

**City of Hood River
City Council Work Session
November 9, 2020**

Council: Mayor Kate McBride, Mark Zanmiller, Megan Saunders, Tim Counihan, Jessica Metta, Erick Haynie, Gladys Rivera

Staff: City Manager Rachael Fuller, Finance Director/ACM Will Norris, City Attorney Dan Kearns, Fire Chief Leonard Damian, Police Chief Neal Holste, Public Works Director Mark Janeck, Senior Project Manager Wade Seaborn, City Recorder Jennifer Gray, GIS Analyst Jonathan Skloven-Gill

Absent:

I CALL TO ORDER – Cell Phone Reminder – 6:00 p.m.

Land Acknowledgement Statement and Pledge of Allegiance

II BUSINESS FROM THE AUDIENCE

Tracey Tomashpol, Hood River, OR –

Gracias por la oportunidad de hablar otra vez sobre la falta de transparencia que continúe en las deliberaciones de las varias agencias del gobierno de Hood River, incluyendo el consejo de la ciudad y la comisión de planeación.

He pedido varias veces que la ciudad provee un archivo de sus deliberaciones que usa ambos video y audio. El sistema actual, que solo tiene la grabación en voz, es insuficiente. Peor, es un impedimento y una barera a la participación en nuestro gobierno municipal para muchas personas, incluyendo:

- Personas que no habla inglés con suficiente habilidad de entender una grabación que solo usa audio
- Personas con diversos problemas de audición
- Personas que no pueden identificar quien esta hablando, y por lo tanto, no pueden comprender el contexto de la discusión o las opiniones de las personas que hablan

Tomashpol stated some of you will not have understood her introduction. It's the same problem many people who want to understand the city council or planning commission meetings have when all they have is an audio file with no video. Beside the problems mentioned above, the use of just an audio file:

- Leaves people listening with a hard time knowing who is speaking, particularly in discussions with interruptions or where the speaker is not identified;
- Leaves people unable to follow along when staff present new information in the form of slides that were not included in the packet

- Makes it difficult for those who aren't technically savvy to find the portion of the file that matches to an agenda item

She stated she first proposed both live streaming and archived video with translations in October 2019 and was told that this was a 2020 goal, in order to expand citizen participation and understanding. Tomashpol reviewed her suggested items.

III PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Co-Housing Appeal, D. Nilsen, J. Kaden

Mayor McBride opened the public hearing at 6:05 p.m.

Mayor McBride explained Councils function in this land use appeal case is to review the record of this matter, take public testimony and written comment and decide if the applicant has met or does not meet the applicable approval criteria in the Hood River Development Code and State law. Even though this is an opponent appeal of a Planning Commission approval, the applicant still bears the burden of proof. It is not our job to be more restrictive or lenient than these approval standards allow, but rather to interpret and apply the approval standards as written. These are the approval criteria that are listed and analyzed in the planning commission decision and staff report in the packet. They will also be summarized as part of the staff presentation.

Second, Council is required to render an impartial decision on each application. This means that we cannot have a personal financial stake or bias that would prevent us from making an impartial decision. Before we begin the hearing, I will call for the disclosure of bias, ex parte contact and conflict of interest from each councilor. Anyone in the audience will then have the opportunity to question any of us about those disclosures.

Council's decision in this matter, once reduced to writing, will be the City's final decision and may be appealed to the Land Use Board of Appeals by anyone with standing. To appeal the decision, you have to participated either orally or in writing while the record is open. Any issue you may wish to preserve for a subsequent LUBA appeal you must raise before us. Also, in any appeal to LUBA, you are limited to evidence you submitted during the City's local process while the record was open to new evidence. At present, the record is closed to new evidence.

Before Council tonight is an appeal of a planning commission decision to approve a Site Plan Review to construct a multi-family cohousing development called Adams Creek Cohousing - City File No. 2020-03.

Opponents to the development raise 15 issues in their appeal of the Planning Commission decision. This is an "on the record" appeal from the Planning Commission, which means that we do not allow any new evidence beyond what was heard and available to the Planning Commission. Participation in the hearing is limited to parties of record.

Mayor McBride read the rules and process regarding the public hearing. Script has been added to the record.

There were no questions or objections to the process from Council members.

Dan Bell stated he sent a letter earlier this morning asking whether or not the appellant rebuttal at the end of the process, was consistent with Hood River Code.

Kearns stated he saw Bell's request and he was aware of what the code provided. The code is not consistent with State Law when it comes to appeals by opponents of a permit that was granted to an applicant. Under Oregon Law, the applicant has burden of proof at all stages of a local appeal process. Therefore, the applicant gets the last rebuttal.

There were no other questions.

Mayor McBride stated Council will now consider File No. 2020-03, an Appeal of the Planning Commission's approval of a Site Plan Review application to construct a multi-family cohousing development. A quorum of the Council is present and asked all Councilors to disclose any ex-parte contacts, conflicts of interest and bias in this matter.

Councilor Zanmiller stated he is a direct neighbor of the property and he has participated in the Planning Commission process to date. He is going to recuse himself from this hearing.

Councilor Haynie stated he is also a direct neighbor of this property. For decades his father owned property to the immediately south of this property and grew up playing on this property. He has had contact with various people about this project. One of the people in favor of the project is his neighbor, Matt Green. He has had various discussions about this project. He has had conversations with AJ and Amy Kitt who are not listed, since they have moved out of the neighborhood. He has talked to them about some of their concerns. He has received mailings about the project because he lives near the project. He does not believe he has a particular bias one way or the other. However, he has thought about this and consulted with the City Attorney. He is leaning towards listening in and he will participate in the event of a tie vote, in a role of necessity. Given that he is a direct neighbor and a voice to create any appearance of bias. He lives here and all these people involved are his friends. He is inclined to listen to the proceedings and be available to vote, if required.

Kearns stated Council has been there before, tie vote situation. Anyone who comes back on will need to be aware of the proceedings, who said what and what the record looks like. It would make sense if needed to have Councilor Haynie since he has expressed, he is not bias either way. He has offered to come back under the role of necessity, cast a vote but not participate in deliberation. That is the category Councilor Haynie has put himself in and that seems fine.

Councilor Haynie confirmed that his preference is to recuse himself, unless he falls under the role of necessity.

Councilor Rivera stated she has no bias or conflict of interest in this matter.

Councilor Saunders stated in the past year she has heard from various people in the community that are for and against this project. There was no information provided to her that was not already in the packet. She does not believe those conversations led to any bias on her part.

Councilor Counihan stated in 2016, he participated in meetings with the group that is proposing this development. Back then, it was conceptual and land had not been purchased. He knows several of the individuals, but he has not spoken to them about this specifically.

Councilor Metta stated in 2018, she was invited to consider living there and attend an informational meeting. At that time, she stated no thank you and she did not participate in any meeting. Like other Councilors have stated, living in a small town she knows people on both sides of the issue but she has not spoken to anyone. She feels she does not have a bias and would address the proposal from what is in the record.

Mayor McBride stated she has no bias or financial interest. She knows some people on both sides that have given testimony. She looked at the co-housing website long before they had the site, to learn more about co-housing. That is the only contact she has had with this issue. She knows the person representing the appellant is Dan Bell. Bell took her job at Friends of the Columbia Gorge when she retired. He is now the director. She knows him because of that, and it has nothing to do with this land use decision. She has had no discussion with him.

There were no disqualifications from Councilors.

Mayor McBride asked if there was anyone from the audience that wanted to question anyone on Council on their disclosures or otherwise challenge the participation of any member of the City Council.

Jack Leonard – asked if Councilor Fuller had any disclosures. Mayor McBride clarified that Fuller is the City Manager, not a City Councilor.

Jennifer Kaden presented the staff report that described the application, the Planning Commission's decision and the 15 appeal issues in general. See packet materials for detailed information.

After the staff report Council discussed the procedural request to reopen the record at the end of the staff report.

Kearns reviewed the procedural issue of the applicant requesting that the record be opened to allow them to submit additional information, in response to the appeal issues. A lot of the appeal issues the appellant has raised say they would like more information and more detail. In the staff report, it was explained the code does not require that, certainly not at the preliminary stage of the land use process which it is. The applicant has offered, and the applicant has the burden of proof. They should give the applicant every opportunity to do that. Staff is suggesting allowing a two-week period for anyone to submit anything relevant to the appeal, including new evidence. The second period of one week to respond to things that come in during the first open record period. It is the hope that during the second period, that no new evidence comes in because that would give rise to the other side to review and respond to it. I would add an additional rotation of the revolving door of the record. State law gives anyone the right to ask that they be given the chance to respond to new evidence that comes in. It's a possibility but the hope is in order to stick to the schedule and get a deliberation and decision before the end of the year, that no new evidence comes in. After the second go around, there would be the applicant's final written rebuttal. The applicant has the burden of proving that all the criteria are met. Council should decide on the request, because if the record is going to be reopened, that would affect what people say in their verbal testimony tonight.

Zoe Lynn Powers, applicant's attorney had a procedural question. Responded to the comment made by Kearns about the 120-day period. Her client is willing to extend the deadline for the 120-day period.

Mayor McBride stated the first issue the Council will address, before Council gets to public testimony

on the merits of the appeal, is the applicant's request to reopen the record. Understanding that the appellants and all members of the public have a right to review and respond to any new evidence that comes in.

Staff recommends granting the applicant's request according to the following schedule:

- 2 weeks for new evidence and argument related to the appeal issues (Nov 23)
- 1 week for rebuttal and response to material submitted during the first 2 weeks (Nov 30)
- 1 week for the applicant's final rebuttal – no new evidence (Dec 7)
- Council reconvenes on Dec 14 to deliberate and decide the appeal – no testimony

Councilors discussed and agreed to the applicants' request.

Motion: I move to continue the hearing on File No. 2020-03 until December 14, 2020 no earlier than 6:00p.m. and reopen the record for File No. 2020-03 with the following schedule. 14 days to submit additional evidence and argument on the items identified in the appeal by 5pm November 23, 2020. followed by 7 days to submit responses to materials submitted during the first time period by 5:00p.m. November 30, 2020. Followed by 7 days for the applicant to submit a final statement by 5:00p.m. December 7, 2020.

First: Metta

Second: Saunders

Discussion: Mayor McBride clarified the motion stated was for written material only, all oral testimony will be taken this evening.

Vote: Motion passed (roll called)

Ayes: McBride, Saunders, Counihan, Metta, Rivera

Nays: None

Abstentions: Zanmiller, Haynie

Excused: None

Mayor McBride opened the public testimony portion of the hearing.

APPALLENT:

Councilor received testimony from the appellant Dan Bell. Bell presented a PowerPoint presentation. PowerPoint was added to the record.

There were no questions for Bell by Council.

Jason Parker, Hood River, OR – addressed Council. He echoed Bell's comments and efforts.

NEUTRAL PARTIES:

Mark Zanmiller, Hood River, OR – stated he is not opposed to co-housing development. He does believe there are things that should be improved in the plan. Zanmiller reviewed those items. Zanmiller's full statement was added to the record.

OPPOSED OF THE APPEAL:

Nancy Roach and Greg Crafts, Hood River, OR – her husband has been involved with innovated housing in Hood River. They believe this project will add to Hood River.

APPLICANT:

Councilor received testimony from the applicant's attorney Zoe Lynn Powers, along with Jim Miller

(future owner) and Seth Moran (architect).

Miller explained how the vision for this project came about, the meetings, the growing interest, the challenges they faced, information about co-housing and the values they hold. Values: 1. Recognize relationships are the core of the community. 2. Respect and balance between privacy and interconnection. 3. Responsible stewardship.

Moran gave an overview on the Adams Creek Co-Housing proposal and reviewed project features relevant to the appeal items and the approval criteria. The PowerPoint was added to the record.

Powers concluded by addressing the needed housing in Hood River as stated in the 2015 Housing Needs Analysis. It states there is a lack of sufficient number of multifamily housing units in the City. The project is providing the needed housing under City law. The City may apply only clear and objective standards, conditions and procedures for the site plan review. The applicant has worked in good faith to cooperate with the City and the clients, ultimately this process has the effect that is prohibited by State law. Discouraging needed housing through unreasonable cost or delay. They understand a change on a nearby parcel can be undesirable to individual residents. Council looks more broadly to the needs to the community as a whole, including the need for multifamily housing. This project complies with code and implements the planned density that needs to be development on properties like this, with appropriate zoning to address Hood Rivers housing needs. They ask that Council uphold the Planning Commission unanimous decision and allow this group of owners to develop their future homes in Hood River.

There were no questions from Council.

SUPPORT THE APPLICANT and OPPOSED to the APPEAL:

Kathy Higgins, Hood River, OR – stated she is one of the founders and current Chair of the Hood River County Energy Council. She had three points to state. She addressed Items No. 7 and No. 8 regarding parking and traffic in the appeal, as well as Item No. 14 conflict of interest. Her final comment was about the design and intent of the project, specially to energy. She explained 80% of Hood Rivers electricity is fossil fuel based. When you add in direct fossil fuels in homes, the environmental impact really matters. In addition to design and intent, the focus of light land impact through shared housing buildings the AACH adopted a plan for high efficiency in all electric homes and buildings. That is a trend she would like the Council to hear; more than 30 cities in California have already adopted electric preferred policies and another 40 in process. This development is very forward looking and future proofing at a small spot in Hood River, that will be a model for others.

Heather Staten, Executive Direct of Thrive Hood River – stated this is housing Hood River really needs. Hood River has extraordinarily high housing costs. A lot of it is simple supply and demand. Too few homes have been built since the great recession. The 2015, the Housing Needs Analysis anticipated Hood River would produce 100 new homes a year but Hood River has not come close. In 2019, there were only 57 dwelling units built. Looking at recent history of multi-family housing is worse. It is not happening. This 2.36-acre property Zoned R-3 has been zoned that since at least 1980. The city's comprehensive plan has identified this property as a place where high density housing goes. She questioned if high density housing cannot be built, where it supposed to be built. This project proposes 25 dwelling units in a zone that would allow up to 65 units. If anything, there would be an argument that the project is not using the cities limited supply of high-density residential land efficiently, but the project is being underbuilt. She hopes neighbors can give this project a chance. She encouraged Council to uphold the Planning Commission's approval of this project.

APPELLANT REBUTTAL:

Dan Bell stated he was confused by the earlier motion about the open record. He asked if he could reserve his final rebuttal for the December 14 meeting, when all of the new information is submitted.

Mayor McBride stated all oral testify is being stated tonight. Anything that will be a rebuttal will be in writing.

Kearns stated it is up the Council but the open record Council established indicated would be in writing. This is an opportunity to make concluding verbal comments with the understanding that new information would be coming in and there could perhaps be a different form of written final, before the record closes at the end of this open record period. Unless Council changes the procedural ruling Council made.

Bell stated regarding the comment made that these are subjective impacts to neighbors, these are real impacts to the neighbors. It is indicative of the outreach the co-housing group continues stating they have done. Bell stated they have reached out to them, but they have never listened. They have not made changes to their plan, as a result to any of the conversations they have had with them. The outreach has not been a conversation. He wanted to reiterate the testimony proved by Jason Parker. He explained this is higher end housing, a condominium development. These units can be sold and transferred over time and become rentals; HOA agreements can change. He appreciates the community they are trying to build. We hold no will against that wish. He stated the applicant stated there are no impacts from the stormwater or other flow but there are no drawings to show this. Just because everything is flowing on the property, does not mean it is not going to get stopped at the property. He has heard the applicant talk about the standards they are exceeding. This came up during the Planning Commission hearing. The staff did not reside anything besides from the leading part of the property in a natural area and not building 65 units, where they were exceeding any standard of Hood River code. He would challenge them to identify what those might be because they have not become clear to them during these hearings. He thanked Council for their time. He hopes they take their concerns about consistency within code and State law to heart and think about whether or not the code needs a revision in order to address these issues.

APPLICANT FINAL REBUTTAL:

Powers asked Council if there are any specific questions or concerns, she can address. She wanted to speak to some broader themes in the appeal arguments. The opponents would like you to require compliance right now with all the final and technical engineering requirement, as your City Attorney outlined in his memorandum. That is simply not a part of the approval criteria for a preliminary site plan review. The planning staff, the Planning Commission and City Engineer all reviewed the submitted materials and determined they were sufficient to evaluate feasibility of compliance with the approval criteria. This goes to the checklist of items they brought up. She believes all of those items on the checklist are in the record. They will make that much clearer during the open record period, so the neighbors can see where it is represented. It is important to note the opponents have generally not identified specific issues with the project compliance, with the approval criteria. Rather where they got specific objections in this appeal, their directed to the code standards themselves. Such as how many parking spaces are to be provided or when an expensive traffic impact analysis is to be required by the City. Those code standards are not of issue here. Opponents find fault in how this project and the City have made changes responsive to their concerns. They talk about changes made along the way. They object that the stormwater plan changed but the changes in the stormwater plan reflect the cooperative attitude to working with the City and accepting feedback. Powers also addressed the driveway spacing standards. There are results of the collaborative

improvement of this project during the site plan review process. Needed housing does not mean rental control. It means the City has done an analysis of what their supply of housing is and what the demand for housing is in the City. There is an additional need of housing for these types, including multifamily. Overall, an appeal of a site plan review should be a process to raise specific concerns about compliance. The notice of appeal does not identify those specific Hood River Municipal Code sections that it relates to. They have responded to some of the code sections they think they are being responsive to, in their written materials. They will provide more during the open record period. This appeal is an effort to create a delay and increase the cost of the project, in the hope that it will go away. The owners here are not developers motivated by profit, their future homeowners motivated by creating community and building their dream homes. This is a really good project and that is why Planning Commission unanimously approved it. They ask that Council uphold the Planning Commission decision.

There were no additional questions by Council.

Mayor McBride announced Council will continue the hearing to 6:00p.m. December 14, 2020 and keep the record open according to the previously stated schedule.

WORK SESSION

- IV OPEN WORK SESSION – 8:19p.m.**
- V AGENDA ADDITIONS OR CORRECTIONS**
- VI DISCUSSION ITEMS**
- VIII ADJOURN WORK SESSION – 8:19 p.m.**

REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING

- I OPEN REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING – 8:19 p.m.**
- II AGENDA ADDITIONS OR CORRECTIONS**
- III CONSENT AGENDA**
 - 1. Change Order 6 Phase 1 Waterfront Storm Sewer Project, M. Janeck
 - 2. Award Professional Service Contract for Final Design for Cascade Ave. 15th to 18th Water and Sewer Replacement Project. M. Janeck
 - 3. Resolution 2020-21 for Inclusion Under the State of Oregon Deferred Compensation Plan, M. Morris

Motion: To approve the Consent Agenda.
First: Saunders
Second: Zanmiller
Discussion: None
Vote: Motion passed (roll called)
Ayes: McBride, Zanmiller, Saunders, Counihan, Metta, Haynie, Rivera
Nays: None

Abstentions: None
Excused: None

IV REGULAR BUSINESS ITEMS

1. Energy Council Comments to the Public Utilities Commission

The Energy Council would like to submit comments on the Oregon Public Utilities Commission Implementation of Governor's Executive Order 20. The Energy Council would like to make sure the local governing bodies are on board with the comments. Harvey presented to Council on behalf of the Energy Council, regarding their request and to received feedback.

Councilor Zanmiller explained he believes the Energy Council should be more in line with other things that they do on Council. He believes they are doing good work, but he does not have a strong sense there is a good connection. Council adopted the plan and has taken the ownership of the City's membership in that so there is an expectation that Council plays a role when they mention the City of Hood River. If the City is going to be mentioned or ask for a letter to support what the Energy Council is doing, Council should review the draft first.

Councilor Rivera shared her thoughts and recommendations on communicating to the community and reaching out to the vulnerable populations.

Council agreed it would have been best if they had developed the letter that will go to PUC for Council review, before coming to Council with the ask.

Council discussed and authorized Mayor McBride to review the final comments to ensure the Council agrees with the statements and not conflict with any of the current City policies.

2. First Quarter Financial Performance Report, W. Norris

The First Quarter (Q1) Financial Report includes three months of financial data through 25% of the fiscal year. The attached report provides full-year estimates-to-close based on historical financial patterns, knowledge of upcoming expenditures, and actual spending and revenue received through September 30, 2020.

COVID-19 substantially and negatively impacted City revenues. The difference between pre- and post-pandemic forecasts show a revenue decline of \$1.7 million for FY2019-20 and FY2020-21 attributable to COVID-19. The City reacted in several ways. The most significant being a one-year pause to Urban Renewal division of tax, resulting in a projected General Fund revenue bump of \$560,000. This action also benefits overlapping taxing districts, including the County, Library, and Parks districts. The City received an allocation of Federal CARES Act dollars. However, this federal funding is limited to direct reimbursement for COVID-19 expenditures. 2/3rds of the City's CARES Act allocation was distributed as economic support to community partners. The remaining portion directly offset City COVID19 expenditures and did not help offset revenue losses.

Despite this extreme revenue shock, the City remains on stable operational footing due to cautious financial decisions over the last decade. As communicated in the FY2020-21 Budget Message, the City's financial position enables the organization to hold on major programmatic adjustments until the long-term financial impacts of COVID-19 come into focus.

General Fund Revenues
Property Taxes

FY2020-21 property tax collection starts in November. Without actual collection data, the Q1 Forecast defaults to the budgeted amount. As noted above, the FY2020-21 property tax receipts include an estimated \$560,000 attributable to the pause in Urban Renewal division of tax for all three districts. Monies attributable to the Heights and Waterfront districts will not continue into future fiscal years. The impact from the impending closure of the Columbia Cascade District is dependent on whether the Urban Renewal Agency chooses to administer a partial collection in FY2021-22 to bring the district to its full maximum indebtedness.

Transient Revenue Tax

The largest dollar impacts from COVID-19 are in Transient Lodging Tax (TLT). The City saw a 90% TLT reduction in May, 2020 vs. May, 2019. Revenue declines steadily lessened through the Fall, with September, 2020 tax returns being only 18% below September, 2019 tax returns. Initial October tax returns, associated with September stays, indicate the City may be posed for double dip as winter approaches and outdoor gorge activities slow. Alternatively, October's dip may be due to poor air quality from wildfires and not COVID19.

The Q1 Forecast assumes that TLT revenues will slightly worsen this winter and then slowly improve again in the Spring and Summer months. This forecast is modelled in the chart below. Dark blue months are actual figures and light blue months are Q1 Forecast assumptions. This forecast is subject to a high degree of uncertainty based on the trajectory of the COVID-19 pandemic.

Parking Meter Receipts & Municipal Court Revenue

The severity of parking meter and court revenue declines were a surprise and significant downward revision from the Adopted Budget. Meter receipts have remained roughly 50% below the prior year throughout the pandemic. Similarly, fewer traffic stops and ticketing for infractions are reducing Municipal Court revenue. Because each of these conditions have persisted from March through September, the forecast assumes continued softness through FY2020-21.

General Fund Expenses

Expenditures are largely trending within budgeted expectations. Under-spending noted for Fire, Police, and Parks are largely due to turnover, which replaces employees at the top of a pay scale with employees starting at the bottom of a pay scale, as well as several vacancies that have either been filled or soon will be.

The Q1 Forecast estimates that the General Fund Balance will decrease by approximately \$1.0 million. This is attributable to a \$736,601 PERS Side Account deposit and an estimated \$300,000 buydown of Fire/EMS compensated absence balances. Each payment reduces prior existing City liabilities and therefore is not an operating expense. A personal finance analogy is using savings to paydown debt.

The Q1 Forecast assumes that the City will not move forward with an additional \$250K locally funded economic development program because CARES Act dollars largely filled this need.

Other Major Revenues

COVID19 impacted both local and state gas receipts. State gas taxes are faring worse than local taxes, trending down year-over-year 23% (state) vs. 9% (local). It is possible that gas tax receipts will improve if the pandemic is substantially controlled in 2021. Conversely water revenues are up. The same phenomenon that had people flooding home improvement stores during the pandemic may have also increased landscaping projects and associated water use.

3. Fiscal Year 2020-21 Quarterly Supplemental Budget (Resolution NO. 2020-20), W. Norris

On June 8th, 2020, the Hood River City Council adopted the appropriations resolution governing the City's Adopted Budget for Fiscal Year (FY) 2020-21. Routinely mid-year changes in revenue or operating conditions require appropriation adjustments. ORS 294.471 allows the governing body of a municipal corporation to adopt a Supplemental Budget by ordinance or resolution. The City of Hood River has customarily grouped necessary adjustments as needed into quarterly supplemental budgets. This allows all adjustments to be considered in context of one another and their cumulative impact on the City finances.

The Supplemental Budget, Resolution 2020-20, makes the following adjustments:
GENERAL FUND

Repairs to Fire Engine #2 \$7,000

Fire Engine #2 was purchased in 2010 at a cost of \$551,744 and is scheduled for replacement 2032. A significant repair was needed to the Fire Engine's tie rods which are needed for steering. Resolution 2020-20 accesses budgeted contingency to pay for this unexpected maintenance cost.

RESTRICTED REVENUE FUND

Providence Homeless Services Grant \$ 25,000

The City is acting as a financial intermediary for a Providence Hospital Grant to improve local homeless services outreach. The supplemental budget budgets both these grant funds and expenditures.

UTILITY FUNDS

Emergency Sewer Line Repairs \$20,000

City crews responded to an emergency breach of a sewer line located near the wastewater treatment plant. The damaged line was stabilized, and Crestline Construction is currently working on its repair. Resolution 2020-20 accesses budgeted contingency in the Sewer Fund to pay for this unexpected repair work.

Motion: I move that City Council approve Resolution 2020-20, to make appropriations and adjust the adopted budget for Fiscal Year 2020-21.
First: Counihan
Second: Rivera
Discussion: None
Vote: Motion passed (roll called)
Ayes: McBride, Zanmiller, Saunders, Counihan, Metta, Haynie, Rivera
Nays: None
Abstentions: None
Excused: None

V REPORT OF OFFICERS

A. Department Heads

1. Council Work Plan Survey Released, R. Fuller

B. City Recorder
1. Reading – Ordinance

Motion: To read Ordinance 2057 (Nature's Way Rezone) for the first and second time by title only.
First: Saunders
Second: Zanmiller
Discussion: None
Vote: Motion passed (roll called)
Ayes: McBride, Zanmiller, Saunders, Counihan, Metta, Haynie, Rivera
Nays: None
Abstentions: None
Excused: None

Gray read the ordinance by title only. The Mayor announced that Ordinance 2057 had passed its first and second reading and would become law in 30 days.

VI MAYOR

VII COUNCIL CALL

VIII ADJOURN – Adjourned by unanimous consent at 9:31 p.m.



Kate McBride, Mayor



Jennifer Gray, City Recorder

Approved by City Council on 12-14-2020