GREENWOOD CITY COUNCIL
February 25, 2008 - 5:30 p.m.
MINUTES

PRESENT
Council Members: Mayor Nicholson, Niki Hutto, Linda Edwards, Betty Boles, Herbert Vaughn, Johnny Williams and Barbara Turnburke; City Manager; Assistant City Manager; City Clerk; City Attorney; Phil Lindler; Chris Trainer of the Index Journal and Chris Witt of Greenwood Today.

CALL TO ORDER
The meeting in Council Chambers was called to order by Mayor Nicholson at 5:30 p.m. and he welcomed everyone to the meeting.

The Mayor also gave the invocation.

STATEMENT AND QUORUM
Mayor Nicholson read the following statement, “In accordance with the Freedom of Information Act, Chapter 4, Title 30, Code of Laws of South Carolina, 1976, an agenda has been posted on the front door of City Hall and notification of this meeting has been given to the news media.”

The Mayor then asked the City Clerk, Steffanie Dorn, if a quorum was present. She said, “Yes, Mr. Mayor, we have a quorum present.”

APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA
Mayor Nicholson asked for a motion to approve the consent agenda.

Motion to approve the consent agenda was made by Johnny Williams, seconded by Betty Boles.

The Mayor asked, “Is there any discussion or corrections? All in favor raise your right hand. So moved.”

Motion passed unanimously.
Mayor Nicholson read the item and recognized Mr. Thomas Firriolo.

Recognize Mr. Thomas Firriolo of 303 Jennings Avenue.

THOMAS FIRRILOLO “Good evening! My name is Thomas Firriolo. I think I’ve been in front of the Board approximately 18 months now in hopes that this City Council would consider my properties that seem dormant. Has the Council reached any verdict or decision as to the splitting of the OPI zoning?”

MAYOR NICHOLSON “I think that’s one item we have on the agenda today. Is that right, Mr. Brown?”

STEVEN BROWN “Yes, sir.”

MAYOR NICHOLSON “As we stated earlier, we were waiting until we finalized changing OPI and other zoning changes in our ordinance. The request will be on the agenda today.”

THOMAS FIRRILOLO “So you’re going to vote on that item this evening?”

MAYOR NICHOLSON “Yes, sir.”

THOMAS FIRRILOLO “Well, may I come back after the vote?”

MAYOR NICHOLSON “No, sir.”

THOMAS FIRRILOLO “Did you all receive a copy of a letter dated February 22nd?”

MAYOR NICHOLSON “Yes, sir, I did.”

THOMAS FIRRILOLO “But I’m not allowed two or three minutes to approach the Council after your vote?”

MAYOR NICHOLSON “Well, after the vote today we must have second reading. If you’d like to request to speak, you can.”

THOMAS FIRRILOLO “Yes, sir. Thank you.”
CONSIDER

Ordinance No. 08-006 Amending Ordinance No. 03-010, Zoning Ordinance, Chapter 6, Supplemental Regulations, Article 3, Animated Signs.

(1st reading)

Under Public Hearings Mayor Nicholson said, “The format that we employ in the public hearings is that we ask that you come to the podium, state your name and address for the record, whether you’re a resident of the City or County of Greenwood, and try to limit your comments to no more than four or five minutes.”

The Mayor then read the first item and recognized the City Manager.

STEVEN BROWN

“Mr. Mayor and Council, I’ll ask Phil to do that for you.”

PHIL LINDLER

“Thank you, Mr. Mayor and Members of Council. This is a request by the Planning Commission to revise certain standards within the City Zoning Ordinance that deals with electronic reader boards or automatic changeable copy boards. We use those terms interchangeably. They are the signs that are used electronically in order to display a message. Typically, they’re in use such as marquis signs where you have individual letters that are changed out, but this is done electronically.

The amendment that is before you tonight basically has five items that are deviating from what your current standards are. The proposal looks at the time between transitions, animation, maintenance, temporary signs with electronic reader boards and the location. The proposal would allow a modification to the time between transitions from 60 seconds to 15 seconds for commercial areas. For animation, it would deviate from currently no animation to the allowance of animated graphics as a background for text in commercial areas. It does provide for maintenance requirements, programming and light sources. There is also a stipulation in the proposal that would allow for electronic reader boards as long as any temporary signs were removed from the site. There is a location modification where it’s currently only limited to General Commercial, Core Commercial, Light Industrial, and Warehouse with Heavy Industrial that will be allowed for religious, public and educational uses in residential areas that are subject to conditions. Thank you.”
MAYOR NICHOLSON  “Okay. Thank you, Phil. Alright, first, is there anyone here to speak in favor of the ordinance?”

TRACY TERRELL  “Mr. Mayor and Council, my name is Tracy Terrell of 601 North Street. I’m in favor of the ordinance; however, the time period that you put this together, it just came to my attention that the Planning Commission put a ban on temporary animated boards. In my situation at my dealership, I was not allowed to install a permanent board because of my franchise signs. I had to bring in a temporary board which, if you looked at it, you would think it was a permanent sign because of how we designed the base. I am able to move it from my new and used car lots to one of my other lots.

I’m in favor of the ordinance but they just threw in a loophole on me tonight. If the temporary sign ban is going to be an ordinance, I think we need to table this and talk about it a little more.”

STEVEN BROWN  “Mr. Mayor, I just found this out by talking to Tracy in the hall. He has a pole sign which is permitted under the City but his franchise holder, Chrysler, prohibits him from having a digital sign on their sign. Therefore, when he tried to get a second pole sign for the digital reader, our ordinance prohibited it. That is the reason why he has the portable sign. It’s not that he hasn’t tried to comply, but he’s got a unique situation. We’ve encountered franchise requirements previously. Do you remember the Fairfield Inn and the requirements on their signs? That’s similar but we did not know about it.”

TRACY TERRELL  “Yeah, along with the temporary sign, I do get my permit every 90 days like I’m supposed to.”

NIKI HUTTO  “Weren’t we more concerned about temporary signage that wasn’t a high end, digitally attractive thing such as the unattractive paper, or am I misreading this?”

STEVEN BROWN  “One of the concerns is there are some people who have the portable, digital signs on wheels for rent. You can see it out at the food place on Highway 72. The thinking of Council was those were the type of signs that are beginning to show up all over town and will continue if you don’t put something in this ordinance to control it. It seems to me there ought to be a way that we can control the influx of those signs. However, he does have a unique problem that, at this time, we have not determined if there are any other businesses to consider.”

TRACY TERRELL  “For the record, I’m on the Festival of Flowers Board and I plan to bring my sign Uptown to help promote the City.”
MAYOR NICHOLSON  “Okay. Thank you, Mr. Terrell. Is there anyone else to speak in favor?”

WILLIAM CAIN  “Mr. Mayor and Board, I’m William Cain of 108 Rutledge Road. Approximately a year ago, some of the business owners in the area approached me to ask Council to open this issue. I work for the sign company that sold some of these units so I’m kind of a common thread.

An issue at the time was our current code which I guess you’d call a first draft. A couple of years ago these signs were so expensive that there weren’t a lot of them so there weren’t a lot of codes to regulate it. Well, the sign cost has come down and they’re a little more efficient and effective. We’ve decided to update our codes to kind of get close to some of our surrounding areas and give our local businesses an opportunity to be consecutive with the other areas.

We’ve been working on this with the Planning Commission for a year now and Mr. Lindler’s Office has put in a lot of time trying to coordinate with everyone. We got this proposal that we think is a good blend between protecting our County’s aesthetics and also getting our business owners what they need. Through this process, I have provided hundreds of research pages to address safety issues. The Federal Highway Administration in several States has done research and, obviously, they don’t think that the signs are a safety hazard. If you’re traveling on the interstate or see the local ‘minute’ displays now, they’re all using these signs. A lot of these studies actually found a decrease in accidents based on the fact that these are easier to read than the old style marquis we were used to seeing in front of the theater where there were a lot of numbers. Because these are a little easier to read, they were actually less of a hazard.

There’s only been one opposition to it. There were some research done on electronic billboards but I want to make it clear to Council that we’re by no means trying to change anything related to billboard codes only the EMC on our freestanding signs. There is also some research concerning flashing signs that we strictly prohibited in our proposal we wrote for Council.

We set up one of our demo signs which, unfortunately, were on a temporary sign trailer in front of Sports Break to show the Planning Commission and any Member of Council what we were proposing. There were no complaints from anyone countywide and the actual Planning Commission liked what we were trying to do.
I am in favor of the proposal that we presented. I do have a concern about some of the temporary sign issues for Mr. Terrell and any other situation. Mr. Terrell has been a lot of help and I’ve been trying to get this code worked out. I hate to see him penalized for trying to update our code with a newer version. Thank you.”

MAYOR NICHOLSON

“Thank you. By the way, Mr. Cain is with the Rainbow Neon Sign Company, Inc.

Okay. Is there anyone else to speak in favor of the ordinance? Is there anyone opposing?”

KATHY CONSTANT

“Well, I’m the one person that he referred to. At the last Planning Commission meeting, I kind of referred to myself as the ‘voice crying in the wilderness’. I am Kathy Constant and my address is 331 West Cambridge.”

Mrs. Constant then read a prepared statement.

- attach -

MAYOR NICHOLSON

“Thank you, Mrs. Constant. Is there anyone else to speak opposing the ordinance? Okay. Seeing and hearing none, we will close the Public Hearing. At this time, we will move into recommendation from Council.”

STEVEN BROWN

“I’d like to ask City Council to do a number of things. One would be to take first reading of this ordinance in title only. If you can set up a second public hearing at your next meeting, this will allow the City Attorney, Planning Director and Mr. Terrell, along with some of the others who have worked on this, to possibly develop some minor changes to the ordinance that will address some of the issues such as franchise guidelines. We will then be able to give you some information to address these concerns.

The reason I’m asking you to accept this in title only is I hate to delay this matter another 30 days. If you don’t like our recommended changes next month, you can adopt the ordinance as it is. However, this will give us some time to address these issues.”

MAYOR NICHOLSON

“Okay. You’ve heard the recommendation coming from the City Manager. Do I have a motion?”

Motion was made by Johnny Williams, seconded by Niki Hutto to adopt the ordinance in title only.
LINDA EDWARDS  “Are we going to discuss this in work session?”

MAYOR NICHOLSON  “Yes.”

LINDA EDWARDS  “I’d like to know why they wanted the time shortened because I couldn’t remember.”

MAYOR NICHOLSON  “Okay. We’ll discuss this in the work session because there are some other things they must work out. Are there any other questions? All in favor raise your right hand. Opposed? 6-1, the motion passed.”

Mayor Nicholson, Niki Hutto, Linda Edwards, Betty Boles, Herbert Vaughn, and Johnny Williams voted in favor of the request. Barbara Turnburke voted against.

The motion passed.
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CONSIDER

Ordinance No. 08-007 Amending Ordinance No. 03-010, Zoning Ordinance, Chapter 3, Zoning Districts and Boundaries, Table 3-1, Zoning District Use Matrix, Section 3.3.1.1. Uses Permitted in All Commercial Districts; Section 34.3.2.1. Additional Uses Permitted in NC; Section 3.3.3. OP-Office Professional; Section 3.3.3.1. Additional Uses Permitted in IP; Section 3.3.3.2. Additional Conditional Uses Allowed in OP; Section 3.3.3.3. Additional Special Exceptions Allowed in OP; Section 3.3.3.4. Additional Accessory Uses Allowed in OP; Section 3.3.4.1. Additional Uses Permitted in GC; Section 3.3.5.1. Additional Uses Permitted in CC; Section 3.3.6. IP - Institutional Professional; Section 3.3.6.1. Additional Uses Permitted in IP; Section 3.3.6.2. Additional Conditional Uses Allowed in IP; Section 3.3.6.3. Special Exceptions Allowed in IP; 3.3.6.4. Accessory Uses Allowed in IP; Chapter 5, Article 2 Lot Size, Density, Setback, Height, and Building Spacing; Table 5.1. Development Standards; Table 5.3. Open Space and Impervious Surface; Table 5.4. Bufferyard Requirements; Chapter 6, Article 3. Sign Regulations; Section 6.3.10.3. Signs Permitted in the OP And IP Districts; Article 5; Communications Towers; Table 6.6. Districts Permitted, Conditions and Height.

(1st reading)
PHIL LINDLER

"Thank you again, Mr. Mayor and Members of Council. The modification of your OPI Zoning District by breaking it up to OP (Office Professional) and IP (Institutional Professional) is a request that we’ve talked about for some time. One of the two distinct zoning districts, Office Professional, will take the retail portion out of the mix. The institutional component will permit everything in Office Professional but will allow for large skill and institutional uses such as universities, colleges, hospitals, and large assisted living quarters as well.

I apologize for the length of the public hearing requirement. Once you modify one zoning district then you have to add those components throughout the rest of the zoning districts and the zoning ordinance itself dealing with everything from cellular towers, signs and everything in between. That’s basically the jest of what we’re doing tonight. Thank you."

MAYOR NICHOLSON

"Okay. Thank you, Phil. Is there anyone to speak in favor of the zoning change? Is there anyone opposing?"

THOMAS FIRRIOLO

“I’m in favor of splitting OPI to OP and IP if that’s what you’re considering, particularly in the areas of East Cambridge that I’m involved in. That is certainly going to evaluate everyone’s property. Long before I became a citizen of this wonderful community of Greenwood, Cambridge Avenue was the Main Street when we had approximately five railroads. So, my vision continues to be Cambridge Avenue with its magnificent homes that could be flourishing businesses and add to our economy.

That was my vision of Five Flags Over Greenwood. Bringing businesses into Greenwood would clearly overcome the recession and truly evaluate these magnificent homes properly. These homes are selling very, very inexpensively. Most of these homes, because of the square footage, are used for triplexes to sixplexes.

I feel very strongly that the effort this City
Council would bring the community at large by opening up the door for businesses will eliminate a lot of the transient apartments to be stores and shops. For example, one of my properties happens to be shy of 2½ acres. I visualize the acreage to be suited for a new police command station because it’s in the East and West Cambridge area. It could be a fire station, medical or assisted living complex, and a nursing home. We have a nursing home directly across the street from my property that I believe started in 1974 when they demolished the historical home. Many professionals could be there or a branch hospital, for example. I’ve even had visions of a public relations substation for police to assist in the costs. In larger cities, substations are very effective, cost wise.

For example, 543 is a very large lot. Both of these properties are backed against the railroad which has served our community. We should continue to hang on to this railroad because it is the only one we have. That railroad could be revitalized and bring more businesses on Cambridge Avenue. Even though I was denied by this Council on numerous occasions over the concept of Five Flags over Greenwood, the five flags represented different states. I felt very strongly that we could bring in people from North Carolina, Georgia and even Florida because we have a lot of historical areas.

Anyway, I’m for the consideration of rezoning this area, not only because of my property, but it will open the doors for many entrepreneurs to utilize these magnificent homes. It will evaluate everyone’s property rather than building a parking complex to aid more apartments on Cambridge Avenue. Thank you for the opportunity of approaching Council.”

“Thank you, Mr. Firriolo. Is there anyone else to speak in favor of, or opposing, the ordinance change? Alright, seeing and hearing none, we will close the public hearing.

Mr. Brown do you have any recommendations?”

“I have some questions for Council. Will you
consider reducing the acreage requirements for a Bed & Breakfast to .75 acre? If the acreage is not reduced, I believe it will virtually eliminate Bed & Breakfast use. The type of structures that lend themselves to that use are usually not located on large lots.”

NIKI HUTTO  “Which would be basically 3/4 of an acre?”

STEVEN BROWN  “The minimum would be .75 acre because a one acre tract will be difficult to get in the City.”

NIKI HUTTO  “I don’t think there’s anything in the immediate area that has a one acre tract.”

STEVEN BROWN  “Well, I guess my question is do you want this to happen? If you wanted to control bed and breakfasts and limit its use, probably one acre is one way to do it.”

BETTY BOLES  “I think that was the original purpose for doing it the first time.”

STEVEN BROWN  “Was it to encourage or discourage it?”

BETTY BOLES  “Discourage it.”

NIKI HUTTO  “No, I thought we wanted to encourage it but not make it intrusive on the residents. If you had a small piece of land with three cars for three guests, how will that affect the neighbors next door? So basically, 3/4 of an acre is a good size piece of property in that area. You’re looking at a significantly sized lot.”

STEVEN BROWN  “The Grace Street Property is a little over a quarter of an acre so that gives you an idea of where I’m going. The other question I have is also in the Bed and Breakfast section. We talked about parking being an unpaved surface. I’ll ask that you consider inserting ‘any unpaved pervious...’ and consider some language similar to ‘as approved by the City Engineer...’ We just didn’t want any kind of surface there. In conjunction with that, I would ask if it was your intention under Business, General Services and Office Buildings that parking could also be unpaved and located in the rear.”
NIKI HUTTO  “It could be, but I think we need design standards for the unpaved surface so that it won’t become weeded. It should be edged and cornered so some design standards should go along with those guidelines.”

STEVEN BROWN  “My question is, you stated unpaved parking for bed and breakfasts. In the same section, you have general business and office but do not state unpaved parking. I think we would interpret that the only allowed unpaved parking would be at a bed and breakfast. Therefore, if Council wants the facilities in OP to be an unpaved, pervious, parking lot, we need to state it in the ordinance. You would say a bed and breakfast would have an unpaved surface but the office must be paved. So would you insert language stating it can be an unpaved, pervious surface approved by the City Engineer?”

JOHNNY WILLIAMS  “I was under the impression that we wanted to leave as much as possible unpaved because of water runoff.”

STEVEN BROWN  “Well, yes sir.”

JOHNNY WILLIAMS  “That’s what I was thinking.”

STEVEN BROWN  “The only other concern is about organizations in institutional zones leasing or renting their property for outdoor events, concerts, and things of that nature. I am concerned with the school district building all of these new schools while Southside, Mathews and all these different schools will eventually be vacated in the middle of these communities. What is the standard, Phil, that protects those surroundings residential properties from schools, or whomever, leasing these properties on Saturdays and Sundays for long periods of time that may disturb the neighborhood such as the problems we’ve had at Brewer?”

PHIL LINDLER  “There are no changes to any of those things for outdoor events. Right now, we have two different standards. One is for concerts and stage shows and the other are for outdoor religious events. In this proposal, there are no modifications from what you currently have for concerts and stage shows.

You must have parking for such events and the
permit is issued for no more than five consecutive days. There will be no more than five permits issued per calendar year. Therefore, that’s up to 25 days on one location that can run straight through or spread throughout the year.

Like I said, you must have adequate parking and sanitary facilities to serve for the proposed use or activity as granted by the City Police Department. For outdoor religious events, the same thing applies there but the permit can be issued for no more than 14 consecutive days and no more than three permits issued per property.”

“Is City Council willing to entertain consideration of some language that would require events which are of the non-public type to provide their own security as a condition of us issuing a permit? It’s getting to a point that more people want to do things. If you notice, the ordinance stipulates that these types of events can be held for so many consecutive days, three and four times a year. As these events continue to happen in Greenwood, we see ourselves having to police programs which will generate money for other institutions. All I’m asking is that security must be provided by the person requesting it to issue those permits. I’m trying to differentiate between a public event and a non-public event.”

“Can you just be more specific? What are you talking about?”

“It could be an individual, a group of individuals, a club, or organization that wants to hold an event.”

“What about a motorcycle show?”

“If a school is having a football game, that’s a public event but a lot of people are renting the facilities now. It may be churches or any kind of organization and we’re required, as a City, to provide security to these events. It stretches us to where we often times have to pay overtime to get these events covered.

All I’m saying is, as these facilities become
available, you’re going to have more of these situations. I’m not against anyone. I’m just trying to make sure we have personnel to do what you want us to do and not having to call people who are off duty to police an event that is generating funds for some other organization.”

MAYOR NICHOLSON

“So the only thing you’re saying is that they be able to provide their own security during the event?”

STEVEN BROWN

“Yes, sir. If they want to pay for our police officers, some other police organization or hire some security personnel that it be a part of the requirement. This ordinance has the language that gives us the right to ask them to do so. I’m just concerned.”

JOHNNY WILLIAMS

“I agree with you because more and more schools are beginning to rent their auditoriums for different things and you can’t police them all.”

NIKI HUTTO

“Do we have insurance liability requirements for those applying for permits?”

STEVEN BROWN

“Well, who ever rents the facility would have the liability.”

BETTY BOLES

“Would they need a permit for an inside concert?”

STEVEN BROWN

“These are basically outside. If we can insert some language for your next reading, we would like for you to consider it. That’s all I have.”

MAYOR NICHOLSON

“Alright. You have your recommendation coming from the City Manager. Do I have a motion?”

Motion to accept the recommendation from the City Manager was made by Johnny Williams, seconded by Niki Hutto.

“Are there any questions? All in favor raise your right hand. So moved.”

Motion passed unanimously.

- attach -
“We will have a second reading since we’re making some changes. There will be a public hearing before the second reading next month also.”

CONSIDER

Ordinance No. 08-004 Amending the City of Greenwood’s Official Zoning Map (Ordinance No. 04-020) by Rezoning Property Located at 610 Calhoun Avenue from R4 (Residential – Medium Density) to R7 (Residential – High Density).

(2nd reading)

Under unfinished business, Mayor Nicholson read the first item and asked for a motion.

A motion to approve was made by Niki Hutto, seconded by Barbara Turnburke.

“Is there any discussion? All in favor raise your right hand. So moved.”

Motion passed unanimously.

- attach -

CONSIDER

Under New Business, Mayor Nicholson read the first item and recognized the City Manager.

Contract for Artistic Director of Live After Five Programs.

STEVEN BROWN

“Mr. Mayor and City Council, our recommendation tonight is that you authorize us to sign an agreement with Mr. Hack Bartley as the Artistic Director for the Live After Five programs. He will basically be doing our bookings for the bands and entertainers. The terms of the contract are before you. We’re also asking that you allow us to expend a maximum of $20,000 of hospitality funds to pay for this program.”
MAYOR NICHOLSON "Okay. You heard the recommendation coming from the City Manager for the Live After Five program that starts in April and runs through October. This has really been a success for Uptown. Do I have a motion?"

Motion was made by Betty Boles, seconded by Niki Hutto.

"Is there any discussion? All in favor raise your right hand. So moved."

The motion passed unanimously.

CONSIDER Mayor Nicholson read the second item and recognized the Assistant City Manager.

The Acceptance of Bids and Allocation of Funding for the Uptown Phase II Enhancement Project.

CHARLIE BARRINEAU "Mr. Mayor and Members of Council, we advertised a bid for Uptown Phase II, which is the project to install crosswalks at Main and Maxwell, Main and Oak, and Main and Court. As you recall, one of the key highlights of the master plan of the City Center was to provide for these crosswalks to make Uptown more user friendly, particularly between the eastern and western sides of the square. We received three bids and the high bid was $396,900. The low bid of $293,774 was presented by Chandler Construction in Greenwood. We received a State DOT Enhancement Grant for $200,000 and you have allocated $50,000 in Hospitality Taxes. At this point, we have almost expended $50,000 to handle the engineering for this project.

It seems like a simple project but it’s very complex. If you can imagine, we will really have to do some unique traffic control to do this construction of downtown. We think it’s a large part of the overage expense that came forth in the bids. To complete the project as shown, we would need an additional $100,000 from City Council out of the Hospitality Tax.

We provided you the numbers that show those monies are
available through the end of this year, if Council is willing to allocate them.

I did offer you an option if you didn’t want to expend those funds by removing Oak Street from the project. There is an existing pedestrian countdown with a marked median. However, our proposal would be to put in the matching pedestrian countdown lights and decorative crosswalks to match the three intersections. So again it’s totally up to the consideration of City Council.

This project will begin after Main Street is resurfaced which is scheduled to be the first of March. I hope this could begin in the first of April and it’ll take approximately 60 days. I’ll be happy to answer any questions.”

MAYOR NICHOLSON  “Is there much pedestrian traffic at the Oak crosswalk?”

CHARLIE BARRINEAU  “Right now with the countdown, it’s the number one pedestrian crossing. But we see more use of the crossing from Main and Maxwell when we have events at the Theatre and Federal Building. During the Live After Five and when the Inn on the Square has events, it’ll be the other crossing.”

BETTY BOLES  “What difference does it make?”

CHARLIE BARRINEAU  “It depends on where the event is placed. During the Boo Bash and the Festival of Discovery, I would say the Oak Crossing is the number one crosswalk.”

BETTY BOLES  “How much would it offset the costs?”

CHARLIE BARRINEAU  “I can’t tell you at this time. My guess would be only $25,000.”

MAYOR NICHOLSON  “Alright. We’ve heard the request coming from Mr. Barrineau. Do I have a motion?”

Motion was made by Johnny Williams, seconded by Niki Hutto.

“Are there any questions or discussion? All in favor raise your right hand. So moved.”

The motion passed unanimously.
Mayor Nicholson said, “The Work Session is next Monday. Charlie and I will be at a conference.”

“Mr. Mayor, I have reserved that day for a possible hearing on the suspension of a business license.”

“Yes. Have you heard any more from that?”

“I have, but they have the freedom to appear before you. We gave them that date and hopefully everything will be worked out during the early part of this week. Phil, what do you think?”

“I haven’t checked with anyone.”

“We’re trying to get it worked out but, if for some reason either party does not accept the negotiation, then the hearing will be held before you next Monday.”

“Okay. Work Session will be next Monday.”

There were no comments from the City Manager or staff at this time.

Mayor Nicholson asked, “Do I have a motion that we adjourn?”

Motion was made by Barbara Turnburke.

The meeting adjourned at 6:22 p.m.

Floyd Nicholson, Mayor

ATTEST:

City Clerk and Treasurer