

CITY OF SUTHERLIN
Regular City Council Meeting
Sutherlin Civic Auditorium
Monday, July 14, 2014 – 7:00PM

COUNCIL MEMBERS:

MAYOR: Tom Boggs, Frank Egbert, Patricia Klassen, Todd McKnight, Karen Meier, Forrest Stone
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 (via Skype)
Andy Parks, Finance Advisor

Audience: Joe Groussman, Donna Pagel, Floyd Van Sickle, Bertha Egbert, Condie Valenzuela, Dan McCormick, Carole Connell, Gayla Holley, Jean & Dennis Wilde, Mike Meier, Greg Henderson, Jack Trowbridge, Justin Peterman, Tadd Held, Gene Fisher, David and Candy Taylor, Greg Mock, Carol Swesso, Beth & Jim Houseman, Dan Knight, Dony Knight, Shawn Erickson, James Jackson, Eunice Jackson, Ken Wolfer, Gary Hall, Pam Cameron, Willie Caldwell, Susan Osland, Brian Burke Sr., Tracie McKnight, Matt Parrish, Nichole Zamarripa, Jared Crum, Devon Colburn, Geruen Erandio, Lucas Erickson, Evan Villalobos, Kenny Gardici, Michelle Sumner

Meeting called to order by Mayor Cameron at 7:02pm.

Flag Salute:

Roll Call: All present

Introduction of Media: Garrett Andrews, the News Review

PUBLIC COMMENT (agenda items only)

- Local Business Owner and area resident, Dennis Wilde, stated he is in favor of the proposed sewer rate increase provided it is for a Class A system. Seriously concerned regarding a discussion to introduce Class B effluent water into Ford's Pond rather than Class A. His farm has water rights from the pond and Class B would seriously jeopardize his organic farming operation of olive trees and hardy kiwi. Requesting to be included in any notices regarding this proposal, including and not limited to any permits submitted to DEQ or the Water Resources Department.
- Sutherlin resident, Floyd Van Sickle, referred to the Fairway Ridge land use project and so many unanswered questions, feels the current planning approval should be vacated and sent back to the Planning Commission for another review.
- Sutherlin resident, Beth Houseman, reported she had her husband, Jim, recently presented their nonprofit organization "Friends of Ford's Pond" to the Parks Advisory Board. A discussion was held regarding the storage of Class B vs. Class A effluent in Ford's Pond. At previous Council Workshop, DEQ representative, Jon Gasik explained if Class B is stored in the pond, a fence or tall vegetation and set backs would be required, as well as restriction for recreational uses due to pathogen risks. Would like to request Gasik's PowerPoint presentation be added to the City's website. Class A is the only means to get productive use out of the Ford's Pond property.

- Sutherlin resident, Jim Houseman, thanked Council for their service over last couple of years and the very difficult issues they have tackled. Referred to the proposed sewer rate increase, recognize that city is living with 40 years of failure to bank money in anticipation of needed improvements. Feels it is in the best interest of the City to bank on this Class A water system, costing (per his calculations) an additional \$3 per month.
- Sutherlin resident, Joe Groussman, presented another consideration for Class A water system if restricted to Class B effluent, it is his understanding the golf course could not use this for irrigation purposes, believe this may put them out of business, as well as affect the property values of residents residing near the golf course.

ANNOUNCEMENTS / APPOINTMENTS

None

PRESENTATIONS / PROCLAMATIONS

- **Presentation & Proclamation to Special Olympics Team**

Mayor, Denny Cameron, read Proclamation announcing July 14, 2014 as Special Olympics Sutherlin Team Oregon Day. Team Oregon Unified Basketball Coaches and players were called forward to receive their Certificates of Award for competing at National level in Lawrenceville, New Jersey, representing the State of Oregon and winning the Silver Medal in the Championship game. Mayor Cameron presented the certificates with the help of Councilor McKnight and led the room in applause congratulating Coaches and players.

- **Wastewater Rate Discussion**

Staff Report – Finance Advisor, Andy Parks, presented a PowerPoint slideshow on Wastewater Treatment Facilities Financing Updates, financing applications, projected rates and funding issues in relation to proposed Wastewater Treatment Facility Plant (WTFP) and rate increases.

- Ford's Pond – \$3.0 million
- Balance of project – estimate of \$19.242 million (includes cost of Everett St. force main)
- Total estimated project cost – \$22.242 million

The City's Charter Amendment limits the annual increase to a CPI factor based on the prior 12 months and applies to the consumption rate only; rates that are not based on usage have no restrictions. Comparatives were presented regarding proposed rate changes and different methodologies regarding the increases.

Additional discussion:

- Is special permission required when changing rates, for instance the multi-family's "flat" rate? *Not according to the Legal Counsel, currently there is no flat rate associated with multi-family, only a consumption rate, one of the ways to balance that within the charter amendment is to create a different rate structure, a combination of a flat base fee plus consumption.*
- Can Council change the rates right now? *Ideally you would deal with this all at once, but don't think it's reasonable to suggest a rate resolution that addresses all of the potential issues and have it completed by the middle of August, could bring back something easier to address such as multi-family residential rate and look at remaining rates in a few months, giving time for a deeper look analysis.*
- What are you asking of us now? *Not asking anything other than providing information, will be hearing back from IFA in the next week or two, they may require a rate resolution for closing. If so, will communicate with City Manager, Jerry Gillham, to add to Council agenda. DEQ will want a rate resolution in place before they close. Council may choose to have a resolution that deals with all of the issues or a two-step approach.*
- Wouldn't it be best to do as much as possible in the beginning to make these rates simpler and more equitable? *Yes, however may not want to hurry in and make changes, then get into a public process with a committee that changes what Council has just implemented. Council may want to form a committee and rate schedule for a final resolution by January 1, 2015.*

- If we raised that rate increase to \$3 or \$3.25 instead of \$2.58, how much quicker could we pay off the \$3 million loan, if that could be paid off in a five year period [versus a 25 year period] City would then only need to pay on the \$19 million loan? *May come at a tremendous cost for the City, for instance for each million borrowed, you're looking at approximately \$1.60 per month on the rates, it would cost the City far more to pay that off in five years. Do not have that number available at the moment but will forward to Council, those calculation were previously sent in an email to Council.*
- Concerned with the maintenance on the pond, Lone Rock just cleared blackberries from the property; this will be a future task for City Staff. *It's factored in and additionally capital outlay reserves will be set aside for this, there will be an estimated \$250,000 per year that can be used for those expenditures.*
- Is this based on “normal” growth for the City? *There are two examples presented, one with 0% growth, and one with a 1% growth, which result in approximately \$2 difference in fees, growth has a very positive impact on rates.*
If there is a population growth period like in early 2000’s, this scenario would look even better. *Yes, the proposed treatment plant is for a community of 14,000, will not cost much more to operate than with 8,000 people, most costs are fixed.*

- **Fire Services Update**

Staff Report – Chief of Police, Kirk Sanfilippo, presented a Fire Services Options PowerPoint presentation, the information provided will be linked to an action item on tonight’s agenda. Background history, fire options, (not listed in priority order) and Fire Services Technical Team (TSTT) and Citizen’s Advisory Committee (CAC) comments were presented. Each option included a list of priorities, as well as pros and cons:

- Option #1 – Establish a combined professional fire, police and volunteer fire department. Sanfilippo explained an interim Fire Chief and administrative staff would need to be hired right away.
- Option #2 – Negotiate fire services contract with Douglas County Fire District #2 (DCFD #2).

Points of discussion:

- Like the idea of combining Fire and Police, however what does the police union think of this idea? *Have not met with them in an official meeting capacity, have conducted briefing meetings regarding the concept, since they have never done anything similar, felt if this is a possibility would be willing to explore it, this may not have been the consensus of all for their own personal reasons, however they did not say “absolutely not”.*
- Questions regarding coverage, understand that volunteer staffing can go up or down, if police become tied up on a fire, this brings up concerns about police coverage. *Staffing levels vary; try to have at least one police officer on duty 24/7.*
- What is our minimum staffing requirement, how many firefighters do we have to have? *We have not talked about numbers yet or developed a structure, when Council decides which option to focus on, will bring back numbers and the cost associated with those numbers.*
- Whatever option we’re looking at there will need to be a base to operate on. *That is listed in our priority steps, “establishing a FY 15/16 organizational structure and budget”.*
- Thought this option [DCFD #2] was off the table according to Fire Chief, Greg Marlar. *Have not discussed this with him, nor had negotiations formally with their Board of Directors, wanted to bring this up as an option to find out if Council would like us to explore it, if that is the case will sit down formally, find out if they are interested.*

Audience member, Pam Cameron, stated one of the “cons” that was not listed but discussed at the CAC meetings with that negotiations with DCFD #2 would not be a longtime fix.

- Has FSTT or CAC met to discuss these issues at combined meetings? *Haven’t specifically discussed that, would like to know if Council would like us to continue with the teams; if so could get the two groups together.*

Sanfilippo stated FSTT talked about another option, suggested going out for a Request for Proposal (RFP) allowing other agencies to bid on providing fire services. *Some groups were bought up as examples, Rural Metro and North Douglas Fire; however agencies have not been approached; do not want to get into negotiations without authorization.*

- Would like to examine the option of hiring a professional group that would bring in temps until locals are trained, could advertise in trade magazines. *FSTT member and leader of CAC, Michele Sumner - This was discussed but not considered an option because the RFP would take quite a bit of time and would be putting together the volunteer portion of the service, which is what the City would already be doing, would also be losing the local control that citizens were concerned about.*
- Concerns shared in deciding on a volunteer fire department and not having enough volunteers. Would like to be able to explore that scenario without having to go out to bid. Understands this is available in some areas in the state.
- It was never mentioned that people weren't happy with DCFD #2; it was the cost issue and having a permanent taxing district. *That is why we discussed keeping this as an option and discussing with DCFD #2.*
- Concerned with staffing, training, funding issues, as well as equipment and apparatus costs, additionally volunteer does not mean "free". Will pay for it one way or another; want the best service you can pay for.

Discussion continued regarding equipment use, City owned as well as the fact that DCFD #2 has a large amount of equipment available.

FSTT member, Dan McCormick – With regards to DCFD #2 as an option, it doesn't cost anything to ask them what their position is.

Mayor Cameron – Concerned that options have not been explored any more than a few weeks ago. *Sanfilippo - Seeking policy direction, as a team leader will not go forward until instructed to explore that option.*

- **Garden Club – Community Center Project**

Staff Report – Community Development Director, Vicki Luther, presented a project Sutherlin Garden Club is proposing for the parking lot area across from Sutherlin Community Center. The Garden Club initially presented their plan to City Staff who took it to the Parks Advisory Committee for review. Garden Club will provide the plants and pavers, City to provide bark mulch, which the Garden Club will spread. Irrigation will be installed by City crew; water will be metered; City Staff will maintain the area after completion. No action was needed, brought to Council for informational purposes.

CONSENT AGENDA

- **Minutes from June 23, 2014 Regular Meeting**
- **Minutes from June 23, 2014 Workshop**

MOTION made by Councilor McKnight to approve consent agenda as presented; second by Councilor Meier.

Discussion: None

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

Opposed: None

Motion carried unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARING

- **Land Use Appeal – Fairway Ridge Subdivision**

Staff Report – City Planner, Carole Connell, stated the hearing was schedule for this evening, because of the ongoing negotiations with an element of this project, another 30 day extension has been granted until August 18th. Would like to request Council continue the hearing until July 28th. Gillham explained we could go through the public hearing and still not satisfy the issue that may become litigious. However, could come up with a "win-win" solution by resolving concerns and have a concept of an agreement:

- Installation of the 1,000 ft. sidewalk would not go in right now as discussed at last Council meeting
- Mitigating damage to the street during construction and development process was also a concern, suggest requiring repairs to the streets by the construction development that caused the damage

- Rather than installing a sidewalk along the north side of Scardi, consider a pedestrian crossing to go onto the south side of the street

Would be able to get the upgrades from Alaska Sutherland Knolls Corporation (ASKC) on the road going east from Galpin property, both would put in curb, gutters and sidewalks during their developments. Suggest adding the two concerns in the form of an agreement with ASKC. The attempt is to come to a settlement agreement and bring to Council at the next meeting; would not need to have a public hearing and the land use issue is settled.

MOTION made by Mayor Cameron to proceed with attempt for a settlement agreement based on the concept of damage of the roads protected, having pedestrians guided to different location on the road and agreement parameters of original contract presented; second by Councilor McKnight.

Discussion: Mayor Cameron voiced concerns regarding a letter from ASKC Attorney in the [June 23rd] Council packet. *City Attorney, Chad Jacobs – The issue now is if City accepts the settlement agreement, they would withdraw the appeal so the issues raised in the letter would not be issues City would ever have to address.*

ASKC Attorney, Zack Mittge concurred with Jacobs' analysis.

Councilor Klassen questioned whether she would be legally allowed to vote on this motion and the settlement agreement. *Jacobs – Yes, to be safe you should declare a potential conflict of interest tonight and during the settlement agreement at July 28th meeting.*

Councilor Klassen declared a potential conflict of interest because of her residence and also sits on that board of directors, and will not be biased.

Van Sickle questioned whether the City Manager should declare a potential conflict of interest, as well as another Councilor that lives there. *City Manager is not voting, therefore would not need to make a declaration.* Councilor Stone stated he is not on the Knolls Estates Board, and not involved with the issues.

Mayor Cameron reported he was present at a Planning Commission meeting when this topic was discussed and has other knowledge of this. *Jacobs – The idea of bias and ex parte contacts are all relevant for purposes of the land use hearing, these issues will need to be disclosed at that time, tonight's issues regarding bias and ex parte contacts do not need to be addressed, only the conflict of interest and potential conflict of interest.*

Councilor Stone questioned the need for adding a condition that the sidewalks will be installed at the time of development. Discussion was held regarding if motion needed to be amended to address that issue. *Connell – Suggested not adding a condition now, it is currently a required standard in the Development Code, to attach a four, eight or ten year condition to a decision that isn't being made in a land use forum with a hearing and a standard procedure now is not a good idea. Jacobs – Concurred with statement.*

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

Opposed: Councilors Klassen and Meier

Motion carried.

ACTION ITEMS/GENERAL BUSINESS

o June 9, 2014 Minutes – Regular Meeting

Staff Report – City Recorder, Debbie Hamilton, stated after review of the audio and minutes, verifies and stands behind Deputy City Recorder's transcription of the minutes as being correct. Additional phrasing has been added to the conversation; "brackets" have been added that refer to a document Council received in their [June 9th] packet; as a reminder to Council members and the general public, this helps them to understand what is being referred to, clarifying what may not have been "said", but is noted. Referring to a section on page 6 in the minutes, added "brackets" for clarification purposes in reference to a document regarding expenditures made by Council as a whole.

MOTION made by Councilor Boggs to approve July 9, 2014 minutes as presented; second by Councilor McKnight.

Discussion: Councilor Meier - Upset with the wrong amount being used, concerned with minutes and a media article.

Councilor Boggs – The more you argue about this, the more defensive and the guiltier you look, if you are not guilty of anything, forget about it and move on.

Councilor Meier – Media article referred to the wrong amount, contacted Andrews regarding the issue.

Mayor Cameron – This is the third discussion on this issue, feel it was done in an effort to exaggerate the affect, this has been discussed enough and have made our point.

Councilor Meier - Concerned with the facts not being presented and wasting Council time.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carried unanimously.

- **Ordinance No. 1037 – Transient Room Tax (second reading title only & adoption)**

Staff Report – City Manager, Jerry Gillham, reported a paragraph has been added to Section 2 as requested by Council.

Second reading by title only was presented by Deputy City Recorder, Diane Harris.

MOTION made by Councilor Boggs to approve second reading and adoption of Ordinance No. 1037 – Amending sections 3.08.020 and 3.08.190 of Sutherlin Municipal Code to increase the amount of City's Transient Room Tax and conform the use of funds derived from such tax to the requirement of state law as amended; second by Councilor McKnight.

Discussion: Councilor Stone – Concerned with increase in motel tax and the sewer rate increase effecting citizens.

Councilor Klassen – This isn't for residents, this is a motel tax; owners will pass the 3% increase on to their patrons, this will bring Sutherlin closer to the rest of Douglas County's [transient room tax rate].

Jacobs – Referred to Section 3 of the draft ordinance, regarding the effective date, typically an ordinance takes effect 30 days after enactment, given this is a tax, need to consider the date for it to be in effect, such as September 1st.

Councilor Klassen – Do we need to amend the motion? **You should unless you want it to take into effect 30 days after its enacted. If you want a certain date it should be amended.**

Mayor Cameron – Want to make a date certain if there is a particular reason for that, otherwise will not amend the motion. **Will not be necessary.**

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

Opposed: Councilor Stone

Motion carried.

- **Land Donation – Heavenly Court**

Staff Report – Community Development Director, Vicki Luther, reported owner of a small piece of property located on Heavenly Court, wishes to donate to the City. This was presented to the Parks Committee, resulting in a unanimous vote against City taking it. It would be additional maintenance for City, as well as being unusable property.

MOTION made by Councilor Boggs to not accept donation of Heavenly Court property being offered by Carl Barron; second by Councilor Klassen.

Discussion: If Red Rock Road is developed, would that piece of property be able to be used? **No, there is a good sized ditch between Red Rock Road and the property.**

Potential uses were discussed, however there were no viable options.

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

Opposed: Councilor Stone

Motion carried.

- **Mayor's Questions/Discussion**

Mayor Cameron explained the reason for bringing this to Council, would like to get some issues resolved officially. The first item regarding the Monday agenda setting meetings ties closely with the second item, Monday agenda setting meetings being recorded.

- **Council President at Monday agenda setting meetings and,**

- **Monday recorded meeting of agenda setting sent to Council**

Meetings are recorded, would like to make these available to Council and would like their opinion regarding access to the information.

Councilor Meier – Feel Councilors are not receiving the same information, don't have a problem with the entire Council listening to the meeting.

Councilor Boggs – The purpose of the meeting is to set the agenda.

Councilor McKnight – Suggest eliminating the Monday meeting, Staff will set the agenda and forward it to the Mayor for review or Staff could send the agenda to the entire Council; can then add or make changes.

Gillham – Suggest emailing the agenda to Council after Tuesday Staff meetings, will be able to build on agenda that week, Council to review it and respond back to Gillham with any questions or changes.

Jacobs – This is where you have to be careful of serial meetings or meetings via email; discussion on what is on the agenda is fine, if talking about the merits of the agenda items, that's where you can get into trouble.

Mayor Cameron – Likes the idea, would like to try it, brings the whole Council in and have input.

Council will contact Gillham with any questions or additions to the agenda.

Councilor Egbert – Concerned with how City will address people, for example that are running for Council, but do not use email, suggest City have a policy to address this. *Can deal with this case by case.*

Gillham - If a Council member wants an item on the agenda, will put it on the agenda, however Mayor can remove the item, if so, that Councilor would need to have two other Councilors concur to have that item placed back on that agenda.

MOTION made by Mayor Cameron to initiate process, see how it goes, provide all Councilors the opportunity to plan the agenda; second by Councilor Stone.

Discussion: Will keep Council updated regarding the agenda, discussed faxing the agenda to Councilor Egbert, will also include a deadline date for input.

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

Opposed: None

Motion carried unanimously.

- **Technical Advisory Fire Services Team discussion**

Concerned the advisory team is predominately current or former fire fighters, it seems to have a different attitude than the citizen's committee. Disappointed with lack of information received so far, unable to make a decision. *Gillham – As you recall we had until the end of July to report back to Council, wanted to bring back one or two options, the issue is there is a disparity of opinion on which route to go. Made a decision with Sanfilippo, did not want to go a direction without Council instruction. Found there is a huge difference in opinion between CAC and FSTT. Felt that whatever route we go will be criticized for being biased or prejudiced, want to bring the two key options to Council to seek input on the direction to go. Some details have been completed. Have set up fire services advisory office space, announced and will be interviewing candidates for starting a fire services training academy, meeting with and interviewing an interim Chief this week. Have done what we need to be doing to make this work and have until the end of July for presentation, seeking Council decision on the direction to move, will then be able to move aggressively.*

Councilor McKnight – Concerned with the funding, once information is presented will be able to make a better decision.

Mayor Cameron – Reminded there was a previous question asking if someone can provide a contract, as well as finding out what the minimum standard is.

- **Council consensus discussion**

Gillham distributed history of events related to a recent topic discussed by Council. Concerns were mentioned regarding a Council decision by consensus not to pursue an ODOT proposal discussed at a Budget Meeting involving Central Avenue. At City Council meeting Gillham brought additional information he received to Council for reconsideration. Mayor Cameron questioned this action. Gillham explained that previous discussion was during the budget process. However, at a later date Gillham was

approached by ODOT with additional information regarding the project that he felt Council should be aware of.

Councilor Klassen stated Gillham's job is to do the best he can for the city, regardless of what path it takes, he had new information to present to Council.

Gillham – Doesn't feel you want a “puppet” City Manager, rather someone that will bring information that may create a completely different scenario.

Discussion continued regarding concerns with “motions” and “consensus” and reasons for bringing additional information to Council for consideration.

Councilor Egbert – Still concerned with the cost of ODOT’s proposal.

Mayor Cameron – Confirming Council agreed to encourage Gillham to proceed with available grants, but bring back engineer’s analysis costs first before making a decision, would like to know where that process is at. ***We are still working on it.***

- **Project software cost**

Would like to find out the cost of adding a project management module to City’s existing software.

Discussed with Finance Supervisor, Dan Wilson, cost may be around \$10,000, but will confirm that information. This would be a great help especially with a \$20 million project.

MOTION made by Mayor Cameron to agree to the purchase of project management software; second by Councilor Stone.

Discussion: Without knowing the cost would suggest not making a motion at this time.

Mayor Cameron withdraws motion.

Mayor Cameron suggested making a motion to continue the meeting since it was now after 10:00pm.

MOTION made by Mayor Cameron to continue agenda until 10:45pm; second by Councilor McKnight.

Discussion: None

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

Opposed: Councilors Boggs

Motion carried.

- **Discussion – If not in packet no decision made**

Concerned there is no time to absorb the information and make a decision if not in packet. ***There are some exceptions for example, the urgency of the decision needed by Council.*** Discussion continued regarding the information that is received without enough time, would like to deal with it on a case by case basis, Council will make a decision at the next meeting.

- **Fire Service Options**

Staff Report – City Manager, Jerry Gillham, stated he is seeking Council direction from options presented.

Points of concern:

- Why overload current Chief of Police regarding Police/Fire option. ***Police would be used as a supplemental fire fighter.*** We should have our own Fire Chief, minimum basic fire requirement of people to do the job, disagree with the option of an officer going out to fight a fire. ***That is important to discuss, during this process the thought was that police officers could be used much like our volunteers in a support capacity. If a fire did occur, officers could be mobilized, in addition would receive incentive pay for participating in the program, but would be voluntary. Also discussed involving the Public Works employees, have a daily built-in team of level 1 volunteer fire fighters, also receiving incentive pay. The Fire Chief would be in charge of them.***
- Would then have two unions involved
- Concerned with pulling current Staff away from their jobs

Discussion continued regarding back up from local fire districts and needed volunteers.

MOTION made by Mayor Cameron to eliminate all options except for Option #1; second by Councilor Egbert.

Discussion: Councilor Klassen – Would like to look into the three options.

Councilor McKnight – Contact DCFD #2's Board of Directors, find out their position in the matter.
Councilor Egbert – Disappointed with not having that answer at this stage in the game.

Councilor Klassen – Need to have bases covered, need to know if DCFD #2 is interested, find out if there is a company that does provides fire service and the cost of getting our own Fire Department.

Councilor Egbert – If we contract out, whether it is Rural Metro for example, will be contracting out the administration portion, but will still need to count on volunteers, will lose local control if contracted.

Mayor Cameron – What are you going to ask DCFD #2? *Sanfilippo – If they are interested in any discussions involving negotiating for something similar to what we have currently or a layered approach in service to provide the City. If they say yes, will sit down and talk about more of the details. Council is the policy setters, it was apparent to me, as the team leader, that anything that took us down a path where rumor or speculation made anybody believe we're moving in a direction, would be problematic, that is why we did not take that position.* Need to discuss what questions Council would like asked, City knows what it can afford to pay.

Councilor Meier – Would like to have DCFD #2's answer available at the next Council meeting and provide quotes.

Mayor Cameron withdraws motion.

REPORTS

None

CITY MANAGER UPDATE

Council will receive an activity report covering two weeks.

CITY COUNCIL COMMENTS

Councilor Boggs –

- None

Councilor Egbert –

- None

Councilor Klassen –

- Read a timeline of events involving Council member's actions and concerns, explaining the main reason for her presentation is that she understood that after the June 9th Council meeting, Council would put things aside and start working together as a unit, the very next day more things happened, wanted to let everyone know what was going on.

Councilor McKnight –

- None

Councilor Meier –

- Asked Jacobs for clarification regarding the hiring of an interim Fire Chief and if it needs to come to Council for approval if amount of the contract is over \$25,000. *Jacobs – If the individual is an employee and not an independent contractor, Gillham has the authority to hire him without Council approval as long as it is a budgeted position, if independent contractor, then subject to Public Contract rules.* For clarification, that rule is \$25,000? *Correct.*

Councilor Stone –

- Concerned with the RFP for value analysis and lack of information regarding goals, it continued to refer back to the facilities plan, and we are trying to get a totally different plan. *Luther – No we aren't trying to get a new facilities plan we are asking them to do a comparative on the plant not the plan itself, the plan refers to the Sequential Batch Reactors (SBR), we want to*

know if that is the best option. Gillham – In terms of faith and what they are doing, this is an “engineer’s world” process, this was created by project engineers that do analysis.

Mayor Cameron – Would like to request a meeting with Orenco’s engineers. *Gillham - Would rather involve the whole team. Shared concerns of Mayor meeting with them [Orenco] as it implies there is a lack of confidence in the team.* That would be fine, would like to make sure Councilor Stone is notified of the meeting.

Mayor Cameron –

- Concerned with Strategic Plan on City website not up to date. *Will be updating it when new website up.* Request Council is notified on calendar for a review of the Strategic Plan every six months.
- Questioned Chamber contract did not include goal expectations, would like to set up goals with them.

Councilor McKnight – Have been approached to take part in the TRT grant application process.

PUBLIC COMMENT –

Resident, Bertha Egbert, spoke as a citizen of this town, has the right to speak her mind at meetings, concerned with Councilor Klassen’s statement implying Councilor Egbert and recent “request for freedom of information”, resents the implications.

Resident, Pam Cameron, spoke regarding Councilor Klassen voicing concerns regarding Councilors and their wives involvement in the CAC meetings. All were encouraged to participate.

ADJOURNMENT –

With no further business meeting adjourned at 10:52pm.

Jerry Gillham

Approved:

Jerry Gillham, City Manager

Respectfully submitted,

Diane Harris

Diane Harris, Deputy City Recorder

Denny Cameron

Denny Cameron, Mayor

Approved by Council July 28th, 2014