Park Road be referred to as a pedestrian pathway to clarify that the road is used by pedestrians. The terminology clarifies the difference between the facility and the structure. The original Findings had stated there was no new structure; however, the tower would be on the pathway and the enclosure would contain additional equipment. The new language clarified that the equipment and generator were part of the project and the design of some of the structure had not been reviewed because it was within a fenced enclosure. There were no changes to content, but the revised Findings were per Councilor Price's recommendations.

Councilor Herzig thanked Planner Johnson for making sense out of Council's rambling discussion. He was concerned about stating the pole was six feet wide instead of six feet in diameter. Planner Johnson confirmed that the width is the diameter.

Councilor Nemlowill believed Staff did a good job coming up with new Findings and she found nothing wrong with Councilor Price's revisions.

Mayor LaMear reminded the public hearing was closed on January 19th and was continued to consider the revised Findings of Fact to approve the appeals.

City Manager Estes clarified that voting in favor of the revised Findings would uphold the appeals and deny Verizon's permits.

Mayor LaMear explained that she planned to vote against the appeals because she did not know where else the pole could be located. The other option would be to double the size of the pole at the Column, which she did not want. She agreed it would be wonderful if Shively Park could be kept completely open, but there may be no other practical way to give citizens cell phone service.

City Council Action: Motion made by Councilor Herzig, seconded by Councilor Price to adopt the Findings and Conclusions contained in the Staff report as revised by Councilor Price and approve Appeal AP15-01 on New Construction Permit NC15-03 by Ron Zilli. Motion carried 3 to 2. Ayes: Councilors Price, Herzig, Nemlowill, and Mayor LaMear; Nays: Councilor Warr and Mayor LaMear.

Mayor LaMear read the rules of appeal into the record.

City Council Action: Motion made by Councilor Herzig, seconded by Councilor Price to adopt the Findings and Conclusions contained in the Staff report as revised by Councilor Price and approve Appeal AP15-02 on Variance Permit V15-03 by Ron Zilli. Motion carried 3 to 2. Ayes: Councilors Price, Herzig, Nemlowill, and Mayor LaMear; Nays: Councilor Warr and Mayor LaMear.

Mayor LaMear read the rules of appeal into the record

City Council Action: Motion made by Councilor Herzig, seconded by Councilor Price to adopt the Findings and Conclusions contained in the Staff report as revised by Councilor Price and approve Appeal AP15-03 on Wireless Communication Facility Permit WCF15-03 by Ron Zilli. Motion carried 3 to 2. Ayes: Councilors Price, Herzig, Nemlowill, and Mayor LaMear; Nays: Councilor Warr and Mayor LaMear.

Mayor LaMear read the rules of appeal into the record

Item 7(b): Local Option Tax – Marijuana Retailers (Police)

Under House Bill 3400, cities may impose up to a 3 percent tax on sales of marijuana items made by those with recreational retail licenses. This tax must be imposed by referring an ordinance to the voters at a statewide general election, meaning an election in November of an even-numbered year. There is no provision in law for taxing medical sales.

As with any revenue raising measure, it's important that the budget committee approve any proposed taxes as part of its approval of the budget. See the Department of Revenue "Tax Election Ballot Measures" manual for more information.

In anticipation of this matter being brought to City Council to consider referring the matter to the voters, Police Chief Johnston visited with the four existing medical marijuana retailers who have all "opted in" for recreational sales. All of the retailers were very open to the conversation. Some relevant points to the conversation included:

- Three of the four existing businesses plan to convert to recreational outlets. The fourth has plans to remain a medical outlet but will be opening an additional outlet that is a recreational outlet.
- Three of the four existing businesses were very supportive of the City pursuing the tax. The fourth was supportive after a discussion on the state tax plan. They initially believed that this three percent would be on top of the existing 25 percent being levied by the state. Once they learned that the tax would be imposed only on the licensed recreational facility that will have a state tax rate of 17 percent and not in addition to the higher "opt in" tax of twenty five percent they were supportive.
- Based on verbal estimates of what the businesses have seen for recreational sales since the October "opt in" sales began revenue is estimated to be in the neighborhood of \$100,000 annually.

Revenue estimates are very rough. Given the early sales this is a conservative number; however, what the sales will look like over time is difficult to gauge. The opt-in law only allowed sales of flower and not extracts or other marijuana related products. The retail price of edibles and other extracts is more expensive than that of flowers. How the availability of these products in the market shapes the sales is unknown. Additionally, it is unknown what tourism opportunities are available to this market. Several of the current owners have plans to market toward the tourist economy. They also see several other markets available that will require legislative change.

One concern that we tried to address is a concern that high tax will move people back to the black market. All four of the current retailers in Astoria do not believe they are competing on price with the black market. They instead are offering a variety, safety, and surety that the black market cannot. None thought that the tax would move people back to the black market.

To refer the matter to the voters, Council would hold a first reading and second reading of the ordinance at separate meetings then adopt the ordinance by a roll call. After adopting the ordinance Council would adopt the resolution. This adoption will set the ballot title. The ballot title will be published in the "newspaper of general circulation in the city." After a period of review, if no objection to the ballot title is filed the matter will be filed with the County Elections Official. It is recommended that Council consider holding a first reading of the proposed ordinance to refer a 3 percent local option tax to the November 8, 2016 ballot.

Chief Johnston explained that the State has imposed a 17 percent tax on recreational marijuana and it was originally believed local jurisdictions would not receive any portion of these funds because all of the tax revenue would be spent on enforcement measures. However, the legislature has allowed local jurisdictions to refer a local tax option to the voters. There are concerns that imposing a tax would raise prices enough to incentivize black market purchases. Additionally, people want to know how much revenue could be gained and how the revenue would be used. He visited the four medical marijuana dispensaries in Astoria that have opted into recreational sales to find out more information. Three of the businesses were very supportive of a local tax. The fourth did not seem to understand the taxing scheme and was initially opposed to a local tax. He explained to this business that the current 25 percent tax would lower to 17 percent on January 1, 2017 and only if the business has converted from medical to recreational sales. So, even a 3 percent increase would net a 5 percent drop in the tax rate. After learning how the taxing worked, this fourth business was also supportive of a local tax. All four of the businesses disagreed a local tax would incentivize black market purchases. Purchasing marijuana is now like going to a good taproom with 25 different varieties of beer, not walking up to a guy on the corner to buy one kind of marijuana. The experience is completely different from the black market and all of the vendors believe the experience is what they are offering. The vendors are selling marijuana legitimately, they have a

selection, they know the tetrahydrocannabinol (THC) content of each flower, and they are offering a service. He considered the tax rates in other states and found that until July, Washington's tax rate was 47 percent. Washington has since lowered their tax rate to between 20 and 30 percent and Colorado charges both an excise tax and a sales tax on marijuana in addition to the sales tax charged on general items. So, Oregon's 25 percent tax is lower than Washington and Colorado. The four dispensaries in town are selling a significant amount of flowers, which is the only marijuana product available to recreational buyers right now. Sales are expected to increase once extracts and other products can be sold because those products have higher retail prices and are more popular than the flowers. Based on current sales, he estimated three percent of flower sales would be about \$100,000 annually. Three of the four businesses plan to market to tourists in various ways, so it is difficult to tell what the retail sales will look like. If a sales tax is implemented, City Council and the Budget Committee would need to decide what to do with the revenue. As a continuous source of revenue, the money could be used for salaries. He encouraged Council to consider this as they begin making policies. The Police Department posted a link to an article in the *Daily Astorian* on their Facebook page and received some interesting comments that indicate some public education will be necessary. Staff is prohibited from making a recommendation on this issue and can only present the facts.

Councilor Herzig said he has received phone calls about this tax. There will not be a tax on medical marijuana, only recreational marijuana; however, the language in the ordinance states "the sale of marijuana items by a marijuana retailer." Chief Johnston explained that State statute defines a marijuana retailer as a recreational retailer that cannot sell medicinal marijuana. There is no provision in Oregon law that allows taxation on medical marijuana.

Councilor Herzig asked if the marijuana industry was still a cash only business, if the businesses could deposit money into a bank, and if not, how would the City charge taxes. Chief Johnston explained that the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) regulates this issue. Banks and credit unions are trying to make this work, but the amount of work necessary to maintain FDIC insurance is significant. Therefore, marijuana is still a cash business.

City Manager Estes asked how businesses reported sales and taxes to the Oregon Liquor Control Commission (OLCC) and how their information was verified. Chief Johnston understood these details were still being worked out. OLCC has some regulatory authority on how sales and taxes are reported, but only over businesses that have applied for a license. Commercial operations that have never been licensed are under the authority of local law enforcement, not the OLCC. Marc Warren will be Astoria's inspector for both marijuana and alcohol, and he will also inspect Columbia and Tillamook Counties. City Manager Estes added the OLCC is developing the rules for marijuana retailers, which are expected to be implemented by the end of 2016.

Councilor Herzig said he hoped the country would legalize marijuana by 2017 so Astoria would not have to jump through these hoops.

Mayor LaMear asked if one store could sell both medical and recreational marijuana. Chief Johnston said the law currently requires a store to sell one or the other. The opt-in period allows medical businesses to sell flowers to recreational buyers, but once licensed as a recreational facility, the stores must sell only recreational products by a certain date. Two of the four businesses in Astoria are working to get this law changed. The one business in Astoria that does not plan to convert to recreational sales plans to open a separate recreational business.

Mayor LaMear was concerned because this whole discussion began when the government started hearing from people who really needed medical marijuana. She did not want all of the medical services to close, leaving only recreational sales. Chief Johnston said the products are the same, but the dosages are different. Medical marijuana has much higher dosages and is tax-free.

Councilor Price said she supported the tax and supported putting the tax on the ballot. All of the information that comes with the ballot title refers to "a marijuana retailer." She asked if the language should be changed to allow more than one marijuana retailer.

City Attorney Henningsgaard explained that the language in the ordinance was drafted by the League of Oregon Cities attorneys, but City Council could change the ordinance in any way. Chief Johnston said he looked at the language in some of Astoria's other tax ordinances and found that at least one of them was written in the singular. Councilor Price believed the wording in the marijuana tax ordinance needed to be more inclusive.

Councilor Nemlowill did not believe the tax would hurt the businesses and Astoria could do good things in the community with the money.

Councilor Herzig said this tax was discussed last year when Council was talking about other ballot measures. He understood Director Brooks was not familiar with the costs associated with adding measures to the ballot, and County employee Sheryl Holcomb has told him the costs are a moving target. He asked Staff to find out how much it would cost the City to put this tax on the ballot and if money could be saved by putting more than one measure on a ballot at the same time. City Council has previously discussed ballot measures regarding fluoride in the water and certain City charter amendments. City Manager Estes confirmed Staff would present this information at the next meeting.

Mayor LaMear called for public comments. There were none.

City Council Action: Motion made by Councilor Herzig, seconded by Councilor Nemlowill to conduct the first reading of the ordinance to refer a 3 percent local option tax to the November 8, 2016 ballot. Motion carried unanimously. Ayes: Councilors Price, Warr, Herzig, Nemlowill, and Mayor LaMear; Nays: None.

Director Cronin conducted the first reading.


NEW BUSINESS & MISCELLANEOUS, PUBLIC COMMENTS (NON-AGENDA)

There was none.

ADJOURNMENT


There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:15 pm.

ATTEST:



Finance Director

APPROVED:



City Manager