

**MINUTES**  
**EAGLE MOUNTAIN CITY COUNCIL SPECIAL MEETING**

September 30, 2006

Eagle Mountain City Council Chambers, 1650 East Stagecoach Run, Eagle Mountain, Utah 84005

**1:00 P.M. SPECIAL SESSION – CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

Mayor Brian B. Olsen called the special meeting to order at 2:31 p.m.

CONDUCTING: Mayor Brian B. Olsen

ELECTED OFFICIALS PRESENT: Councilmembers David Blackburn, David Lifferth, Vincent Liddiard, and Linn Strouse. Councilmember Heather Jackson was not present.

CITY STAFF PRESENT: Gerald Kinghorn, City Attorney; Gina Peterson, City Recorder; and Peter Quittner, Deputy.

**Minutes reported verbatim.**

PUBLIC HEARING – FY2007 Budget Amendments

ORDINANCE – Consideration and adoption of an ordinance amending the budget for Fiscal Year 2007.

Mayor Olsen: We're going to open this September 30th Special City Council meeting for 1:00 p.m., that was scheduled for 1:00 p.m., at this time. Our earlier meeting went over, but we do call this meeting into order. We are going to forgo the formality because this is a continuation from the former meeting. The Pledge of Allegiance has already been offered. Let me see, am I on the right schedule here? OK, I'm going to give the time to Councilmembers Blackburn and Liddiard for, do either of you want to do a presentation on this or do you want to go right into a public hearing?

Councilmember Blackburn: That's a good question. Seeing as how we've brought this item before the Council and the public several times, I think everybody knows and has seen what we're looking to do here. I believe also legal clarification since we've submitted and requested this meeting would be that the final item would be probably be to table the action, anyway. Is that correct, Jerry?

Mr. Kinghorn: Yes, this ordinance has the same problem the other ordinance has. This is basically something that was acted on by the full Council in the past, or the interpretations and overlapping issues of the budget are all wrapped up in the budget, and so it's a one-action ordinance item the way it's been brought to you.

Councilmember Liddiard: By show of hands, does anybody here really want to make comment that can't be here on Tuesday [inaudible – too fast] some kind of comment because this is already on the agenda for Tuesday? Anyone?

Mayor Olsen: We probably, Councilman Liddiard, we probably ought to, for the formality's sake, open the public hearing or at least entertain a motion, because it's a special meeting. Open it, if nobody does,

then we'll close it, then we can, just because it's here and it's been published, just to say that we did it. Is there a motion to open a public hearing?

Councilmember Blackburn **moved** to open the public hearing at 2:36 p.m. Councilmember Strouse **seconded** the motion. Council members voting yes: David Blackburn, Vincent Liddiard, David Lifferth, Linn Strouse. The motion **passed**.

Councilmember Liddiard: I would like to introduce this topic.

Mayor Olsen: Go ahead. Oh, wait. Yeah, go ahead.

Councilmember Liddiard: The way this is mentioned, so that you can phrase your comments, is the following: *"The following are brief explanations and rationales for the amendment of the differences, if any, for the overall 2006-2007 Eagle Mountain budget. Number one, custodian. (If I'm reading this too fast, I apologize. I have a cold. I will slow down, ever so slightly.) Custodian: The City has discussed over the past six months bringing custodial services in-house through hiring one full-time equivalent person. This person would be responsible for the maintenance and cleaning of City Hall, Public Works and Public Safety buildings. This additional employee will cost \$42,000 annually, \$30,000 to be transferred from the custodial contracts and \$12,000 from general funds as an addition to the budget."* What you don't see on this was on a previous budget was for an accountant's position at \$40,000. I didn't include it on this specifically because I was at odds with the fact that it would be a custodian making more than the accountant and the position description and duties or qualifications of the accountant were never fully described to us, as to why the position was warranted and the qualifications and duties. I would have rather paid an accountant more money and get some better capabilities for our city than only \$40,000 and not meet current and future needs.

Plans Examiner: The Building Department is proposing hiring a plans examiner. This position would assist with the review of plans and act as a building official when Kent Partridge is unavailable. This expense is being budgeted \$76,000 and it is estimated that this amount would be covered by new permit fees. The growing economy, growing costs of homes, and the relative affordability of cost of homes in our city has caused us to grow quite a bit. We have available land, we have available plat, we have people that are willing to build homes and we are a bargain in Utah. We're a bargain anywhere in the West. We have a lot of growth that's taking place. It sure would be nice to be able to meet that growth demand.

Codification of ordinances: This would allow the completion of some codification of City ordinances. This would assist the Recorder's Office in being able to have a better reference to ordinances with the City, and that would be done through the codification company. It's budget-neutral because there's monies left over from this effort out of the last year's budget and were fully expensed.

Changes in the compensation of elected officials: I'm going to skip that one. Five, changes in all references from Chief of Staff to City Administrator: Previously, we've had a City Administrator, we desire to entertain a change to have a City Administrator, rather than a Chief of Staff. You know, there was a rumor that we were trying to get rid of Mike Wren, that this was pointed out in that direction, and then it's just the chopping block is going to fall and we're going to get rid of everybody else, as well. This by no means is intended to threaten Mr. Wren or his position.

Number six, Fire Department equipment: The Fire Department has been given a grant for \$37,465, of which \$11,585 has been required as a match. There's been some confusion about this because this particular item has been mentioned as being able to receive a refund from last year's grant that could be attributed to this. So the confusion is, if we're getting a refund from last year's grant, that means that last year we paid for all of it and the grant actually never came into fruition, and so we want to apply it to a new grant purchase to be able to do some things there. What it boils down to is that if we buy this, it's good for you, it's good for me, it's good for everybody in the city because the equipment will help to further the capabilities of our Fire Department. There's a little bit of confusion as to how all that really worked with the funds from last year being applied for this year, but essentially it would be budget-neutral, as it was explained to us.

Electric Department Lineman: The electric department is in need of a qualified lineman. Apparently, more than one. This would be at least one person that would help us to be able to do things more than just electric meter setting, but be able to meet some of the demands and the requirements of the electric department.

Number eight: Set all funds as delineated in the General Fund as referenced in the Council review as approved from the June 20, 2006, budget of 2006 and 2007 as different budgetary departments. This would allow each of the funds that were set up, either as offices or as divisions, to be able to be considered as budgetary funds and independently auditable by the State Auditor. This would help, at least, as from a perspective of being able to understand which funds are delineated for which purposes and seeing that they are accountable as such.

Number nine: Set the budget as policy direction for the Mayor and staff. This is budget-neutral because it is a policy line, rather than a fiduciary line, meaning that the budget itself, as it was introduced, and with its introductions and as it was passed, would be the policy direction from the Council to the Mayor and staff to be enacted as these are the priorities, these are the fundings laid out and the capabilities and intents where we felt the city needed them.

Number ten, changing a mileage reimbursement for the Mayor from \$80,000 to \$40,000. Excuse me. Thank you, Mr. Lifferth. I have a cold and I made a decimal error, a gross decimal error. Change of mileage reimbursement from \$8,000, eight followed by three zeros, to \$4,000, four followed by three zeros. And to set the manner in which mileage reimbursement for everybody in the city, the way it's formed and the way that's submitted, the way it's brought back and how it's paid, but in these specific things so that those are approved by the Council.

And number eleven, Code Enforcement Officer: This would approve additional hours to increase the workload, increase the hours for that position that we currently have as a part-time position in the city. That's it, so your comments in the very public hearing should be appertaining to the things that were just mentioned.

Mayor Olsen: Thank you. Is there any public comment, or this public hearing is now open. Looks like we have, make sure this is on. And it's the same instructions for everybody: state your name and address.

Ms. Peterson: Len, could you turn on, yeah.

Len Whitney: Leonard R. Whitney, Jr. I live at 2139 East Weeping Willow Way, the house with the American flag flying 24/7. I'm here today to defend, talk about budget amendment number eleven. I am the Code Enforcement Officer for the City of Eagle Mountain. I've been here for over a year now and I feel I've done a very good job in my position, and the problem is that I cover 48 square miles of Eagle Mountain. It is quite difficult to do it on the time I have. Presently, I only have fifteen hours allotted to this position. And to show you how busy a position it is, it'd be fifteen times two, as I recall, is thirty. It was when I went to school. Well, so far for this pay period closing today, I've accumulated sixty-two hours of covering the city and the code, helping to keep the city well. I wanted to give you a quick example of what I am doing, and I do care about this city. I had a situation where I had a very difficult time getting this particular person to clean up their property, and I won't mention names. But I thought, "Well, how am I gonna do this? I've left violation after violation, I've talked and talked." So I thought, well, "I'll call this person up and say, 'Let's come up with a solution to take care of this problem.'" And so my solution was that I had connections to get an eight-foot by fifteen-foot trailer, along with this particular fellow's pickup. And I did acquire the trailer and he did pick up, and also I came to the City and got two permits for the dump and he cleaned this up. And it's all cleaned up now and it looks wonderful and the neighbors are happy and the area where I live looks much, much better. And I go out of my way to work with people. I have a person that is trying to run an auto shop over on the corner of Partridge and Blossom. He's been trying to run an auto shop and he has for the last several months and I approached him on Friday and told him it has to cease. He doesn't have permission to have a shop, and we're coming up with a solution for him to acquire a place that he can do this business outside of the city or build something inside. Anyway, I see my time is about up. Now you see what my wife has to put up with. Long-winded.

Mr. Liddiard: Mr. Mayor, could we allow him more time? I would really like to hear the rest of what he has to say.

Mayor Olsen: The Council members can allow more time if, OK, I'm getting a heads-up, so . . .

Mr. Blackburn: I'll second that.

Mayor Olsen: Go ahead. Just let that thing keep going.

Mr. Whitney: Thank you. So I've had many opportunities to work with many of the people and I'm proud to say I am a very diplomatic person. I haven't hurt anybody. I know what to say and how to say it so that I don't offend anyone. We've come up with an idea now, a little thank you card that we've put together and it has the logo of Eagle Mountain City on it. And when people do adhere to requests of cleaning up their property, I think it's fitting to go around and give them a thank you card, signed by me and the City Council, for the effort that they made to make this a better city to live in. And the reason, I don't just want forty hours for the sake of forty hours. The benefits I'm not really too concerned about. DuPont gives me nice benefits and DeAnna works for the City and she gets nice benefits. So if it cost the City money to give me benefits, well, forget the benefits. But I need forty hours to do this job the way this job deserves to be done and the way the city deserves to have me do this job so I can keep up with it. And as I mentioned to Councilman Blackburn, I've raised ten children, and that's no one's fault here. The thing is, it's like raising children. You go to your child and say, "Clean up your bedroom or else" and so they clean up their bedroom and you go back in a few days and it's right back where it was. Well, that's what I run into here. I go show them what they have to do or tell them what they have to do in a diplomatic way, and I go back through and I have to do it again. So I'm very hopeful that you Council people here, men and women, will consider giving me the forty hours I need to do the kind of

job that this city deserves to have done. And again, I'm grateful for all of you. I'm grateful for this position. I do handle it well and the city is looking better. Thank you very much.

Mayor Olsen: Council, just for FYI, the time that we went over was, and that's all I was timing, I was figuring out how to turn that auto-beep off, but it was 1:48, so just. Anyone else that would like to make a comment for public hearing? Tiffany Ulmer is coming up. What I'll do is just start it when you start.

Ms. Ulmer: Tiffany Ulmer, 1320 Harrier Street. A couple of comments first. I hope we can get Ms. Strouse's mike fixed. As we noticed, it might not just be her mike. It might just be her electrifying personality. And if we could find a mike that would work for her, because it hisses every Council. All right, looking at the agenda items that you have listed, one through eleven, oh, I had another quick comment. I just would like to comment about the maturity of the audience. Our audience has really grown over the years, where we aren't holding signs and picket signs and pitchforks and they've done a very good job. And the Council's also calmed down today, too. OK, agenda items one through eleven. Number five, it says the City Administrator and, you know, you're changing the Chief of Staff to City Administrator. Yes, I know it won't change and you won't get rid of Mr. Wren. It puts him in charge of the Public Works, but I know on the pay scale that Public Works administrators make, that he will probably leave at that. And so I think we need to revisit this one. If he is the gentleman we want to keep, maybe we need to combine Public Works and have him be in charge of something else and pick up the City Administrator where he maybe picks up something someone else is doing part time. So I'd recommend removing that one and let's reconsider that one.

On number eight, I have some confusion with the setting the general funds between departments. I thought that was already what the law required and we need to make sure our budget is according to State terms, because I've heard confusion on that, and I need clarification on that. On number ten, on the mileage reimbursement, for the most part I'm pretty much fine with that. He deserves a good slap there and so go ahead and slap that on him. But my only thing is the delay on payment. I would recommend that you make sure, as Council, you maybe put that you need to approve it within thirty days or a Council or two Councils or something like that, because otherwise it'll be years later when we finally get around to approving it, just knowing how the City works. Last other comments is related to number four, which was discussed about the compensation. I think the Mayor has heard a lot and now it is his time. I don't think it is appropriate to decrease a mayor's salary without his consent. If he said, "You know what, I'm suddenly a millionaire because I won the lottery and I don't want to be paid any more," then he could bring that to you. But now it's his turn to come up with a nice compromise. Set up maybe, "Hey, I'll take a small, this type of decrease" or set something like that. It's time for him to bring a plan to you, because I think if we cut it down to the thirty grand, it allows only the rich or the retired, or maybe even just the . . . It limits the amount of people who could run for mayor in the future. And also any changes, unless the Mayor actually approves it, I think you need to set them up for next election. If you want to drop it down to thirty grand a year, I'm fine with that if you'd like to, if that's what you feel, but to do that for the following election year. Thanks.

Mayor Olsen: Thank you. Anyone else? All right, Council, it looks like there's no more comments to be made. I'll entertain a motion close the public hearing. [multiple voices] Let's see, Councilman Blackburn got the words out first.

Councilmember Blackburn: I said “Mr. Mayor” first. [laughter from audience] Jerry, just a point of clarification: we cannot adopt or enact anything that is seen as a budget amendment actually dealing with numbers, correct?

Mr. Kinghorn: Yeah, or anything that is embedded in the budget or interprets the budget. It would be an amendment to the budget, it would be something new or in addition to, it would be a change in the budget.

Councilmember Blackburn: OK, so I was looking at this and wondering: items number five, eight, and nine are not changing numbers.

Mr. Kinghorn: But they are interpretations or policy direction in the budget. They’re amendments to the budget. They’re changes in the budget document that you want by virtue of the ordinance.

Councilmember Blackburn: All right. Thanks.

Mayor Olsen: OK, let’s entertain a motion to close the public hearing.

Councilmember Strouse: Mayor, I had two or three comments on these items.

Mayor Olsen: Should we close the public hearing, then entertain a motion, and then that way Councilman Strouse can, has the opportunity to speak, because this is the public hearing. So let’s entertain a motion to close the public hearing.

Councilmember Lifferth **moved** to close the public hearing at 2:48 p.m. Councilmember Liddiard **seconded**. Council members voting yes: David Blackburn, Vincent Liddiard, David Lifferth, Linn Strouse. The motion **passed**.

Councilmember Strouse **moved** to discuss the ordinance. Councilmember Blackburn **seconded**.

Mayor Olsen: Councilwoman Strouse.

Councilmember Strouse: OK, my two cents for worth I wanted to add. During the regular budget which we approved in the end of June, that is the time, you know, we worked right up to that to prepare for the following year. That’s the biggie. That’s when you’re really supposed to, every department head and everybody is supposed to really, you know, this is their chance to say, you know, “We need this.” OK, we did not get anything from the Building Department. So, again, when the Council does not get information, but I have to hear that our Building Department supervisor, Kent Partridge, has not taken a vacation since forever and I don’t hear about that until someone in Council comments, rails me for it, I have a problem. We have a problem with communication. That should have been brought up in the regular budget session. It should have been brought up prior to talking about amending the budget. I, you know, we’re on fire here with building permits. That’s something that should have been discussed then and I’m not against it, but we need the information so that we can make good decisions.

The Fire Department issue: During the regular budget we were told there was \$11,000 left over from last year’s grant money to put toward the \$36,000 or around that needed for this equipment, which is a wonderful thing for our Fire Department to have. The way EMS grants work, you almost always get those approved, I mean that is just a given. I asked during that budget time to set aside money so that

that would be in the budget. So we get a request for a budget amendment which, because of lack of information, the answers to questions, we had to vote those down for the time being. Then a couple of days ago, maybe three, I got an email from the Fire Chief, well actually, the Fire Chief emailed the Mayor and the Mayor emailed the Council, wanting us to vote on setting, approving this money for this equipment because there was a deadline of September 30<sup>th</sup>, fiscal year or the salesman, you know, was willing to give us a special and we'd save money. That's great, and I sent an email which Mr. Kinghorn responded and said, well I sent an email saying I'm having a problem here because I don't think we should be voting. It's highly inappropriate to be doing the public's business behind closed doors. This is probably the fourth time, possibly, in the last several months that something like this has happened and Jerry concurred that it is not appropriate. That needs to be brought to discussion with the public, which is the proper forum. We shouldn't be doing our city's business by email. And then I was very shocked to get another email from the Mayor that stated, "Sorry, Chief, we don't have any money in the Public Safety budget." I was quite astounded. Here we're talking about approving something and if we had voted on that during the budget amendment session, what would have happened, Jerry, if we'd voted on that and we had no money in the budget? I'm failing to understand why somebody, first of all, it would have been nice during the regular budget to have put it in there, put that money aside, awaiting the grant.

Mr. Kinghorn: You know, I'm not familiar enough with the details of that to know what happened. I suspect that what the problem was they needed to enlarge the budget by the amount of the grant.

Councilmember Strouse: I asked for it. Yeah. Okay, on to car mileage. There is ways that we can also help save the taxpayers money. I understand there is a car that is rarely ever used, only has maybe twenty, 25,000 miles on it – correct me if I'm wrong – in the parking lot, and if that car is used, instead of the Mayor's own car, then we can use the City's gas card, which I believe it's excise tax that the City does not have to pay, so it's saving the taxpayers money if we actually use a City car for the Mayor. On the change in the formatting of our budget: That is only confirming the way we have always done it. Former Mayor Bailey, the people before, the finance people. This is almost the end of my second term in office. We simply want to continue operating with the format that we've always used. That there was a discussion over, when we were questioning about the transfer of money for a \$3,000 desk, when that was questioned, the response was, "Well, we do our budget in quarters, so the Council doesn't even need to approve that or even know about it." Which was quite a shock to me. That's never the way we've been operating. So that's my points for today. Thank you.

Mayor Olsen: Where were we at, everybody?

Councilmember Blackburn: I think we were on discussion of the item at hand, Council comments.

Mayor Olsen: There were some things said that I think we need to address right now. City Recorder, Gina, Ms. Peterson, how many budget retreats did the City have that were on public record?

Ms. Peterson: We have had an all-day budget retreat. I'd have to look up the date.

Mayor Olsen: All right, correct me if I'm wrong, Council, how many did we have, three?

Councilmember Strouse: We had one fairly long one and two brief ones.

Mayor Olsen: And was Councilwoman Strouse in attendance for all those meetings?

Ms. Peterson: I'd have to check the record. I know she was in attendance at the all-day budget retreat.

Mayor Olsen: I'm assuming that there was a point there, I'm only assuming, but there was a time there when the Council interviewed all the department heads, and it may have been that we did not have you present at the time that Mr. Partridge was interviewed. I would concede that the plans examiner was never discussed, information about it. We never assumed that we, our city would grow so fast. I think we only estimated 400-some permits to go through this year and we're already over 600, hence that. But I think just out of fairness to me, to say that the information, I don't want to put words into anybody's mouths, but I want to make sure, there is the potential that you may not have been, at that point, for the information.

Councilmember Strouse: So somebody actually said that Kent Partridge has never been able to take a vacation?

Mayor Olsen: That's what I'm saying. The information may have never been provided or was released from him to you during that interview session, but what I'm trying to say is that you may have not been there, is what I'm trying say. We'd have to verify with the record. But your statement alluded to that, me and some, something about me not giving the information to you, or something.

Councilmember Strouse: I didn't say you. You inferred that. I didn't say you.

Mayor Olsen: And if that's the case, I mean, we can go back in the record, but I want to make sure that this is clear.

Councilmember Liddiard: I think the frustration came out of not the actual budget meetings, but actually at the budget amendment meeting when this first amendment was first proposed. I'm not talking about the actual budgetary process.

Mayor Olsen: Explaining why the position was needed and that was not done at the time that this was first introduced, a couple of regular Council meetings back, is that what you're saying?

Councilmember Liddiard: I'm just talking about the timing of the event, not what transpired there, but the timing of the event. We are not talking about June or May meetings. We're talking about two weeks ago when the comment was made, "I can't take . . ." whatever. I think a lot of it came from Ms. Jackson about he's not taking a vacation because of the workload. That was two weeks ago.

Mayor Olsen: OK, all right, maybe we'll just ignore that, I guess. I don't know, I'm confused here. The Fire Department email. You're all sitting here. Did I send that email to you? No, I did not. Second thing is, did I request you to vote?

Councilmember Lifferth: No.

Mayor Olsen: Thank you. There's also an allusion to voting in the past. Is there anyone here on this Council, and I'm, I think it's important, we've got to stop this. Have we ever done this in my term, we've voted over the internet?



Councilmember Lifferth: Mr. Mayor, we did authorize a purchase of a vehicle that I think had already been budgeted for, there was money there, but it came up before the Planning Department. I'd have to go back to my notes, but I do remember an email where we all said, "OK, and we'll authorize this."

Mayor Olsen: I want a legal opinion. It's the word "voting" that's got me red-flagging all over the place.

Mr. Kinghorn: Well you can't, yeah, you can't vote by email. I know there are emergencies that come up where the Council has to be notified of things, and that's what I said in my email. I don't have any problem with being notified. But when you start discussing and stating positions and literally voting, "Well, I'm going to, this is what I'm going to do." I haven't seen any of those kinds of discussions for a long time. I think, Mayor, you and I talked about the fact that was highly improper and shouldn't happen.

Mayor Olsen: But even coming into office, I've been really, in fact . . .

Mr. Kinghorn: But I haven't seen any, I haven't seen any voting and I don't know about this vehicle thing. I just wasn't involved.

Mayor Olsen: Well, I also allude to the Council that part of our, maybe our communication issues is that we have stopped doing what's been done in the past in former administrations where the Council's actually been chatting about issues and I've been, you know, all of us have been very alert to that, even Councilman Strouse is bringing it up, and I would, I would suggest that we've been, that that has also restricted us from communications. But I want to make sure that we're, "voting" is maybe just the wrong word, because I don't want us, I want to make sure that nobody's thinking we're voting, because if we are, then . . .

Mr. Kinghorn: I think what she was talking about was the Fire Chief's request that you vote on it today so that you could come in under this mythical salesman's deadline. This is a pet peeve of mine, by the way. We could talk about this more, but I think that's what your reference was to, wasn't it, voting today?

Councilmember Strouse: Yes, well, and part of the email referenced some kind of a process where we all agree to it today and then we validate this by an official vote at a later date, and that just didn't strike me as proper at all.

Mayor Olsen: I wonder, I wonder if that's the perception. I don't think that was the Chief's intention. I think he was pleading with the Council to pass that so that he could save the City some money, but under the circumstances, my response was, is that, under the circumstances, that's pretty much impossible.

Mr. Kinghorn: I think the point is well taken that notice of important matters can come to the Council on an emergency basis when there's not time to bring it to the Council, but certainly no voting.

Mayor Olsen: Nor did this Mayor require a vote. That's all I want to clear up.

Councilmember Strouse: And I didn't, I didn't say you did. But I'd be happy to send those emails to you for your evaluation and possibly a suggestion of, when we do have these, which should be rare,

emergency situations, how exactly do you recommend that we proceed so that we're following the proper letter of the law and, whenever possible, involving the public, as they well should be, in our decisions?

Councilmember Liddiard: May I make just kind of a, it almost comes as an editorial comment. I'm not so interested in the methodologies or the wherevers and how-tos and why-fors as the substance of the, this is an opportunity for us to request additional information or discuss the things that are at hand. I think Linn's comments were a lot more of, were seeking information here rather than accusatory, but rather a discussion-led item of, "This is the valid points of interest that I have. These are the areas of which I would like additional detail." These are the things that we are seeking for, in order to make sure that we're meeting those requirements of the city. One of the things that has been talked about in public comment is the electric department lineman. "Boy, we really need people. We need lots and lots of people." You know what, that would really be nice for us to hear as a Council, things like, "You know what? This is one step out of fourteen steps. We need 40,000 more people." OK, when do those people come online? Two years? Five years? What is the long term plan here? We're two months into a budget, why are we talking about it now and where does this put us? Is this the finger in the dike? Is it a new dike? Is it, you know, where are we at in this process? If we're talking about a lineman at this point, is this an emergency need and in two more months we got another emergency need? We'd kind of like a little bit more of the whole picture, rather than just an initial shot of, "We need this."

We want to meet the needs of the staff because they meet the needs of our citizens. Our citizens don't care if we're City Councilmen or Mayors or not, they care that the lights work, that the water's there, that when the gas comes on that they've got heat. That's what they care about. They don't care about most of the other things that we might be involved in personally, day to day. They want to make sure that when they drive their car, that the light is going to work, that there aren't potholes, that they're not getting a free wash when they ride their bike up and down the street. These are the things that they're interested in. "If my heart stops beating, is someone going to come there and pound on my chest? If my house starts on fire, is someone going to come help me?" They want to make sure that, as a Council, we get the right information and we can provide those resources so that they can have their needs met, and most of the rest of the time, they want to be left alone so they can go out and get their work done and have their time with the family and not have come to special session meetings, not have to come to general session meetings, and not have to worry about things in general, because when I go home, I'll turn the lights on, and if I stick my finger in the socket, hopefully, somebody will show up and beat on my chest. Those are the things that really plague them. And most of the rest of the time, if you're expecting someone to put their hand over their heart as you walk by, we're all going to be sadly disappointed, because it's just not going to happen.

And I think that is where a lot of this takes place. The codification of ordinances, that helps us, it helps the citizens, because the Recorder's Office then has a better resource. How is that resource really going to help? That's what we want to know. Is it the right resource? Is it the codification of only ordinances or are we going to get resolutions in there? Are they going to be stored in the basement next to the drain or are they going to be stored in a place where it's going to be useful to them? We've talked about everything from GIS for the Planning Department to a variety of other things. Many of the budget things came through a budget analyst. You came into a year having to move forward and to make some things happen. Early involvement and being able to have all aspects of this, I think, are very useful for us. Mr. Whitney's explanation of things and the dialog that we had here had probably been the most useful conversation I have had on the particular Code Enforcement Officer, I would dare say, ever. The next part of what I would like out of that is what kind of fees did the City collect last year, this year? Is

it a seasonal thing, where most of his work is going to be during the summer? Is it a year-round thing? Are we preparing to give him what he needs for now only to see that he's bored out of his mind in the winter? Where does he focus most of his efforts? These are some of the things we'd love to hear about.

And when these things come to us, it would really be nice to have, these are the qualifications of the person that will fulfill this need. These are the duties which they will take care of. This is the salary banding. This is a full time, this is a part time. This is a full time, temporary position. That kind of information becomes very useful for us in making sure that we're meeting some of the needs and requirements that are out there. And much of this why we're here and why we're talking about that is an effort to seek some of that, to be able to have some information, and when it was first presented to us, we got information that said, you know, the budget just is kind of there. And except for things like the Fire Department and three others, once it's there it's this hodgepodge of funds that can be willy-nilled out there. And that was never really quite clear in my mind. The budget that I had, had this detailed introduction. I was thrilled because our budget now has actual verbs in it. It actually has grammatical sentences, where when we first started on the Council, we had this spreadsheet and "good luck." So, more of that would seem to me as, this is policy, this is direction, this is where we want to go, and then we kind of had the wind right out of our sails, because then we were told, "Yeah, but once you give the A-OK, it's whatever." And regardless of whether we're voting yes or no, the Council still needs to understand that our involvement of that doesn't necessarily end with the yes or no vote. We're still here to participate in that, we still represent the citizens.

Mayor Olsen: And I appreciate those comments. In fact, that makes me aware of some of the issues of why we're at where we're at today. It may be, because of our exponential growth that we're experiencing, it may be necessary that we as a Council have, almost into the year, another budget retreat, because all the numbers that we all voted on previously have literally changed, in the sense of what revenues come in and what our expenditures are increasing because of those, that increase in growth. So they're basically neutral, but what we're not keeping up with is, is the services, and that is what I think went unanswered, then, is what you're saying. Also, I would, you asked a question about, you know, is this a band-aid, is this, this is where I think that some of our miscommunication has happened. I would suggest that we would get together as a Council, in an open public meeting, of course, to review the budget again because I would say this is a band-aid. These positions right here that we're discussing, the ones that have been presented before, as well, I do see that as a finger in the dike. With the anticipation come January there would be a request for additional positions, but what I can see is happening is, is that the Council is unaware because it hasn't been provided to see that our budget is changing before our eyes. Not that we're spending money that we shouldn't, but that the budget that was voted on, because we only, we only, just as an example, we only budgeted what, 400-some permits. We're already, Kent Partridge, he told me the other day we're almost processing near to 800 now, and we're not, we've got a couple more months to go; no, three months to go. It'll be the biggest year of growth. The other issue is, is that I would need to come to the Council and say, "Well, if we continue that for another year, which is half our fiscal year, then you know, do we hire the positions?" So what I'm trying to say, in a nutshell then, is that your questions are valid, they have been unanswered, those, and now I can see what you're saying. At the same time, I think staff and I, when we presented this, to us it was like a no-brainer. We just need these. But the Council, I can see, is saying, "Well, wait a second. We don't know, well, Mr. Mayor, why are you asking for a plans examiner?" That's what I'm understanding. Now, if I'm off, please correct me, but am I hearing you? Is that what you were telling?

Councilmember Liddiard: That's what I'm saying. I think surprises are nice when they come with a little pretty bow on it and you get something out of it. The rest of them are just opportunities for your

liver to spell “enzymes.” So it’s kind of a rather difficult thing to be up here and see that, uhhhhh [cry of anguish], you know, and that kind of “bring the reader along” in the story you’re telling would be really nice.

Mayor Olsen: Because otherwise, you were just expected to say, “Here it is. You just have to vote.”

Councilmember Liddiard: Exactly. And being placed in a point of ultimatum right when you’re being told that whatever you’re going to do really doesn’t matter, because after you approve more monies, then the Mayor position can do what you want with more money. That wasn’t the intent. If we’re going to approve more money, we want to make sure that the money that’s approved for a custodian goes to the custodian, that money approved for a plans examiner goes to the plans examiner.

Mayor Olsen: And I think that perception, it was never the Mayor’s intent to take money and spend it somewhere else, but that’s, yes.

Councilmember Liddiard: But there’s some of the frustration. It’s kind of interesting as we’ve talked about this and you’re giving us a little bit more, having a forecast rather than some surprises would be tremendously useful. I’ve had some conversations and emails back and forth with one of the developers in our city, and said, you know, it’s kind of interesting. We have an opportunity, the Council [inaud.] to redo some of the developer fees, because it was brought to the Council, that, “Hey, this is an important thing. We should reduce fees,” and then immediately afterward, we get, “and we need to hire another person.” And you almost kind of go in your mind, “Wait a minute. We got more work, but we’re reducing fees. Why don’t we leave the fees where they are so we can have more help? If the workload continues to increase, what needs to happen? What if we hire an additional person and then, due to seasonal things or market things or whatever, what if that workload goes away? Then what do we do? Where are we at with these different things? Well, if we have more work, there’s obviously more money, so we can pay for another person. That’s good. That’s where it should come from. Is that really, you know, how all that is going to work? What happens when monies go down? Hopefully, you know, that doesn’t happen because it’s good for the city, blah blah blah, everything else. But try and forecast and have a little bit better picture of where we’re going to go, things that are going to be associated with that, are going to be tremendously useful for us in being able to make sure that, “Hey, we need a plans examiner but we also need a vehicle for that person.” That’s going to be another thing that comes up. We didn’t talk about that. Is that person expected to operate their own vehicle or no, that’s only a plans person so they don’t go anywhere.

Mayor Olsen: OK, so what you’re bringing up is something that’s already happened to us, where we approved the position and then, all of a sudden, we need a car.

Councilmember Liddiard: Or, or I even hear comments from, “You know what, geez, we’ve got people giving their heart and soul every day for two dollars less an hour than they can get anywhere else.” Well, why don’t we pay someone five dollars more an hour and get a million dollars’ worth of work out of that? We’re not opposed to paying people more money if we’re getting a good service out of it. We don’t necessarily want to be the training ground so we can have everybody make their mistakes on our dime and then go and do a good job somewhere else. If we could provide them the adequate training, help them to get the resources they need, provide them the tools necessary to do the job, and then invest in that person so that they make contributions back to the organization, that’s what we want. If it’s a five-cent to a five-dollar difference and our systems are going to get that much, and I dare say, even more out of it, we would like to help make sure that happens. So bringing us along as a Council and

making sure that, that we have that level of information or at least being able to say, “You know what, let’s go the extra mile on this one. Let’s make sure that this electric department lineman is going to be able to receive the certification and the training necessary so they’ll do more than set meters. Let’s make sure that they understand power looping. Let’s make sure that they understand how to set a transformer. Let’s take the next step in making sure that people who are going to respond in an emergency have the tools and the ability to change a fuse when someone like Mr. Ferre is out of town. Who’s going to save the day?”

Mayor Olsen: I appreciate that. That discussion has helped understand some things. Councilman Strouse.

Councilmember Strouse: Yes, one of the many questions that never got answered during the regular budget time or during the budget amendments was, during the regular budget time, there was information we were given at the hearing that was all day long. The numbers there did not match the numbers given to us as the budget that we were working on. In the budget amendment hearing, one of the things that really irked me was to have in my packet information, budgetary information that stated, “We have spent half the budget in the first two months of the fiscal year.” Well, that’s a pretty, either a scary or a ridiculous statement, as so, as a Council person, it’s my job to ask the questions, and when I don’t get the answers, or ridiculous answers, then I have a problem with it. I need to do my job. I need to have correct information. When I asked what that meant, and I have the tapes from the work session, I was told, I was told that it was because the high cost of a well breakdown. I wanted to see the warranty on that well. I wanted to see the monies associated with the breakdown of that well that cost so much money and destroyed some peoples’ sod that were very angry about it. The response I got in this Council chamber was, “Well, we can’t talk about that because it’s a liability issue. We are involved in litigation.” And I said, “That’s all the more reason why the Council needs to talk about it.” If the City is in litigation, it’s our responsibility to be part of that conversation. That closed executive session never happened that I requested. I’ve never got an explanation. I did find out on my own exactly what that original fiscal statement meant, but this is just one of several examples of why we need to communicate better and, when questions are asked, that actual time is taken to get the correct answers and also, before something’s put in our packets, let’s make sure that somebody knows what it means. And if I ask to see the warranty on the well or if I ask to see the cost breakdowns, I expect that I should get it, and none of it has ever showed up.

Mayor Olsen: Who did you ask for those from? We need to follow up, you know. Who’d you ask? All that kind of stuff so that we know.

Councilmember Strouse: OK, Mr. Wren is the one that answered and said it was a well problem that caused all that extra cost in the budget. That was his explanation. Then I asked him for the warranty and the cost breakdowns, and I asked you, Mr. Mayor, why this wasn’t in a closed executive session item, because you’re the one who said it was a litigation issue, and that you couldn’t talk about it, and I said we need to talk about it. Am I wrong on that, Jerry? Is it not the Council’s responsibility to, when there’s a litigation issue, isn’t the Council involved?

Mr. Kinghorn: Yeah, I think on this particular one, it’s unfortunate that a little more explanation wasn’t given that day, but this is a potential litigation issue. There’s no litigation going on. There wouldn’t be without you knowing about it first.

Mayor Olsen: That’s correct.

Councilmember Strouse: There's not?

Mr. Kinghorn: No, there's not. There's not any litigation. It's a potential litigation issue and what, what's going on, in my understanding, is there's an investigation about exactly who did what with respect to setting the pump in this well, you know. Is it, and why was it designed to go where it was, and what happened with respect to casing the well to a particular depth. There's a number of details that are, they're trying to pull together, so that at some point, we can sit down in a closed session and have detailed information for you about what happened and what direction it points, in terms of recourse, and whether or not we're cut off from recourse by a statute of limitations, for example. It's probably not so much a warranty issue as it is a statute of limitations issue, and when we can raise a claim, because the well has been in service for some period of time. But normally we would always, before, I shouldn't say normally, but always before commencing litigation, we would have a discussion with the Council so you'd know what it's about and why, and what our basis was, and we'd get approval from the Council to commence litigation, to make sure that we were, you know, on good grounds. But this, as far as I know, this is still in the process of some, gathering some detailed information about exactly what happened and then looking at where recourse might be available. It's not very good to come to you in a closed session and say, "Gee, we've got this problem and we don't have any answers for you. So, there's kind of a fine line there between when we present the information and when we just say, "We don't have the information yet and we'll let you know later."

Councilmember Strouse: But since that was given as an answer to me as to explain, then why couldn't we have had a closed executive session just to say what you said, and that way, fine. We can move forward.

Mr. Kinghorn: It's probably not even something we need a closed session about as this point, because I don't know enough to spell it out. Hopefully we can find some, hopefully we can get some recourse, but at this point it doesn't look like it's ever going to be litigation, in my judgment.

Mayor Olsen: It's important to realize, also, the piece of information that you're lacking that I have been hesitant to share is that the Mayor is finishing up my investigation, Jerry, with a perceived conflict of interest with a member of the Council with this issue. That is the problem, but now that I've let the cat out of the bag, I think that once we're done, because that is my authorization to do, I need to do that before I can go to closed executive session with the Council. And that is something, how do you share something like that? "Oh, well one of us may benefit, or something like that from this." I'm trying to finish up with that investigation. So I realize the frustration you've had, but I need to verify the request that I've had, before we move into a potential litigation thing because of the perceived conflict of interest with a member of the Council with that issue.

Mr. Kinghorn: I guess you and I can sit down and talk about it.

Mayor Olsen: We . . . No. Yes.

Councilmember Strouse: Jerry?

Mr. Kinghorn: Because these things progress, you know. They don't always, we don't always all know the same thing at the same time.

Mayor Olsen: No, and we shouldn't ever expect anybody to ever know. One of the things, Councilman Strouse, that I think, maybe I'm confused, but there's an allusion to the half the budget being spent and I remember that being, that was, it was written by our City Treasurer in an agenda summary, but that had nothing to do with the well. The half budget was a line item for computer expenses and the hardware went down and had we not spent the money, it was almost \$30,000, which was half the computer line item, had we not done that, we would have lost, the City's never had a backup system.

Councilmember Strouse: I have the tapes that say Mr. Wren used that as an explanation.

Mayor Olsen: We need to be courteous. Let me finish and I'll let you say it and I understand what you're saying because I remember this. I was sitting right here. I remember you looking at an agenda summary and saying, "Well, it says right here we've spent half the budget." And it does say that. It did say that.

Councilmember Strouse: What does it mean?

Mayor Olsen: I am handling that internally with the City Treasurer, why that error occurred and I, we can make it a Council issue if you'd like, but the issue is, is that he was referring to, he's not here to defend himself, so I apologize, but he, he made a mistake. He wrote on there that we spent half the budget when in reality, we'd spent half the line item for computer expenditures because we had to purchase a hardware system, a backup, in order for. We would have lost all the utility billing. We would have lost all records. We wouldn't have known anything anybody had done and we, as a Council, did not ever know that, that we never had, or maybe one of you did, I don't know. I'm assuming we didn't, but coming into office and the staff says, "Well, Mayor, we don't have a backup system and this thing's ready to fail."

Councilman Liddiard: You can use my laptop.

Councilmember Strouse: Thanks.

Mayor Olsen: So this hardware system was purchased and, in the budget, that was what Mr. Burt was referring to, the City Treasurer, is that we had spent half of that. You are right, if we had spent half the entire budget for the year, that would be a very serious thing, but I think there was confusion, at least from what I heard, and that's why I'm restating it, that agenda summary, it was incorrect. I did read that and it did say what you're saying. The half budget had been spent. What Mr. Burt was referring to was the computer, but that half budget had nothing to do with the well. I think we're talking two different issues. The well is a whole separate thing that had to be done, as well.

Councilmember Strouse: No. No, I think we're missing the point here. The point is, as a Council person, we have to ask when things don't make sense or if improper information or misinformation, it's our job to question. So I questioned, you know, I questioned and the answer I got was that it was because of the well that we'd spent half the money.

Mr. Kinghorn: [inaudible, away from microphone]

Councilmember Strouse: And my second issue was, if I ask for the warranty on the well and cost breakdowns, as a Council person, in order to do my job, I have a right to have information and an

answer and so if we have to go in closed executive session, so be it. We should get the answer. Now you mentioned about an investigation, yet another investigation going on.

Mayor Olsen: This is only with the Mayor. It has nothing to do with the Council and I would appreciate you realizing that that is my right.

Councilmember Strouse: I'm not saying it's not your right. I'm just . . .

Mayor Olsen: No, but you're leaving . . .

Councilmember Strouse: No, no, no, I'm trying to get a clarification from our attorney please, please.

Mayor Olsen: I am the chair of this meeting. And I want one second. No, you . . . This has got to stop. Listen, the problem is, everybody was at that meeting and you all remember Linn Strouse sitting there going, "It says right here, nah nah nah." And I hate to be embarrassing to you, but the fact is, . . .

Councilmember Strouse: You're mocking me.

Mayor Olsen: I what?

Councilmember Strouse: You're mocking me?

Mayor Olsen: Let me explain something, Ms. Strouse. My perception is that you did not understand what was happening. You have looked at an agenda summary from two weeks ago and you assumed that we had spent half the budget.

Councilmember Strouse: No, I did not.

Mayor Olsen: OK, can I finish, please? You are being rude.

Councilmember Strouse: All right.

Mayor Olsen: Now listen, this is the problem. When we have meetings, someone speaks, and when I'm finished, you speak. That is how the system is going to work. If you don't like it, run for Mayor. And if you don't like it, set a procedure, because I'm tired of the whining. Right, that two weeks' meeting, you sat here and you were saying we'd spent half the budget. Two council members took the time to sit here and say, "Linn, you're not understanding." Because you were going off saying we'd spent half the budget, ah la la la. And now you're saying that has something to do with the well. These are two separate issues. And if you want information as to a warranty, then I will whack this gavel and we will stop the meeting and I will go get your information. But don't sit here and insinuate that we are not providing you with information. That is unfair. Now if you, still to this day, want to continue to have this banter, this fodder with you and I with this issue of you're not getting your information, I want to know right now what you need and we will stop this meeting, we will get your information. I hope you're not laughing at me, Ms. Strouse. This is not funny.

Councilmember Strouse: No, I'm not. I'm being very patient.



Mayor Olsen: I hope you, oh really? Do you want a turn? Go ahead. I find no humor in this whatsoever.

Councilmember Strouse: I don't think it's funny at all.

Mayor Olsen: Well, good. What information do you want, Ms. Strouse? I would like to know. I'm tired of the accusations. They are false. What information do you lack that the Mayor has withheld from you?

Councilmember Strouse: I have tapes that substantiate what I'm saying.

Mayor Olsen: I want to hear them.

Councilmember Strouse: OK, you just interrupted me and you're treating me very rudely, so I suggest we both use better manners.

Mayor Olsen: OK, I'll shut up. Go ahead.

Councilmember Strouse: OK, my whole point is, when information comes before the Council and it doesn't make sense, obviously if we'd spent half the budget in the first two months of the year, that's a very serious problem. So I want to know, make sense of this information that's before me, so I asked and got the answer from Mr. Wren, and when I found out that the information had to do with the well, then I wanted to know about warranties, if it covered it, and cost breakdowns. So then I don't get my answer to my question [short gap when tape switched sides] then litigation, so we can't talk about it, OK? That, to me, as far as my knowledge is, a time when we should go into closed executive session and talk about it. So I would just like a clarification on what constitutes a time when the Council has no right to information and when we do have a right to information. I would like Jerry to . . .

Mayor Olsen: Well, Jerry can talk when he's ready and when I allow him to, but I have a right to respond. You have alluded to . . .

Councilmember Strouse: I'm done.

Mayor Olsen: Didn't you just want to turn it over to the chair to give him an opportunity to speak?

Councilmember Strouse: I'm going to . . .

Mayor Olsen: OK, because I'm ready to, I'm ready to talk.

Councilmember Strouse: OK, and you just alluded to another investigation. I'd like to know at what point does the Council have a legal right to know about investigations going on? That's, I'd like to have a better understanding. In order to represent the people, we have to have knowledge, so, what can we say and what can we not say? What can we know and what can we not know? Do I have no right to ask at work session, "What does this mean?" And because I ask what it means, does it mean I'm, duh, don't understand. It means I want to hear what other people explain it, so that I can be sure I'm getting the correct information.

Mayor Olsen: And is that, Jerry, go ahead. She wants an answer. Is there an investigation?

Mr. Kinghorn: Well, there are a lot of, there are a lot of questions. The only, the only investigation about the well that I understand is the investigation about the well, that there's a question about who performed what work, what their warranty was on the particular work they performed, who's responsible for whatever happened with the well, and whether the City has any recourse, and we're, as I understand it, they're trying to pull that information together so that I can look at it and we can come back to the Council and say, "Here's what we found." So, and I think it's, sometimes it's misleading if we come in and say, "Well, we've got a little bit of information, you know. We think we've got a, from what we can tell, we've got a hold of something here, feels like a snake and then it turns out to be the tail of an elephant. I mean, I'm not trying to make fun of this, but at some point when we think that the City has to undertake some, some legal recourse or when we're the subject of litigation, when we understand that, when we say, "OK, we can see what's involved in this," we need to come to the City Council and, and give you a heads-up and say, "Here's what's going on with this." You always have, you always have the right to information. You always have the right to information about the warranties that the various vendors provided on the well equipment, for example, or information about the engineering contract for the design of the well. That information is just information that you're entitled to at any time. It's, it's, and I think if you wanted to have a report on a specific matter, you know, we could talk to the Mayor and say, "Let's get that report." Under these new agenda rules, you could put that report or that discussion on the agenda and we could discuss it in a closed session, kind of bring you up to date on an interim status, you know, when we don't have something finished we could give you, give you kind of a report on what step we're in or what stage we're in in the investigation. It's kind of a, kind of a judgment call about at what point do we think you would be interested in hearing what we have pulled together with respect to a particular event like that pump failure.

Councilmember Strouse: When the well was barely a year old, is my understanding . . .

Mr. Kinghorn: Well, the well was older than that, is the problem. The well, a lot of the well work was finished. For example, the drilling and placement of the casing was finished a long time before the actual pump and motor were placed in the well, and that was finished a long time before the actual line was constructed that tied the well in with the rest of the system, so, you know, it took a long time to get that thing finished, for whatever, whatever reason. During that period, our recourse against people was running, our statute of limitations was running on specific aspects of the work. I don't want to make this more complicated than it is and I don't have any real, documented results in front of me, so I'm, I'm speculating a little bit based on what I've been told verbally.

Councilmember Strouse: That's OK. My issue is at what point is the Council allowed to be involved and be privy to information that helps us understand what's put before us and to help us represent our constituents? Is there not a nondisclosure agreement that the Council can sign when they're in closed executive session if we're worried about somebody on the Council being involved in the litigation?

Mr. Kinghorn: Well, I think the question of whether there's a conflict is a different question than the question of whether we're worried about disclosures because it might jeopardize our position in litigation.

Councilmember Strouse: OK, that's helpful information. Thank you.

Mayor Olsen: Anything else?

Councilmember Strouse: Nope.

Mayor Olsen: Councilman Strouse, I apologize to you if I'm coming across, you said I was mocking you. I wasn't. I want to make it very clear right now that this Mayor will not tolerate your accusations towards me or any member of this governing body against me again without evidence. I want to make it clear that this councilwoman has never asked me for this information. She's alluding to the Mayor, that the Mayor has refused to give this information. This information was requested from her to Mike Wren. She made that clear, and I plan to disclose Tuesday night some of the issues and the problems we're having with regards to this potential litigation. I think we'll reveal some light. Is there any more comment from the Council regarding this? But this Mayor will not tolerate it any more. The accusations need to stop. If you can't back it up . . . Go ahead, interrupt me.

Councilmember Strouse: I thought you were done. What accusations?

Mayor Olsen: Well, I did, too, before.

Councilmember Strouse: OK, I apologize. I thought you were done. What accusations?

Mayor Olsen: Do you want a list now?

Councilmember Strouse: Yeah, I asked questions, but I'm not aware that I made any accusations. Jerry, did I legally make accusations when I asked a question?

Mr. Kinghorn: Well, I don't . . .

Councilmember Strouse: Did I violate something? I'm trying to . . .

Mr. Kinghorn: Asking questions is different than accusing somebody of wrongdoing.

Councilmember Strouse: That's what I thought. Thank you.

Mayor Olsen: Well, am I misunderstanding Councilman Strouse when she says that she has been not given information from the Mayor regarding these matters? Is that not an accusation? Mr. Kinghorn.

Mr. Kinghorn: Mr. Mayor, I'm sorry. I need, I'm supposed to be at a wedding at 4:00. I'm not going to make it. I need to go call my wife, if you don't mind, and just let her know that I'm not going to make it to this event.

Mayor Olsen: That's fine. Is there any further discussion by the Council with regards to these matters?

Councilmember Blackburn: Are these requested comments pertaining to the item on the agenda or the way the conversation's gone?

Mayor Olsen: Do you need time to talk?

Councilmember Blackburn: Well, seeing as how we're here at 3:30 in the afternoon on a special session that we know is going to be tabled. I do like some of the comments and the openness that has been given. I think we're starting to scratch truth in what needs to happen in the way of open information and

feedback for everybody, but seeing as how this item is going to essentially be tabled, I would like to call the question. I personally left a funeral service today, that I can't quite plan those myself, either, but obviously we're taking up more time than I think, excuse me, I think this is important to spend the time on, and maybe we need to call a special session so we can freely and openly talk amongst each other and clear the air, deal with the good and the bad, but I think we need to call the question and enjoy Saturday.

Councilmember Liddiard: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Olsen: Yes.

Councilmember Liddiard: The motion was to discuss it. I don't believe there was a motion to table or to do anything. That's what I understand, so I will move that we adjourn.

Ms. Peterson: There was no vote on the discussion motion.

Councilmember Liddiard: There was no vote on the discussion motion. Aye.

Mayor Olsen: Meeting adjourned.

### ADJOURNMENT

Councilmember Liddiard **moved** to adjourn the meeting at 3:37 pm.