

CITY OF FENTON COUNCIL WORK SESSION PROCEEDINGS
Monday, January 5, 2015
City Hall Conference Room
301 South LeRoy Street
7:30 PM

Mayor Sue Osborn called the meeting to order at 7:30 PM.

Present: Bland, Grossmeyer, Jacob, King, Lockwood, McDermott, Osborn.
Absent: None.
Others Present: Lynn Markland, City Manager, Mike Burns, Assistant City Manager, Cindy Shane, City Treasurer, Rick Aro, Police Chief, Chris Patterson, Legal Counsel and Alan Panter, City Auditor.

Markland introduced Mike Reilly as the new Building and Zoning Official for the City. Council Members welcomed him to the City.

CITIZENS COMMENTS – Jamie Fricke asked to speak on the proposed medical marihuana ordinance.

2014 AUDIT REPORT

Alan Panter of Abraham & Gaffney, P.C. presented the 2014 audit report. He stated the audit went well and the City was prepared when his office arrived. He reviewed the Balance Sheet as of June 30, 2014. Unassigned fund balance is at 40% of annual expenditures, which is similar to last year. This amount is available for future expenditures and to provide adequate cash flow.

Panter next reviewed the Statement of Revenues, Expenditures and Changes in Fund Balance which shows how fund balance changed during the year. Fund balance in the general fund increased by \$88,420. Revenues in the general fund increased by about 5% and expenses by 8.6%, with most of the increase due to additional salary monies and equipment purchases for the Police Department. He next reviewed a chart that showed the last five years of data for Revenues, Expenditures and Fund Balance for general fund noting there have been slight increases in fund balance each year. He then reviewed charts that showed revenue and expenditure detail in the general fund for the year.

Panter reviewed the Statement of Net Position for the water and sewer funds. He stated these funds are intended to be financed by user charges so the accounting is a little different than the accounting for governmental funds. He reviewed the Net Position portion of the report and explained the line item ‘Net investment in capital assets’ is the cost of assets less the debt issued to construct the assets and that this is the largest portion of net position in both the water and sewer funds. The ‘unrestricted’ line item is the cash flow for both funds. He reviewed the Statement of Revenue, Expenses and Changes in Net Position for the water and sewer funds which details the operating and non-operating revenues and expenditures in both funds. He next reviewed historical data for the water and sewer funds.

Panter reviewed the letter of audit findings. He stated there are three items to report this year. A material journal entry for the proper recognition of accounts payable for the DDA Construction Fund was needed. It was recommended the City take steps to ensure material journal

entries are not necessary at the time future audit analysis is performed. The second item is in regards to capital asset procedures. It was found during the audit that the schedule of capital assets was inaccurate and suggested the City implement better internal controls over the maintaining of capital asset additions throughout the year and review the listing at year end. The third issue is in regards to following up on old and outstanding checks. It is recommended the City implement procedures to follow up on outstanding items on at least, an annual basis.

Markland and the Council thanked Panter and the City Treasurer for their work on the audit.

PROPOSED MEDICAL MARIHUANA ORDINANCE

Markland stated the proposed ordinance sets standards for medical marihuana cultivation. The ordinance has been discussed at length by the Planning Commission and the City Council has established a moratorium while this issue worked through the state court system, which established some legal standards that have been included in the ordinance. He noted the current moratorium is set to expire on February 1, 2015.

Patterson highlighted the changes that were made to the Ordinance since Council last reviewed it. Provisions have been included after discussions with the Planning Commission and the ordinance addresses medical marihuana cultivation in the both residential and industrial districts. The new draft of the ordinance includes additional restrictions and standards provided at the end of section two. Another significant change is that language was added, after discussions with the Planning Commission to allow a medical marihuana caregiver to facilitate growth for a medical marihuana patient in a residential district when a patient is unable to grow for themselves. Restrictions for caregivers were added to section two which allows a caregiver to go into a residential district and grow for one patient, at either the patient's or caregiver's residence. The caregiver would be limited to growing for one patient, which is 12 plants and 2.5 ounces of usable marihuana.

Patterson stated in the industrial district, standards and provisions were added to the ordinance which clarifies that a medical marihuana growing facility is operated by one caregiver. Explicit provisions were also added which state no medical marihuana patient can grow in a medical marihuana caregiver's facility. Previously section two of the ordinance provided for restrictions and standards to allow a patient to grow in a residential district and provided for the thresholds and limitations provided in state law. Section two now also provides for standards and restrictions in the residential district for caregivers.

Patterson stated Council previously discussed the issue of inspecting facilities. A provision was added to allow for inspections of medical marihuana growing facilities. An initial inspection takes place during the special land use permit application process and then annual inspections are required to ensure compliance with the ordinance and the Medical Marihuana Act.

Jacob clarified that the inspections do not apply to the residential district. Patterson responded that is correct. They apply to a caregiver facility, which would be allowed in the industrial district as a special land use.

McDermott asked if a caregiver is growing in their own residence on behalf of a patient, would the City be able to inspect that. Patterson responded the way the ordinance is drafted, a caregiver who grows in their home for a patient, the twelve plants grown in a residence are not subject to inspection. If a caregiver exceeds growing for one patient, they are required to grow in the industrial district in a caregiver facility, which would be subject to inspections.

King asked if growing by a caregiver has to be permitted in a residential area or can the Council opt to only allow it in an area such as the industrial park where it would be subject to regular inspections. Patterson responded the exception that was provided in the ordinance to allow caregivers to grow in the residential district was a request from the Planning Commission.

King stated her concern is if a caregiver is allowed to grow for one patient in a residential area, which is not subject to inspections, how it would be known if they were growing more than the allowed amount.

Patterson stated the ordinance limits a caregiver to grow for only one patient in a residential district and state law limits a caregiver to growing twelve plants per patient. If a caregiver were to grow more than twelve plants, they would be violating both the ordinance and state law.

Aro stated if residential areas cannot be inspected, the Police Department would have no way of knowing how many plants are being grown or how much extra medical marijuana is in the home.

Osborn asked if caregivers can be restricted to growing in the industrial district. Patterson responded yes. The original draft of the ordinance only allowed patients to grow in a residential district, as that right is provided by state law, and caregivers were only allowed to grow in the industrial district.

Osborn asked if a caregiver would be allowed to grow in the home of a patient. Patterson responded the ordinance as currently drafted, would allow a caregiver growing in a residential district to do so either in their own home for that patient, or in the home of the patient.

Lockwood asked if there is a limit on the amount of caregivers that could grow in any residential area. Patterson responded there is a limit on the amount of plants but not the number of caregivers.

King commented that whatever ordinance is enacted, that is in accordance with the law and the Police Chief can check on grow operations to make sure they are not misused. She does not have a problem with medical marijuana, but would like to have some degree of local control and if the Police Department cannot inspect caregivers in a residential area, then they should not be allowed to operate in a residential district.

Bland stated Council needs to make sure that whatever is decided that it does not override what state law allows. He has an issue with the Police Chief not being able to investigate if the Chief is made aware there is a concern with someone violating the ordinance in a residential district.

Jacob stated the Police should not be able to enter a home without permission or a warrant.

McDermott stated the ordinance as written allows for a caregiver to grow up to sixty plants and have 12.5 ounces of usable marijuana in their facility and asked if the original draft of the ordinance indicated a caregiver could have sixty plants, plus twelve of their own if they were also a patient.

Patterson responded the ordinance has always limited a caregiver to growing sixty plants in the industrial district and if they are also a patient, to grow twelve in their home for themselves.

McDermott asked if the section of the ordinance addressing residential districts is worded in a way to meet state law and is not trying to be more restrictive.

Patterson stated the draft of the ordinance originally provided in the summer met state law requirements. The concern at the Planning Commission was if a patient is unable to grow their own twelve plants, is it feasible to require them to find a caregiver that has a facility in the industrial district. His office was asked if there was a legal way to provide for a caregiver to grow in their

home given a relationship to the patient. Language was added to provide for this after discussions with the Planning Commission.

McDermott clarified the only thing that changed since the prior draft is giving a third party caregiver the ability to grow in a residential district for a patient in the caregiver or patient's home, on behalf of the patient. Patterson stated that is correct.

Grossmeyer stated the caregiver that would be growing in a residential district is not likely to have a facility in the industrial park and more than likely would be a family member of the patient. He stated under these circumstances the Police Chief cannot inspect a home, but the plants must be grown in an enclosed, locked facility that the Building Official can inspect to make sure it meets various building codes. Another reason for adding this provision to the ordinance was to address patients living in apartments where they may be unable to meet the parameters of an enclosed, locked facility and not be able to grow at their residence.

Osborn commented she is not comfortable allowing caregivers to grow in a residential district and is more comfortable with allowing it in the industrial park where it can be inspected by the Police Department.

Patterson stated regarding the residential district, it's important to clarify that the draft provided in the summer allowed for patients to grow in a residential district. What has been added to the ordinance since then is a provision to allow caregivers to grow for one patient. He stated the additional standards regarding distances, inspections, etc. are for caregiver facilities in the industrial district which would be allowed as a special land use; the additional standards for a facility in the industrial park are different than the standards that apply in the residential districts.

King stated this is a big step for the City and she wants to make sure the ordinance stays within the law but she is uncomfortable that there are no inspections allowed in the residential district.

Jacob stated he does not want the ordinance to include any more restrictions in residential districts than what is already provided for in the ordinance.

Osborn asked the Planning Commission's reasoning for changing the ordinance language to allow a caregiver to grow in the residential district. Grossmeyer responded the thought was that a patient living in an apartment may not have the ability to meet the requirements of an enclosed locked facility to grow for themselves. The other reason was that a patient may not physically be able to grow for themselves. Language was added to the ordinance to allow a caregiver to grow for a patient either at the patient's residence or their own. He stated someone that would blatantly disregard the ordinance and grow more plants than allowed may not be growing them for medical purposes and that the same problem arises in that the police are not allowed to just enter people's homes. He feels the ordinance keeps honest people honest and the City can draft an ordinance that law abiding citizens can follow.

Aro asked if the ordinance provides for an initial inspection in the residential district. Patterson responded no.

McDermott stated he agrees with Grossmeyer's comments that this ordinance gives people the ability to follow the law and doesn't think it will have any effect on someone intent on the breaking the law.

Grossmeyer stated even if someone chooses to grow less than the twelve plants allowed in the residential district, they still have to do so in an enclosed locked facility.

Lockwood asked the Police Chief if he has any comments for Council as they consider this ordinance.

Aro stated there's a reason for the ordinance and the City has to allow individuals to grow medical marihuana in their homes but there is a gray area if someone else besides a patient is allowed to grow in a residence. He thinks good points were made regarding allowing someone to grow for a patient that cannot grow for themselves but he has concerns that people may take advantage of any perceived loophole in the ordinance.

Osborn clarified that medical marihuana must be allowed in the residential districts for patients, but it does not have to be allowed for caregivers. Patterson responded that is correct.

King asked if growing would be allowed in apartment buildings. Patterson responded yes, what is currently in the ordinance provides for a patient to grow in a residential district and residentially zoned property. He stated landlords have certain rights under state law as to whether or not to permit it.

McDermott asked if it is permissible to have a caregiver register with the City that is operating in the residential district. His concern with allowing a caregiver to grow in someone's home on their behalf is that if a caregiver is not registered, they could be growing for more than one patient and the City would never know, as opposed to a facility in the industrial park that the City inspects annually. Patterson responded the ordinance, as it's currently written, that possibility stands as caregivers are not required to obtain a permit or register as a caregiver in the residential district.

Osborn asked if a patient would be able to have a caregiver grow for them in a residential district and in turn go to a caregiver facility and grow more. Patterson responded no, patients cannot go to the industrial district and grow in a facility.

McDermott clarified that the residential portion of the ordinance are guidelines for a patient or caregiver to grow in a residential district and the City has no mechanism to monitor what goes on in the residential district unless a modification is made to the home that requires a building inspection. In a facility in the industrial park, a grow operation is monitored by a permit process that calls for an initial inspection and subsequent annual inspections. Patterson responded that is correct.

King asked if the City can legally ask a caregiver operating in the residential district for the medical marihuana card of the patient they are serving. Patterson responded the City has to be careful what it asks for; that information is held private by the health department.

Jacob stated he thinks people would be willing to show their card if the police come to their door but thinks requiring people to go on a registry will encourage people to not comply with the ordinance.

Jamie Fricke, 545 North Madison Street, Lapeer, referenced section 6 of the Act that states in part, "*Possession of, or application for, a registry identification card shall not constitute probable cause or reasonable suspicion, nor shall it be used to support the search of the person or property of the person possessing or applying for the registry identification card...*" She commented just because someone possesses medical marihuana does not make them a criminal. She again referenced section 6 of the Act which states "*A person, including an employee, contractor, or official of the department or another state agency or local unit of government, who discloses confidential information in violation of this act is guilty of a misdemeanor, punishable by imprisonment for not more than 6 months, or a fine of not more than \$1,000.00, or both...*". She stated making patients or caregivers disclose information to the Police Department would put the City at risk as they would be breaking the Act.

Osborn stated the City is not looking to have names disclosed.

Jamie Fricke commented the TerBeek (TerBeek v. City of Wyoming) case that went to the Supreme Court restricts what cities are allowed to do and cities have to be in compliance with the Act and telling caregivers they are not allowed to grow 72 plants in their home will lead to lawsuits. She stated the facility she owns is next to an elementary school and there have been no issues. She feels the proposed ordinance creates a lot of unnecessary regulations. She referred to item 5 (Storage of marihuana) on page 4 of the proposed ordinance which states in part “*All medical marihuana must be contained within a separate enclosed, locked facility for each Medical Marihuana Patient for which the Medical Marihuana Caregiver is lawfully connected...*” She stated the Act only calls for growing marihuana to be in an enclosed, locked facility, not *any* marihuana and thinks this language will create confusion. She stated she lives in the City of Lapeer and they decided to not enact a moratorium or an ordinance regulating medical marihuana use. She would like to see something in the ordinance that addresses medical marihuana quantities over the legal limit. She stated concentrates are made to treat certain things and they require large amounts of marihuana which sometimes amounts to more than twelve plants or 2.5 ounces.

Bland asked if the ordinance, as written, follows the law. Patterson responded yes. The TerBeek case was a case the City was waiting for a decision on from the Supreme Court before deciding what to do. The City of Wyoming passed an ordinance completely banning medical marihuana which the Supreme Court struck down, but the Court did not say there could not be local regulation on medical marihuana. Patterson stated the ordinance incorporates the minimum requirements of the Act and the ordinance does not restrict any of the quantities allowed to be grown under the Act. The ordinance also includes additional local regulations provided for by the Supreme Court case. Patterson stated there are ordinances in other municipalities that have more regulations than what is provided in the ordinance presented tonight.

Osborn asked about the ordinances for the cities of Novi and Livonia and how their ordinances read after the Supreme Court decision. Patterson responded he has not read their most recent ordinances and stated those cities went back to the drawing board with their ordinances after the Supreme Court decision. Osborn stated she would like to look at these ordinances.

Lockwood asked if the Council could extend the moratorium to gather additional information. Patterson responded yes.

Osborn stated she would like to see ordinances for the cities of Wyoming, Novi and Livonia to see how they were changed after the Court decision.

Bland stated he is not happy with extending the moratorium and stated if the Council feels an ordinance should be enacted, then action should be taken or if the Council doesn't feel strongly enough to adopt an ordinance, then don't enact an ordinance.

Osborn stated she does not want to enact an ordinance until the Council sees the ordinances from Livonia, Novi and Wyoming.

Aro stated there was recent legislation regarding medical marihuana that did not go to the Governor and asked if that legislation moved forward, would the City have to revisit this issue.

Patterson stated that HB 4271 addresses provisioning centers and that Bill has been sent to Committee and has not been acted on. He stated the ordinance does not address that and it would have to be revisited should the Bill pass but as it is presented now, the Bill contains opt-outs.

Jacob stated if the concern is with residential growing of medical marihuana, extending the moratorium will not affect that as people can grow in their house right now.

Osborn stated this is not something she wants to rush into and she does not want to punish a patient, but the health, safety and welfare of the community needs to be protected and she would like the Police Chief to be able to monitor things as best as possible.

Lockwood stated there have been serious discussions on this issue for the last year and feels if a Council member has any doubt in their mind, the Council should seek more information as the Council is under no obligation to do anything other than extend the moratorium if questions are not answered by time the current moratorium expires.

Grossmeyer stated he is comfortable with the ordinance as written but is not opposed to gathering more information.

More information will be gathered for review at a future meeting.

PROPOSED DOWNTOWN PARKING ORDINANCE

Burns stated the City is working with Corlin Builders to assign parking spaces for the Cornerstone building. Part of that process includes revising the parking ordinance that addresses overnight parking, which is primarily an issue in the downtown district. He stated the Motor Vehicle Code that was adopted by the City does not address parking issues. Administration asked the City Attorney to draft a parking ordinance for the downtown district. What is presented is similar to the ordinance in place prior to the Motor Vehicle Code being adopted and expands the provisions of the downtown district. He stated the biggest issue is overnight parking. The ordinance would not allow overnight parking between the hours of 2 AM and 5 AM with the exception of emergency services vehicles and properly registered vehicles that have been issued special permits by the City. He stated going forward, provisions will have to be added and the ordinance allows for that to be done by resolution.

Patterson stated this ordinance creates the backbone of the parking system and areas that have specific parking spots can be added by resolution. The resolution currently provided addresses the Cornerstone project. Addressing parking concerns via resolution is a much faster, streamlined process.

Lockwood referred to section 32-42 of the ordinance which indicates the Community Center parking lot can only be used by individuals attending functions or working at the Community Center or using the tennis courts. She stated employees of a downtown business park at the Community Center and patrons of certain downtown businesses also park there. She asked if the ordinance should be adopted as is and then make adjustments as needed.

Patterson stated the Council needs to discuss how it wants to treat the Community Center parking lot. He would like the ordinance to contain language that deals with the Community Center in whatever way the Council chooses and the resolution will address new parking spaces. Depending on how the Council wants to treat parking at the Community Center, modifications would be made now for the Council to consider.

Osborn referred to the map provided with the ordinance and asked if vehicles authorized to park in spots designated as residential parking would have a sticker or be marked in some way so the Police Department knows they're authorized to park there.

Burns stated what is proposed in the resolution for the Cornerstone Building is to provide twenty three parking spaces for residents, three fifteen-minute parking spaces for The Rough Draft and two spots for Sawyer Jewelers. There will be an agreement with the property association that they will oversee the parking. The City will issue permits and signs will be installed. The fifteen-minute parking spaces for The Rough Draft are only designated as fifteen-minute spaces from 5 AM-11 AM. After that, they become regular parking spaces. Sawyer Jewelers will have signs specifically for them.

McDermott inquired where the signs will be. Burns responded parking signs have already been made and there will be one sign for two spots. Councilmembers conveyed concerns with signs being visible from Leroy Street.

McDermott asked if the residential parking could be moved away from the spots close to Leroy Street and located behind the building.

Burns stated designated parking spots was looked at in a way that met both the needs of residents and businesses. There was concern with putting all the residential spots behind the building near the businesses and the businesses specifically asked for all the residential spots to not be in that area.

Osborn asked if the residential parking could be moved to the middle row. Markland responded if they are moved there then signs couldn't be installed. Bland commented that would create a plowing problem.

King asked if Cornerstone residents have overnight guests, would they be ticketed since they would not be parking in a spot designated for residential parking.

Lockwood asked if Cornerstone could be addressed tonight and other parking such as the Community Center, could be discussed later. Markland responded yes.

Grossmeyer asked how owners would be required to park in designated areas; what would stop a resident from parking in spot not designated residential parking, which would take up a spot available to the public while the designated residential parking spot sits unused. Markland stated that is something the homeowners association will have to address.

Aro asked if the entire parking area at Cornerstone is exempt from overnight parking restrictions. Patterson responded no.

Aro asked where condo owners that have more than one car, or guests' cars, are supposed to park and stated this should be looked at.

King stated she does not think this should go to the next Council meeting for action as more information is needed. She doesn't want something in place that is so restrictive it discourages people from coming downtown. She thinks the businesses in Cornerstone should be given two spots close to the entrance of the business.

Lockwood asked if there is a timeframe in which the ordinance needs to be adopted. Burns responded the residents will start moving in around March and he would like this to be addressed by then.

Markland stated something else that has to be considered in the next few months is the possibility of creating a new parking lot on the property across the street from Cornerstone.

McDermott suggested the parking ordinance could be brought before Council for action and then work on a resolution specific to Cornerstone at a later date. He stated he has lived and worked in downtown areas and what he saw was that resident parking was only at a certain time of day and for most of the day it's not designated residential parking. Burns stated that idea was looked at but the concern was if someone parked in a space while it was public parking and didn't leave by time the space is designated residential parking, how would that be handled. Administration felt there were too many issues so it was left at being designated residential parking for twenty four hours.

Burns asked if the Council wants to completely eliminate the overnight parking restriction in the downtown area. Markland responded he would have concerns with plowing the downtown area if that restriction is eliminated.

McDermott stated if the residential spots at Cornerstone are going to be charged a \$100 annual fee, the City needs to make spots available. If they are not charged, he doesn't think there

is an obligation to provided designated parking spots. He would rather go the route of not charging and telling residents the area they can park in and let them know if they have a resident pass they won't be ticketed during the five months parking restrictions are in place and by doing this, it makes the resident responsible for finding their spot.

Lockwood stated she likes that idea but is concerned with what buyers have already been told. She thinks if buyers have been told they are guaranteed one spot, then Council should respect that.

Grossmeyer stated he would like to find out what the buyers have been told. If there was a way to require residents to park in the reserved spots, it would make plowing easier because the people plowing would know where the cars would be, but there is no way to require residents to park in the assigned spots.

Markland stated he thinks if people are given a specific spot to park in, they will park there.

McDermott suggested the entire parking lot have overnight parking by permit only. He doesn't want to see someone have a specific spot and then call the Police if someone else is parked there.

Bland suggested things be left alone and if a problem arises, address it then. He agrees if residents are paying for parking, they should be given a designated space, but the rest of the lot should be open public parking.

Markland stated he would like the Council to vote on both the resolution and ordinance, but that both do not have to be acted on at the next Council meeting. He is confident that those who have put a down payment on a condo in Cornerstone have been told they'd have a parking space. He would like the parking ordinance to be considered at an upcoming Council meeting but the resolution addressing Cornerstone can be addressed at a later date.

Grossmeyer stated if the ordinance is passed, it creates a problem with the rest of the downtown area where there are apartments and asked if the City is ready to issue permits to those residents.

Burns stated the provisions of the prior ordinance stated permits were to be issued by the Zoning Board of Appeals for downtown tenants. The new ordinance changes that provision to allow permits to be issued administratively.

Aro clarified that the overnight on-street parking restrictions during the winter months are citywide and not just for the downtown area and includes City streets and City owned parking lots, which are all located downtown. He stated under the old ordinance, certain areas were specifically identified and given an exemption. The new ordinance only applies to on-street parking and municipal owned lots and would not include things like VGs or Millpond Manor.

McDermott asked if the ordinance could be passed and then pull the exemptions listed in the old ordinance into a resolution.

More information will be gathered and this item will come forward at a later date for further discussion or action.

PROPOSED TAX EXEMPTION ORDINANCE FOR MILLPOND MANOR

Markland stated the owners of Millpond Manor are considering refinancing the mortgage. The apartments currently have a tax exempt status for property taxes and are paying a PILOT (Payment in Lieu of Taxes). The PILOT is equal to 4% of the rent collected from residents and the rent is income based. The project was originally financed by the Michigan State Housing Development Authority. The owners would like to have the PILOT reaffirmed for financing purposes.

He stated if the Council is okay, he would ask that it be considered at an upcoming council meeting. He stated a similar request will be forthcoming from Dauner Haus in the near future.

Lockwood stated she would like Administration to have discussions with representatives of Millpond Manor; restrictive parking signs were installed and she believes the original agreement was that it was a shared parking lot.

Item will come forward for action at a future meeting.

RESCHEDULE MARCH 9, 2015 CITY COUNCIL MEETING TO MARCH 16, 2015

Osborn stated she would like to move the March 9th City Council meeting to March 16th as some Councilmembers will be at the National League of Cities conference on March 9th.

Item will be brought forward Monday night for action.

COUNCIL MEMBER COMMENTS

King commented the bushes on the property at the corner of Silver Lake Road and Adelaide Street are high and makes it difficult to turn. She stated people have commented to her that the dumpster for the Cornerstone building by Silver Lake Road and Walnut Street makes it difficult to make a left hand turn onto Silver Lake Road. She commented a final presentation will be made by the Solid Waste Committee regarding changes coming to the solid waste and recycling program.

Grossmeyer stated he attended the dedication of the Habitat for Humanity House and it was a great event. He stated the City will be hosting the Small Cities meeting on February 4th.

Lockwood stated the Holiday Lights Committee will be meeting to review the decorations and see what can be improved for next year. She stated the Beautification Commission will meet this month and the City Manager and Assistant City Manager will be attending to discuss the Streetscape project.

CALL TO THE AUDIENCE – None.

Meeting was adjourned at 9:55 P.M.

Mayor Sue Osborn

City Clerk, Renee Wilson

Date approved: January 26, 2015