

CITY OF SUTHERLIN
Regular City Council Meeting
Sutherlin Civic Auditorium
Monday, May 12, 2014 – 7PM

COUNCIL MEMBERS:

Tom Boggs, Frank Egbert, Patricia Klassen, Todd McKnight, Karen Meier, Forrest Stone

MAYOR: Denny Cameron

CITY STAFF:

City Manager, Jerry Gillham
City Recorder/HR Manager, Debbie Hamilton
Deputy City Recorder, Diane Harris
Finance Supervisor, Dan Wilson
Community Development Director, Vicki Luther
Chief of Police, Kirk Sanfilippo
Fire District #2 Chief, Greg Marlar
City Attorney, Chad Jacobs

Audience: Larry Bahr, Dot Huntley, Scott Cameron, Floyd Van Sickle, Jack Trowbridge, Seth Vincent, Tadd Held, Jim & Beth Houseman, James Wraith, Justin Peterman, Judi & Ian Black, Joe Groussman, Jack & Tracy Van Dolah, Donna Pagel, Willie Caldwell, J. Lindeen Brown, Gayla Holley, Bruce Cortes, Stan McKnight, Jess Miller, Sue Gillham, Brad Litchfield, Zack Mittge, Jacob Masterfield, Greg Henderson, Margaret Wilson, Craig & Bette Hart, Chad Mast, Pam Cameron, Susan Osland, Dan McCormick, Adam Sarnoski, Pat & Barbara Fenton, Dar Yarbrough, Becky Holm, John Bachman, Derek Findly, Phillip Hyatt, Paul Glazner, Brian Burke Sr., Rick Murphy, Brian Gurney, Russ Anderson, Jessica Pierce, Brian Parnell, Dan McCormick, Cy Perkins, Andy Hatfield, Dana Foley, Sam Robinson, Barry Smith, Josh Wagner, Mark Nichols, Tom Spelgatti, Craig Zolezzi

Meeting called to order by Mayor Cameron at 7:00 p.m.

Flag Salute:

Mayor Cameron asked if anyone on the Council wished to declare a perceived conflict of interest regarding any item on tonight's agenda.

Councilor Klassen stated she has a conflict of interest concerning the Alaska Sutherlin Knolls Corporation (ASKC), she will excuse herself when the agenda item is presented. Klassen explained she has been very involved with this project and unable to vote fairly.

Mayor Cameron asked if anyone else wished to declare a perceived conflict of interest. No other statements made.

Roll Call: All present

Introduction of Media: Becky Holm, North County News

PUBLIC COMMENT (agenda items only)

Larry Bahr, resident - explained he understands the City Manager is to be evaluated on his performance at tonight's meeting; he has found his performance to be outstanding, has excellent proactive efforts in his job and made many improvements to the City and its infrastructure, hopes Council will take comments into consideration during the evaluation.

ANNOUNCEMENTS / APPOINTMENTS

None

PRESENTATIONS / PROCLAMATIONS

None

CONSENT AGENDA

- **Minutes from April 28, 2014 Regular Meeting**

MOTION made by Councilor McKnight to approve Consent Agenda as presented; second by Councilor Klassen.

Discussion: None

In Favor: Councilors Klassen, McKnight, Meier, Stone, Boggs, Egbert and Mayor Cameron

Opposed: None

Motion passed unanimously.

ACTION ITEMS/GENERAL BUSINESS

- **Resolution 2014.07 – Exercise Power of Eminent Domain**

Staff Report – CDD, Vicki Luther, stated this agenda item is a continuance from last Council meeting additional information was requested by Council in order to make a decision.

City Manager, Jerry Gillham, stated there are two pieces of information for Council consideration. The owner of the affected property is willing to sell if the City is willing to buy and expressed so in writing, therefore condemnation will likely not be an issue. There is an allocation of \$40,000 in grant money to cover costs and purchase of right-of-way. If the resolution is not approved and City goes forward with the purchase of the property, the \$40,000 will not go toward that transaction or the costs associated with it, City itself would need to pay these costs.

City Attorney, Chad Jacobs, stated City signed an agreement with ODOT, as part of the agreement the City agreed to abide by the Uniform Relocation Act, which carries very specific procedures to follow. Under federal guidelines, you have to negotiate in good faith for fair market value, listing the procedures involved, lastly being condemnation. However, under state law, the passing of the resolution would be the initiation of the condemnation proceedings. After extensive research, have not found any proof in the federal guidelines stating the actual filing of the resolution associated with the initiation of the litigation. Requested ODOT confirm federal guideline procedures and if the City has the ability to access the \$40,000 allocated in grant funds. Council has the choice to pass the resolution or if not comfortable, would suggest continuing this item next Council meeting, by that time may hear from ODOT for more clarification.

Questions and concerns discussed:

- Can resolution be passed with a contingency to come back to Council before enacting it? ***Jacobs - Recommendation is not to do that, condemnation procedures are very strict, if not followed could lead to future legal challenges.***
- This would also need to be done for the PacifiCorp land that is believed to be donated to the City? ***Yes, that is our understanding.***
- If we went back to the original plan for the bridge would this all go away? ***Yes, it would.***
- The original plan for the bridge was on City easement and would go through Scarborough's property, wouldn't it make more sense to go back to that plan rather than set a precedent with this resolution? ***The issue is the Mayor facilitated negotiation session with Mr. Scarborough and City Manager and came to an agreement on what could be done for him therefore making this change; for all practical purposes would be breaking those agreements.***
- Due to the issues, suggest a discussion with Mr. Scarborough, therefore avoiding the condemnation issues.

- Would City need to pay for redesigning the bridge? *May have to pay some additional costs for changing back to the original design.*
- Did you check with surveyors, seems it would be common sense to check on property lines during that time. *No did not discuss with surveyors, they work for ODOT, would be happy to find out.*

Jacobs – Can continue to the next meeting, however it appears the property owner is willing to sell and second property owner is willing to donate, if this can be done without having to pass the resolution of necessity, would suggest delaying the decision.

- Does this affect a timeline? *There is a proposed amendment on hold that has a new timeline.*

Luther – ODOT has expressed strong concerns regarding City requesting and pushing the timeline out further, currently the deadline is May 31st, need to acquire the right-of-ways by that time.

MOTION made by Councilor Boggs to continue proposed action of Resolution 2014.07 – Exercise Power of Eminent Domain until May 27, 2014 meeting; second by Councilor McKnight.

Discussion: None

In Favor: Councilors Klassen, McKnight, Meier, Stone, Boggs, Egbert and Mayor Cameron

Opposed: None

Motion passed unanimously.

- **Bid Award – Pavement Overlays**

Staff Report – CDD, Vicki Luther, reported the bid opening May 1st was for three project overlays: Dakota St. (Hwy 138 to Clover Leaf Loop; E. Fourth Avenue (Sherwood Drive east to Crown Point; and E. Everett Avenue (Umatilla St. east to Waite St). These projects are expected to be completed this current budget year. Bids came in under engineer’s estimate; lowest bidder was Knife River for \$98,982. Staff recommendation to award the bid as identified.

Councilor Stone – How did you decide on these three areas for the overlays? *We actually had five on the list, it was decided two will be moved to next budget year, decision was based upon the wearing on the road. City is planning to have an ongoing program regarding the maintenance.*

MOTION made by Councilor McKnight to award contract in the amount of \$98,982 to Knife River for FY 2013-14 Pavement Management Overlays as identified; second by Councilor Boggs.

Discussion: None

In Favor: Councilors Klassen, McKnight, Meier, Stone, Boggs, Egbert and Mayor Cameron

Opposed: None

Motion passed unanimously.

- **Alaska Sutherlin Knolls Agreement**

{Councilor Klassen removes herself from Council seat to join audience due to her declaration of conflict of interest}.

Staff Report – City Attorney, Chad Jacobs explained the proposed dedication agreement between Alaska Sutherland Knolls Corporation (ASKC) and the City of Sutherlin for portions of Scardi Blvd. Issues have come before the Planning Commission and there is a pending appeal before the Council. After this document was created, some issues arose, one of which is the creation of a sidewalk that has yet to be resolved. Council can approve the agreement as it was originally drafted or present concerns at this time; part of the confusion and cause of delay is the location of the proposed sidewalks.

Gillham explained, concerns were voiced at a previous meeting concerning additional vehicle traffic associated with the Galpin development adding pedestrian hazards along Scardi Blvd/Dovetail Lane; the sidewalk would be approximately 1,000 ft. rather than the previously estimated 500 ft. This is a high priority for Council and a long term best interest for that sidewalk to be put in place and the responsibility of owner of that development.

Councilor Boggs – Is the only issue with that portion of the road? *There is another question and concerning the infrastructure owned by the Home Owners Association (HOA) and if it is part of that right-of-way and how it may affect this agreement.*

Attorney, Zack Mittge, speaking on behalf of ASKC, stated he was not anticipating the sidewalk issues at tonight's meeting; these concerns were presented at the latter part of last week, have not had a chance to review. In 2007 there was a discussion between the City and ASKC regarding the sidewalk on the northerly side of Scardi Blvd. At that time it was in agreement that the ending location of the sidewalk would be at the end of Dovetail Lane. As-built drawings have been submitted to the City Attorney regarding that discussion, as well as draft language regarding private utilities located in the right-of-way under Scardi Blvd.

Would like to urge Council to authorize City Manager to sign this agreement once the final form is available; want to get the sidewalk issue clarified and resolved before dedication agreement is to be signed. Appreciate City Manager, Gillham, raising questions regarding the sidewalk issues.

Councilor Stone – Concerned that City took over a street that is substandard, with no curb or gutters on the north side of Scardi Blvd. and now the taxpayers have to pay for a sidewalk, curb and gutter for a subdivision ASKC wants to build. *Mittge - To the best of my knowledge the agreement was City would take over the dedication of the street. The property that I believe you're talking about is industrial property located west of this development, with the understanding that when the industrial user came in to develop this property, the sidewalk, curbs and gutters would be part of that development. The end of the dedicated area would be just short of Culver Loop parallel to the edge of Lot #52.*

After discussions regarding the proposed agreement, Councilor Boggs suggested tabling the approval, would like to tour the site with Public Works, for a better understanding.

MOTION made by Councilor Boggs to table the approval of the Alaska Sutherlin Knolls Agreement as until next Council meeting; second by Councilor McKnight.

Discussion: *Jacobs – For clarification purposes, this dedication agreement was a process to resolve the appeal that is related to the Galpin Development, approved by the Planning Commission. Under State law, the City has 120 days for the land use process; that time will end around June 20th, will need to be acted on at the next Council meeting. If this does not go through and the appeal has to happen, will have to schedule the hearing itself at the first meeting in June in order to meet that deadline.*

Councilor Egbert – Requesting maps or aerials showing the area identified in the proposed agreement.

In Favor: Councilors McKnight, Meier, Stone, Boggs, Egbert and Mayor Cameron

Opposed: None

Abstain: Councilor Klassen, conflict of interest

Motion carried.

- **Council Meeting Time Limit**

Mayor Cameron stated there has been a request to put a time limit on Council meetings.

Councilor Klassen – Would like to propose, with some adjustment to the agenda, limiting meeting end times to 9:00 pm. If meetings need to go beyond that time, would need to be done by Council vote. Suggesting Council Comments limited to five minutes per Council member.

Councilor McKnight – Concerned with Public Comment (non-agenda items) at the end of the meeting, many times the public leaves the meeting because of the late night. Read a statement regarding discussions at meetings, "Remember monthly meeting time is limited, please ask questions or make statements that will benefit the group; individual comments or questions that can be handled on a one to one basis should be handled outside the meeting". Concerned Council Comments portion of the agenda regarding lists of questions that lead to debate, meeting gets off track, repeated questions are presented, if

questions are not answered contact the City Manager with email or phone call or put on the agenda for discussion.

MOTION made by Councilor Boggs to limit Council meetings to 9:00pm; second by Councilor McKnight.

Discussion: Council Klassen – If full Council decides to extend time limit on a topic would require a majority vote by Council.

AMENDED MOTION made by Councilor Boggs to limit Council meetings to 9:00pm, if extended time is needed would require Council majority vote.

Discussion: Council Egbert – Concerned not receiving enough information from Staff to be able to make a decision and does not understand the problem with late meetings.

City Manager, Gillham, stated the two items on the agenda that required more information were anomalies regarding information received earlier today.

In Favor: Councilors Klassen, McKnight, and Boggs

Opposed: Councilors Meier, Stone, Egbert and Mayor Cameron

Motion failed.

MOTION made by Councilor Stone to limit Council meeting to 10:00pm, if extended time is needed would require Council majority vote; second by Councilor McKnight.

Discussion: None

In Favor: Councilors Klassen, McKnight, Meier, Stone, Boggs, and Egbert

Opposed: Mayor Cameron

Motion carried.

MOTION made by Councilor Meier to change Public Comment (non-agenda items) to the beginning of the meetings; second by Councilor Stone.

Discussion: Councilor McKnight would like to continue with same forum currently in use, concerned with meetings getting off track if all comments are made at the beginning.

In Favor: Councilors Meier and Stone

Opposed: Councilor Klassen, McKnight, Boggs, Egbert and Mayor Cameron

Motion failed.

REPORTS

None

CITY MANAGER UPDATE

City Manager, Jerry Gillham, reported ODOT has proposed City take over the responsibility of Central Avenue from the Visitor Center (Comstock) to the railroad tracks. Their tentative offer of \$1.5 million is up for discussion on whether this is enough to bring the street up to City Standards. Is seeking Council consent to apply for a grant called the “Enhancement Grant” offered through the State, that would rebuild Central Avenue from Bi-Mart to Comstock. If City takes over jurisdiction of Central for the \$1.5 million, would be able to use that as a grant match to qualify for a multimillion dollar grant to rebuild Central from essentially Bi-Mart to the Visitor’s Center. ODOT has agreed to co-sponsor the grant. Bringing to Council now because of time frame involved, will need to start the process and build a template for the grant at the end of this week, will not proceed if there are no commitments to pursue it. The grant would need to be submitted but would not be in effect this next fiscal year.

Questions:

- Would we have to take Central Avenue for the \$1.5 million, before we could proceed to try and get the grant? *That’s what I will find out; if we commit the 1.5 million for the grant and we don’t get the grant, will we be stuck with owning Central.*
- Has it been confirmed the street will be brought up to City standards for the proposed \$1.5 million? *There are questions regarding the actual costs.*

- Would need to engage an engineer and what would be the cost of that? *Would estimate \$10,000 for the project to be “costed” from our engineer, using ODOT engineer’s numbers.*

Council consensus is to encourage Gillham to proceed with available grants, but bring back engineer’s analysis costs first before making a decision.

CITY COUNCIL COMMENTS

Councilor Boggs –

- None

Councilor Egbert –

- Referred to S. Comstock project, concerned with access and parking issues for businesses at the corner of Duke and Comstock. *This is a County project; some of their parking areas are on County right-of-way and City was notified regarding the issue. Staff will be meeting with property owners regarding access and parking issues this week. Will report back to Council with results if that meeting.*

Councilor Klassen –

- Saturday, May 17th SDDI’s Downtown Beautification Committee will meet in front of City Hall at 9:00am for flower planting event along Central Avenue, would like to invite the public to help. Participants will receive a free ice cream cone from Scoop Ice Cream Parlor.

Councilor McKnight –

- Would like to thank the Lions Club for their annual Mother’s Day Breakfast, has been a tradition for his family to attend the event, there was a very good turnout for this nice event.

Councilor Meier –

- Would like to thank Finance Supervisor, Dan Wilson, for getting Financial Statements to Council. Would like to add an item to the agenda regarding Financial Policy Review for Council to be able to specify the Financial Statements expected to receive.

Councilor Stone –

- Did we get the ADA parking and right turn only eliminated from the Comstock Connector design? *Yes, the bid opening has taken place, reviewed by the engineer and now being reviewed by ODOT.*
- When will we get a map of the County project? *We’ll see if one is available from County.*
- Have been approached by several people regarding the potholes on the corner of N. Comstock? *Will contact County regarding the potholes.*

Mayor Cameron –

- None

PUBLIC COMMENT –

- Ian Black, Local business owner - Referred to agenda item regarding disciplinary actions for City Manager, Jerry Gillham. Explaining personal experiences concerning the treatment of others, more specifically being hard on others ineffectively holds one back from achieving goals.
- Justin Peterman, citizen - Citizens are not happy with the leadership shown by Council, this is not directed to the entire Council but to Mayor Cameron, Councilors Meier and Egbert.
Other concerns:

- The questioning of City Staff in public meetings, making accusations, as if trying to catch Staff in a lie. Lack of leadership, hypocrisy, mistreatment and bullying of Staff has left the City in a very bad state.
 - Concerned with a trend of running off former City Managers and Staff and continuing with current City Manager, Jerry Gillham.
 - Concerned with the use of possible scare tactics or proof of illegal activity by certain members of Council. We the citizens of Sutherlin have had enough, and this corruption needs to stop.
 - The only logical solution to this problem is for all three of you to resign from your positions immediately. If you do not resign we will initiate a recall tomorrow morning. If any other Council members continue to participate in this corruption, you too will be asked to resign or added to the recall list.
- Scott Cameron, Local business owner - stated believing that Mayor Cameron, consistently, during tenure as Mayor has shown no respect for Staff, most specifically Gillham.

Other concerns:

- Mayor cannot continue to badger Gillham over frivolous questions, your intent to embarrass him, is childish.
 - To be an effective leader you must praise when due and reprimand when necessary. Praise can be made anytime and in front of anyone, reprimand should only be done, one on one, behind closed doors. If a person is consistently micromanaged, how can they be effective?
 - Mayor Cameron, I put you on notice, if your continued management style persists beyond tonight, you will be faced with a recall notice, along with Councilors Egbert and Meier.
- Jack Trowbridge, Local business owner - understands there are issues between Council and Gillham.

Correspondence by previous Staff members:

- Ron Harker - Important to note that the issues with Mayor Cameron, and other likeminded Councilors is not unique to Jerry, in fact previous City Managers, Robb Corbett and Interim City Manager, Ron Garzini experienced equally similar actions and were continually forced from accomplishing their jobs.
 - Corbett - Mayor Cameron is a wolf in sheep clothing. When asked why he was no longer in Sutherlin, he explained he grew very tired of being treated like he was dishonest.
 - Garzini - He served as a City Manager in several states for 35 plus years, under six different mayors, has never seen a mayor that wants to be the City's critic rather than its leader. Mayor Cameron and other likeminded Councilors are very difficult to work with, in fact one of the most difficult in his 35 years.
- Gillham has done an excellent job getting the community involved with City visioning goals, has reached out to business people and made them feel like their opinions are valuable, is a man of high character and true grit. Despite all the obstacles of working in a hostile work environment, Gillham has endeavored to manage the City while being micromanaged by unreasonable and unethical people.
 - Seth Vincent, Sutherlin resident - Would like to thank Staff for their professional, courteous and upbeat attitudes and Gillham for his hard work as our City Manager these last two years. I have seen his leadership in action, and it's comforting to know he is a major part of the success of this community. His job performance is exceptional.

Presented concerns:

- Extremely concerned about the patterns of the elected officials, patterns of abuse towards City Managers and Staff, constant undermining and questioning of his decisions that we entrust him with.

- Members of Council are micromanaging the City Manager. Extremely concerned about the community and its wellbeing.

Mayor Cameron announced Gillham has requested Executive Session to be held as a public meeting/open session.

EXECUTIVE SESSION – ORS #192.660(2) (i) – Performance Evaluation of Public Officers and Employees and ORS #192.660(2) (b) – Discipline of Public Officers and Employees

Mayor Cameron stated there were concerns by some of the Council members regarding City Manager's performance. Councilor Klassen requested names of those with concerns, is not speaking for entire Council.

Mayor Cameron called for a 5 minute recess at 8:57pm.

Meeting continued after recess at 9:03pm.

Councilor Egbert stated he is one of the members requesting the evaluation.

Council Concerns:

- Concerned with money management
- Not receiving SDC reports previously provided by former CDD
- Alleged false statements regarding Mayor and Councilor Egbert's involvement with North Douglas Fire District
- Concerns regarding ethics complaint directed at Councilor Egbert by previous CDD. [Rick Murphy spoke up that his wife Chris Murphy actually initiated it].

Audience member, Jack Van Dolah, stated City is being micromanaged. It seems it's the same three people that everyone is always talking about.

Mayor Cameron's concerns

- Concerned regarding Personal Services Contract and possible violation of City Code.
- Concerned with amount of money that has been spent with the development of Red Rock Path, to then find out issues involving the rerouting of the path
- Problems with documentation of previous projects

Councilor Boggs responded to the alleged violation of City Code regarding the hiring of Interim Finance Director, Andy Parks. At a November Council meeting, Gillham informed Council of his intention to bring Parks in. In his opinion, hiring Parks was a personnel decision, which is part of the City Manager's job. As long as his contract was not exceeding the budgeted amount, which we are still within budget, then that was not a violation.

Councilor Meier stated she is questioning the amount paid to Parks, and requested this Executive Session.

- There were false statements made regarding Red Rock Path project, questions the amount to spend on the project. The money was spent where it was allocated, however there were irregularities.
- Concerned with the Finance Policy limiting contracts up to \$25,000 limit, Council approval is required if exceeds the limit.

Councilor Klassen – The City Code Cameron and Meier are referring to is not meant for hiring personnel. Agrees with Councilor Boggs, this is a personnel matter, and is within budget.

City Attorney, Jacobs – Would like Council to refocus their conversation, the purpose of the Executive Session, is to voice concerns about Gillham's performance, discuss issues that need to be addressed and allow Gillham to respond, rather than debating.

Councilor Meier - Gillham stirs things up, no one said he was going to get fired. Started problems regarding Fire District #2 that lead to a public records request.

Councilor Klassen - That is not true, the reason there is problems with the Fire District #2 is because the Mayor's wife took a private letter from a citizen and posted it on Facebook.

Councilor Meier's concerns:

- Concerns with hiring friends for professional consulting
- There are four people, and four votes on the Council that feel the money needs to be spent more wisely

Councilor Klassen - Exactly how does Councilor Meier know there are four votes. Have you had a meeting that has come up with four votes? Meier stated no, she never said that.

Resident, Joe Groussman, stated he takes exception to a statement announcing the public is being coerced by Gillham to coming to the meeting. He has attended many meetings and was not coerced. Would like to see Council address Gillham, allow his attorney to speak in response as well.

Mayor Cameron asked Gillham's, Attorney, Margaret Wilson, to respond at this time.

Wilson stated she would like Gillham to address issues brought up by Council.

Gillham responded he wanted to be productive, happy to respond to discussion regarding the mismanagement of projects. However, believe that some things mentioned have not been presented or interpreted correctly. Gillham asked for due respect rather than being talked down and treated as a criminal. Wants to have honest dialogue without being yelled at or put down.

- Don't know of any report that has been asked for that has not been given to Council, provide weekly reports, including status reports on projects, hand deliver the weekly report to Councilor Egbert's every Monday.
- Was unaware SDC reports have not been forwarded to Council members?
Luther - She has never been told to provide an SDC report, the previous CDD may have provided that report but was unaware Council requested it.
Questions why Council has waited a year to make a statement at a meeting that SDC reports have not been given to Council.
- Wanted to respond to the Fire District #2 statement regarding the issue with possibly seeking a contract. Was told by Councilor Meier she had paperwork regarding this.
- Was in no way involved with ethics complaint against Councilor Egbert.
- Regarding the purchasing ordinance, and hiring Parks, sought out the League of Oregon Cities and compiled a list of possible candidates, this was for a Personal Services Agreement, which has a limit of \$75,000, when choosing from a list. Jacobs reviewed the agreement and did not state any problems with it. Do not agree City Code was violated.
- Regarding Red Rock Trail, the project did not start on his "watch" but ended on his "watch". The key thing is a Project Management filing system has been implemented for tracking all current and future projects. Knew there was a need for this system and we moved forward with it.
- Responding to "stirring" people up; have been careful not to do that. Feel this issue was in last performance evaluation and was dealt with then and question why it is still being brought up.
- In response to hiring "friends" for consulting purposes, I do not hire my "friends", have sought out professionals in fields that we are seeking, I know these people, have had a working relationship with them.
- I specifically asked Mayor Cameron if he was going to fire me, his response was "I don't know, I can't tell you that", my only thought was to hire an attorney to protect my job.

- If there is future problems would like dialogue between him and Council, in private one on one, allow for corrections to be made. If corrections aren't made, then take me into executive session.

Councilor Meier questioned a statement regarding who told Gillham there were four votes to fire him. ***Heard several things from community members that backed that assumption up, Mayor did not say he had four votes, but did say he and three others wanted this executive session, if a statement was made that there was no intent to fire me, I would not have gone to this extent.***

Wilson stated she received a letter from Jacobs on behalf of some Council members that, in her mind translated Council members were considering the dismissal of Gillham as City Manager. This proved to be of concern; there has been a pattern of poor treatment of Gillham.

Gillham reminded Council they are getting involved on a level that most Councils don't. Staff has dealt with many issues on projects regarding costs and different approaches. Council needs to realize this is a normal process, does not mean Staff is the blame for these issues. The bottom line is whether the project is within budget, if not it is presented to Council.

Concerned with Finance Reports not being provided to Council; Meier stated she will email example of expected reports. Understood Council wanted different reports than previously receiving.

Gillham stated he gets requests from individual Council members, but needs to be unanimity from the entire Council on expectations.

Councilor Klassen - Would like feedback in writing from Gillham regarding what he heard from Council and their expectations.

Jacobs – Suggested after receiving feedback from Gillham, Council can respond back to Gillham, without conferring with each other. Would like Council aware they cannot “respond all” between themselves, that would be considered a deliberation. After which Council could meet with Gillham regarding any discussion pertaining to the received feedback.

Council consensus for Gillham to provide feedback within 7 to 10 business days, will review again in 90 days. All Council members will be kept informed regarding any City business discussed with other members. Council will meet in executive session or a workshop in approximately a month regarding the feedback.

ADJOURNMENT –

With no further business meeting adjourned at **11:10pm.**

Respectfully submitted,

Diane Harris

Diane Harris, Deputy City Recorder

Approved:

Jerry Gillham

Jerry Gillham, City Manager

Denny Cameron

Denny Cameron, Mayor

APPROVED BY COUNCIL MAY 27, 2014