

**CITY OF COLUMBIA CITY COUNCIL
WORK SESSION MINUTES
AUGUST 30, 2011 – 6:00 P.M.
CITY HALL - 1737 MAIN STREET**



The Columbia City Council conducted a Work Session on Tuesday, August 30, 2011 in the City Hall Council Chambers located at 1737 Main Street, Columbia, South Carolina. The Honorable Mayor Stephen K. Benjamin called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m. and the following members of Council were present: The Honorable Sam Davis, The Honorable Daniel J. Rickenmann, The Honorable Belinda F. Gergel, The Honorable Leona K. Plaugh and The Honorable Brian DeQuincey Newman. The Honorable Tameika Isaac Devine was absent. Also present were Mr. Steven A. Gantt, City Manager and Ms. Erika D. Salley, City Clerk.

PRESENTATIONS

1. 2011 College Colors Day Proclamation – The Honorable Mayor Stephen K. Benjamin

The Honorable Mayor Stephen K. Benjamin and the members of City Council proclaimed Friday, September 2, 2011 as College Colors Day, which coincides with both “Back to School” and the kick-off of intercollegiate athletics on college and university campuses in the City of Columbia, seeks to celebrate and promote the traditions and spirit that make the college experience unique through encouraging fans, alumni and students to wear apparel supporting their favorite college throughout the day of September 2, 2011. College Colors Day promotes higher education in the City of Columbia through increased public awareness, celebrates the achievements of colleges and universities in our state and recognizes their critical and fundamental importance to the City of Columbia

2. 2011 Palmetto Capital City Classic – Coach Willie Jefferies, Executive Director of the Palmetto Capital City Classic

Hall of Fame Coach Willie Jefferies, Executive Director of the Palmetto Capital City Classic reported that they had a wonderful luncheon today that was well attended; ticket sales are going well; and the ancillary event numbers are coming up.

Ms. Linda Huggins announced the 10th Annual Palmetto Capital City Classic. Today we had our Sponsors Media Luncheon with 278 attendees. On Thursday night we are hosting an Old School Fish Fry with Johnny Green as our Dee Jay at the Gamecock Pavilion at \$20 per person. On Friday morning we will host the Garnell McDonald Golf Tournament at the Linrick Golf Club located at 356 Campground Road with the shotgun start at 8:30 a.m. and we already have 132 golfers. On Friday night we will host “Deep in Jazz” with Maysa and her All-Star Band. We appreciate everything that you do to help us do what we do. The 2011 Palmetto Capital City Classic is scheduled for Saturday, September 3rd at 3:30 p.m. The Benedict College Tigers will host Virginia Union at the Charlie W. Johnson Stadium located at 2047 Two Notch Road.

OTHER MATTERS

****Mr. Steven A. Gantt**, City Manager asked City Council to approve a conflict waiver for Parker Poe, because they are serving as the Underwriter’s Counsel on the City’s Hospitality COPS Refunding Bonds and they are working as our Counsel on the General Obligation (GO) Bond Sale for the major capital replacement program.

Upon a motion made by Mayor Benjamin and seconded by Mr. Rickenmann, Council voted unanimously to waive any potential conflict for Parker Poe Adams & Bernstein, LLP Attorneys and Counselors at Law.

ORDINANCES – SECOND READING

Upon a single motion made by Mr. Davis and seconded by Dr. Gergel, Council voted unanimously to give second reading approval to Ordinance No.: 2011-062 – Providing for the Issuance and Sale of City of Columbia, South Carolina, Special Obligation Refunding Bonds (Hospitality Fee Pledge), In One or More Series, In the Principal Amount of not Exceeding \$18,000,000, In Order to Refund all or a portion of the Columbia Public Facilities Corporation Certificates of Participation (Hospitality Fee Pledge), Series 2004; Authorizing the Mayor, The City Manager, The Finance Director and the Treasurer, or any two of them acting together to determine certain matters with respect to the bonds; prescribing the form and details of such bonds; and other matters relating thereto **and** Ordinance No.: 2011-063 – Authorizing and Providing for the Issuance of Special Obligation Bonds (Hospitality Fee Pledge) of the City of Columbia, South Carolina; Prescribing the form of Bonds; Providing for the Payment of the Bonds from the Sources Provided herein; Creating Certain Funds and Providing for Payments into such funds; Making other Covenants and Agreements in Connection with the foregoing; and other matters relating thereto.

3. Ordinance No.: 2011-062 – Providing for the Issuance and Sale of City of Columbia, South Carolina, Special Obligation Refunding Bonds (Hospitality Fee Pledge), In One or More Series, In the Principal Amount of not Exceeding \$18,000,000, In Order to Refund all or a portion of the Columbia Public Facilities Corporation Certificates of Participation (Hospitality Fee Pledge), Series 2004; Authorizing the Mayor, The City Manager, The Finance Director and the Treasurer, or any two of them acting together to determine certain matters with respect to the bonds; prescribing the form and details of such bonds; and other matters relating thereto – *First reading approval was given on August 16, 2011. - Approved on second reading.*
4. Ordinance No.: 2011-063 – Authorizing and Providing for the Issuance of Special Obligation Bonds (Hospitality Fee Pledge) of the City of Columbia, South Carolina; Prescribing the form of Bonds; Providing for the Payment of the Bonds from the Sources Provided herein; Creating Certain Funds and Providing for Payments into such funds; Making other Covenants and Agreements in Connection with the foregoing; and other matters relating thereto – *First reading approval was given on August 16, 2011. - Approved on second reading.*
5. Ordinance No.: 2011-064 - Amending the 1998 Code of Ordinances of the City of Columbia, South Carolina, Chapter 6, Elections, Sec. 6-2, Method of election; election districts, (b) – *First reading approval was given on August 23, 2011. - Approved on second reading.*

The Honorable Leona K. Plough

I just want to take this opportunity to say that District Four is a very robust district that represents a number of neighborhoods. I think the number is about ten (10) neighborhoods that will be shifted over into District Three as a result of this second reading. As I understand it, that shift takes place upon second reading; I mean this reading that the neighborhoods now become in District Three.

Mr. Kenneth E. Gaines, City Attorney

That's correct and in the April 2012 elections those that have been moved to the new districts will vote in that district.

The Honorable Daniel J. Rickenmann

I was asking what the procedure was to get the word out, because I mean it's going to have to be some way of knocking on people's door. The election cycle is already interesting when you're trying to vote and then you're not sure who you're voting for; how's that going to work. When it splits, you're going to have a neighborhood who thinks they're not voting and then you're going to miss out on 3,700 people you've just moved.

Mr. Kenneth E. Gaines, City Attorney

We can send the final maps to them; those houses.

The Honorable Daniel J. Rickenmann

I don't think the map is going to do it. I think we need to understand...well I think we have to figure out a way to hit those households and I don't know if you do it through a robo-call; you do it through a mailer, but you're going to have to do something to let those people know where they're going.

The Honorable Leona K. Plough

The net result is that 7,000 individuals are affected and I think it's important that they know. I think we've done a very good job, I will say to the staff, in getting maps up in the parks and getting information out and I know Bessie's here, the Columbia Council of Neighborhoods and I think...you know I sent out e-mail blasts; I think other colleagues had sent out e-mail blasts. I think it's still whatever we can do to help share that information, because just for many neighborhoods, particularly some over in the Woodlands area it's the first time they would have ever been divided up and some representing one district and others representing another or represented by another. So I do think we do need to have a marketing plan.

Mr. Kenneth E. Gaines, City Attorney

I will speak with Public Information and Mr. Gantt and we'll come up with something.

The Honorable Mayor Stephen K. Benjamin

Is there any other discussion? Seeing none, we'll move the previous question. The Clerk will call the roll. Do you have something to contribute?

Upon a motion made by Mr. Newman and seconded by Dr. Gergel, Council voted unanimously to give second reading approval to Ordinance No.: 2011-064 - Amending the 1998 Code of Ordinances of the City of Columbia, South Carolina, Chapter 6, Elections, Sec. 6-2, Method of election; election districts, (b).

RESOLUTION

6. Resolution No.: R-2011-060 – Authorizing the City Manager to execute an Agreement between the City of Columbia and The Midlands Housing Alliance, Inc. for 2025 Main Street – *Consideration of this item was deferred until September 6, 2011 in order to clarify Clause I.*

Councilor Rickenmann asked that Item 6 be held for clarification of Clause I. We want to identify and understand exactly what the restrictions on sexual offenders cover. There seems to be some discrepancy in the categories based on the State law. We ask Mr. Gaines to make sure that's clarified and we can put this back on the September 6, 2011 agenda.

CITY COUNCIL DISCUSSION / ACTION

7. 2012 Miss South Carolina Pageant

Mr. Steven A. Gantt, City Manager said that he received an e-mail from the Conventions and Visitors Bureau indicating that they have to make application for the proposal for next year by the 30th. The request is for \$5,000 less than it was last year and it would come out of the 2012/2013 Hospitality Tax Fund. They need some response from the Council to include in the package.

Mayor Benjamin said that it was a fantastic event and it received great reviews by the participants. We were lucky to have Miss Capital City and Miss Teen Columbia win this year and they both will go off to the national competition to represent the City and State. I support making sure that we do what we can to keep this. I am surprised that the requested amount is less, but apparently it will still be very competitive.

Councilor Davis requested information on the economic impact of the event in advance of the next request.

Mayor Benjamin reported that there were 1,072 actualized room nights with \$281,400 in revenue from out of area attendees.

Upon a motion made by Mr. Rickenmann and seconded by Mr. Newman, Council voted unanimously to endorse the Midlands Authority for Conventions, Sports and Tourism's bid for the 2012 Miss South Carolina Pageant in the amount of \$20,000 from the fiscal year 2012/2013 Hospitality Tax Fund.

8. Community Promotions Funding Criteria

Mayor Benjamin said that the guidelines are fairly comprehensive and he inquired about organizations not being considered by the committee if they are eligible for Accommodations or Hospitality Tax funds.

Mr. Libby Gober, Assistant to City Council explained that some small community events do not qualify for the Hospitality Tax, because they don't draw in visitors per se. They would certainly look at a local event, but if it is eligible for Hospitality or Accommodations Tax, they do not consider it and that's simply because of dollars.

Mayor Benjamin further inquired about individual neighborhood associations going through their Neighborhood Council; are we talking about the Columbia Council of Neighborhoods (CCN)?

Mr. Libby Gober, Assistant to City Council said yes sir, because we were flooded at one time with different neighborhood groups coming in and there's not enough money to consider all of those.

Mayor Benjamin clarified that we are asking CCN to funnel all of this.

Mr. Libby Gober, Assistant to City Council said right.

Councilor Rickenmann said that he missed the discussion on the amount we're talking about and where does that leave the folks that we considered before. Challenge Day, which has done a tremendous job for the City and our school system, is in a situation where they need to know if we are funding them or not, because they have to make their deposits with the three (3) schools to move forward. They were a line item before, they put in their request long ago for that funding and I am trying to get an idea from Council as to where you all left that. Last year it was on MTV and hopefully this year it will be on CNN.

Mayor Benjamin inquired about the level of support they received last year.

Councilor Rickenmann said that it was \$36,000; a portion came from the Accommodations Tax Fund.

Mr. Steven A. Gantt, City Manager said that there is \$200,000; City Council is going to retain \$100,000 and make decisions on those projects; and the committee will have the other \$100,000. We will advertise the availability of funding and the committee will evaluate the applications.

Mayor Benjamin said that he is prepared to support the Challenge Day contribution as well. There are some other worthy groups.

Councilor Plough urged her colleagues to give serious consideration to the fact that this is General Fund for all practical purposes even though \$25,000 came from our administrative capacity with the Accommodations Tax Fund. I urge my colleagues to give serious thought to last week's conversation about the need for more security in our neighborhoods and more cameras. We've asked the City Manager to come up with recommendations on how we implement that plan. All of those hinge on the need for money. Think first of what our number one priority should be; a clean, safe, financially sound city and I would say that we have some yeoman's work to do in accomplishing just those things. I am not saying that funding individual groups means that you cannot achieve that goal and objective, but I am also very concerned that we are taking \$200,000 that could help make this city more secure and dividing up into small contributions to very worthy projects.

Mayor Benjamin said that he understands Ms. Plough's concerns and he agrees that the camera initiative is something that we need to focus our attention on. I don't see the two efforts as being mutually exclusive; I do see an investment into organizations like Challenge Day actually having a direct and indirect affect in helping us reduce crime. We need to make sure that people understand. I suggest that the City Manager's e-mail to all of us be made available to others, because it very carefully outlines the financial challenge that will come with the deployment of cameras around the city. It may indeed, after we get the review from the Police Department and others, layout that it is a worthwhile expense, but I think it's fair to say that \$200,000 is a drop in the bucket to what it's going to cost to do that and do it right. In no way does this preclude us from moving forward aggressively with cameras in neighborhoods or across the city. Previously I suggested that we start out with a model neighborhood or one in each District. If we move forward with the cameras and we see a 50% drop in crime or greater, then this may be something that we need to make some long-term investments in while looking at replacing the cameras every three years along with the long-term

monitoring costs. Our approach must be comprehensive.

Councilor Plaugh said that the City Manager's e-mail led her to believe that we might have to address the financial needs for a camera system throughout this city by raising tax revenues. The voice of reason that I am trying to offer up is that this is \$200,000 toward trying to address long-term, a capital need that we would have for cameras and if you set aside \$200,000 each and every year, perhaps there's a way in which we could identify other resources that might be added to it so that the financial impact on the taxpayers is where it is right not as opposed to adding a financial burden on the taxpayers for this additional service.

Councilor Gergel said one of the criteria she would like considered in the Community Promotions Guidelines would be a requirement that any organization applying for funding should use this money in partnership with money they would also receive from the County or the surrounding municipalities. This money should go toward making something happen that has broad community support and engagement and fulfills a Council recognized need. Has this been something that has been considered?

Ms. Libby Gober, Assistant to City Council said that they have not considered match dollars. There is a part in the application asking for other funding sources and the committee does look at that. They want to make sure that the City is not the only one vested in the project.

Councilor Gergel said that she would like to make it a requirement. I don't know how my other colleagues feel about that, but it is important to me. She inquired about allowing residents to serve as ambassadors for the city.

Ms. Libby Gober, Assistant to City Council explained that sports groups apply for funding to go outside the city to play in tournaments and the committee allocates \$1,250 to each group that wins a local championship and has the opportunity to go someplace else that is usually cost prohibitive to the kids and their parents.

Councilor Gergel said that we have such little money and such critical needs in this community that that would not be one that I would feel comfortable with. I would ask that we consider a dollar amount that we would limit as suggested by Ms. Caughman. Mr. Rickenmann mentioned a rather urgent request; I continue to mention that the Capital Senior Center is also urgent; they are waiting to hear from us. I don't know what procedure we are putting in place. Again, I am not quite sure why we decided on the \$100,000 for Council and the \$100,000 for the Committee. I would support all of the money going to the Committee with strong directions on the ways in which we want the money to be spent.

Ms. Libby Gober, Assistant to City Council reminded the Council that these guidelines were put into place several years ago and they have not been tweaked as the funding has been reduced. Some of the things that you're suggesting have been into place by the committee directly or indirectly.

Councilor Newman recalled that the only addition made to the conversations from the Finance Committee was just that we would use the Community Promotions criteria as our guideline for sifting through the rest of the funds and going to Dr. Gergel's point, I am comfortable with providing the committee with the full \$200,000 if we give them the direction that they have a strict timeline. I suggested that we split it down the middle to give us the opportunity to go ahead and make decisions on the time sensitive matters that we have. I am fine either way. Have you contacted the individual members of the committee; have you contacted all of them; and how soon can the committee meet?

Ms. Libby Gober, Assistant to City Council said that they can meet quickly. I have communicated

with most of them and most of them are willing to serve. My concern would be opening up the application process through advertisements. We can make this happen quickly; I just need some guidance.

Councilor Newman said that it sounds like a four to six week timeframe. I would suggest that we stick with splitting the funds; \$100,000 for us to consider during our Work Session next week and give Council the opportunity to decide on some of these time sensitive projects; and the remaining portion would go to the Community Promotions Committee. I am comfortable with the existing criteria.

Councilor Rickenmann said that there's support across the State for cameras in public places, but yet they won't allow us to do what would create the best revenue stream for this which is speed cameras, red light cameras and school crossing cameras. The revenue we would generate from that and the manpower that we would reduce from our Police Department would handle the situation that we are talking about. We need to consider lobbying for this. As far as requiring matching dollars for Community Promotions, I hope that we take a similar approach down the road for Hospitality Tax funding.

Councilor Davis said that some of the requirements are tight in comparison to the Hospitality Tax Fund and the Accommodations Tax Fund. I recall that we have allowed funding for groups that are going elsewhere and the position they take is that they are promoting Columbia. The ambassador label is acceptable; we just need to make sure that we fully understand what the purpose is. It's not that much money compared to the other pots. If we plan to be restrictive in that area, then it should be across the board. I don't have a problem with the cameras at lights, but I do understand the local challenge of getting this considered. When we look at the camera wish list we are going to need more than the General Fund to support it long-term. I am going to continue to stress that we look beyond the General Fund. I think Mr. Gantt's e-mail is well laid out, but there are some things we could add and put more emphasis on other dollars. I went to national conferences where the Department of Justice is in fact participating, whether it's a municipality or some of the organizations that are also fighting crime, if we can combine the two, the system we put into place would be sustainable.

Mayor Benjamin said that there is a collective view of the Council as it relates to the Hospitality Tax Fund and other funding that we disperse; we want to see the broad type of community support that Dr. Gergel and Mr. Rickenmann talked about. If for some reason Richland County decides in this particular year that they don't want to support the Council of Neighborhoods or their money is tight, I want to make sure that it doesn't prohibit us from doing so. I want to make sure that we get a great rate, but we don't make it an issue that stops us from supporting things that we find to be important.

Councilor Gergel concurred with Mayor Benjamin adding that in the past, a number of organizations hadn't bothered to put a request in. Maybe we really want to ask the committee to make sure that these groups have explored all possible options. Last week, we took a good look at several of the requests that we had before us and we decided to hold them until we talked a little bit more about criteria. I feel comfortable moving forward with the request for Challenge Day; I know how critical the need is for the Capital Senior Center; and there may be others that we are comfortable with.

A motion made Dr. Gergel to approve Community Promotions Funding for Challenge Day in the amount of \$36,000 and the Capital Senior Center in the amount of \$25,000, failed for the lack of a second.

Councilor Gergel asked that all of the funding be put into the Community Promotions Advisory Committee in the future and that the committee be reactivated.

There was a consensus of Council to advertise the availability of Community Promotions Funding for the submission of applications by organizations within a short timeframe. The existing application will be used for this process. These applications will be considered by the Community Promotions Advisory Committee and recommendations will be made to City Council for approval. Applicants must demonstrate that they have pursued other sources of funding from private and/or public entities.

- **Council recessed at 7:10 p.m.**
- **Council reconvened at 7:17 p.m. and Mr. Newman was not present at this time.**

Upon a motion made by Dr. Gergel and seconded by Mr. Rickenmann, Council voted four (4) to one (1) to allocate Community Promotions funding to the following organizations. Each organization is asked to realize that this is one-time funding that may not be available next year. Voting aye were Mr. Davis, Mr. Rickenmann, Dr. Gergel and Mayor Benjamin. Ms. Plough voted nay. Mr. Newman was not present for the vote.

SisterCare	\$8,500
Palmetto Project (Challenge Day)	\$36,000
Capital Senior Center	\$25,000
Greater Columbia Community Relations Council	<u>\$30,000</u>
Total	<u>\$99,500</u>

APPOINTMENTS

9. Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) – *Consideration of this item was deferred until September 6, 2011.*
10. **Security Camera Update – Mr. Steven A. Gantt, City Manager

Mr. Steven A. Gantt, City Manager reported that there have been two meetings with representatives from the Police Department, the former Camera Committee and the Information Technology Department. We have the criteria in place for the application process and we hope to have those ready for distribution by the end of this week. We included minimal threshold specifications for the camera technology in order for the system to be compatible for expansion purposes. He further reported that the Riverbanks Zoo, which is our largest tourist attraction in the Midlands, has been experiencing a multitude of car break-ins within the parking lot and they are hitting cars with out-of-state tags. The Police Department met with them and one suggestion is to install cameras in the parking lot along with a hunting stand with additional security personnel. The Executive Director asked if they would qualify for any grant funds for cameras and I think so, because that is a hospitality draw. We need a 60-day deadline for the applications and it would be a reimbursement of expenses made. They would have to provide invoices, a map of existing cameras, a map of the proposed cameras to be approved by the Police Department and the field of vision for each camera. It is on a first-come first-served basis; as the applications come in we will provide 50% funding and when the money is gone, it is gone.

- **Mr. Newman returned to the meeting at 7:25 p.m.**

Councilor Davis inquired about the Harbison area.

Mr. Steven A. Gantt, City Manager said that we would have to identify the organization that would pull an application together for the Harbison area. We do not have ownership of any of these cameras; we’re providing a portion of the funding for the hard costs and the cameras would belong to the organization.

Councilor Davis further inquired about Capital City Lake Murray.

Mr. Steven A. Gantt, City Manager said that we would need to stick with organizations that are affiliated with the Hospitality Districts.

Councilor Rickenmann said that Capital City Lake Murray could be used as a conduit.

Councilor Gergel asked if Five Points would have to wait 60-days if they presented an application that met the requirements. They kick started this whole thing with a request for money for cameras that they were ready to install as quickly as possible.

Mr. Steven A. Gantt, City Manager said that as soon as they submit the required information in order for us to make a decision, we will give them a letter of authorization up to a certain amount of money based upon their budget. When they bring the invoices back indicating that they have purchased the hardware, we will reimburse them for half of the hard cost. That doesn't include electricity, connection cables or telephone.

Councilor Gergel asked if they have recognized that there will be a variety of approaches that these various groups will be taking in their need and use of cameras; it's not one size fits all for each area. We need a great deal of flexibility in what we are working with.

Mr. Steven A. Gantt, City Manager reiterated the fact that they developed a minimum threshold on what the technology needs to be for the camera. For example, they must have night vision capabilities and infrared, because the majority of our problems occur at night.

Councilor Rickenmann said that we discussed the use of Wireless Fidelity (Wi-Fi) for the use of meter reading and other services. It makes sense to determine if that's a package that we could piggyback on in the overall infrastructure. As you move forward we need to understand the flexibility of the existing cameras. I remember reading about a group that produced a fuel cell operated camera system and they were looking at the possibility of locating here. We need to reach out to EngenuitySC; it makes sense, because we have a Hydrogen Fueling Station to be used in those systems. We should look at all of these aspects to make sure that we have the options open that could benefit the Police and Fire Departments, meter reading and cameras.

Mr. Steven A. Gantt, City Manager said that we are looking at wireless technology so that we do not have to install cable underground or optical fiber.

Councilor Plough inquired about how the cables would be monitored.

Mr. Steven A. Gantt, City Manager explained that the owners will have to identify to our Police Department where the monitors will be located in case we need to review recordings from that camera. The Police Department has been reactive in Five Points with the existing cameras and it has paid good dividends, we've made arrests and caught the bad guys. We need to discuss how we staff, fund and where we locate that.

Councilor Plough urged the City Manager to think how we can have something in place when new development comes into these districts so that we can do this on the front end and not the back end.

Mr. Steven A. Gantt, City Manager said that they had discussions with Utilities and Engineering about the possibility of installing fiber as we construct water and sewer lines. We did install conduit in Main Street as we did the work.

Mayor Benjamin asked the City Manager or Police Chief to contact Chief Stewart, because he has some insight that he shared that would be worthwhile.

Mr. Steven A. Gantt, City Manager said that Chief Stewart worked with us on the cameras on Main Street that will also be tied into the digital cameras in a couple of our parking garages and we are discussing the criteria with him so that we are consistent with what we are doing citywide.

11. **Administrative Policy Committee Report – The Honorable Leona K. Plough

Councilor Plough, as Chair of the Administrative Policy Committee reported that they met today and recommended that items that will be added, deleted or deferred be done when we adopt our agenda before we start the meeting. It will be the first item on the agenda, to adopt the agenda as it is and whatever adjustments, deletions or deferrals particularly, because you can't add something at that point, would be made at that time. Everybody would be able to comment, debate it or express concerns. If a councilmember is away and has something that they would like to be deferred that request would be brought forward by the Mayor then we would move forward with the agenda once we've voted.

Upon a motion made by Ms. Plough and seconded by Mr. Newman, Council voted unanimously to approve the committee recommendation to implement the adoption of the agenda at the beginning of the meeting. Once the motion is made to adopt the agenda, members of Council can request that specific agenda items be deferred, but no items can be added to the agenda at this time. The Mayor will suggest deferrals at the request of any Councilmember during his or her absence.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon a motion made by Mayor Benjamin and seconded by Mr. Rickenmann, Council voted unanimously to go into Executive Session at 7:38 p.m. for the discussion of negotiations incident to the settlement of a legal claim and the discussion of negotiations incident to the proposed sale of property.

12. **Discussion of negotiations incident to the settlement of a legal claim – *This item was discussed in Executive Session. No action was taken.*

13. **Discussion of negotiations incident to the proposed sale of property – *This item was discussed in Executive Session. No action was taken.*

▪ **Council adjourned the meeting at 8:15 p.m.**

Respectfully submitted by:

Erika D. Salley
City Clerk