PRESCOTT CITY COUNCIL
COUNCIL STUDY SESSION
PRESCOTT, ARIZONA
APRIL 4, 2006

A STUDY SESSION OF THE PRESCOTT CITY COUNCIL WAS HELD ON TUESDAY, APRIL 4, 2006, in the Prescott Municipal Building, 201 S. Cortez Street, Prescott, Arizona.

Mayor Simmons opened the meeting at 3:00 P.M. and asked City Clerk Elizabeth Burke to call the roll, which was as follows:

Present:	Absent:
Mayor Simmons	Councilwoman Suttles (excused)
Councilman Bell	
Councilman Blair	
Councilman Lamerson	
Councilman Luzius	
Councilman Roecker	

- SUMMARY OF CURRENT OR RECENT EVENTS

Mayor Simmons announced he had a commitment from Administrative Services Director Mic Fenech that the sound system would work properly today and there would be no more trouble with it.

Councilman Blair announced the opening ceremonies for Prescott Little League was Saturday at 11:00 A.M. at Bill Vallely Field.

I. PROCLAMATIONS

A. April 7, 2006 - Teen Challenge of Prescott Day

Councilman Roecker read the proclamation and presented it to Willie Sotomayor. Mr. Sotomayor thanked everyone and appreciated the proclamation.

B. April 3-9, 2006 - Prescott Tartan Week

Councilman Luzius read the proclamation and presented it to the Scots of Prescott.

The group thanked the Mayor and Council for the proclamation and invited everyone to the Prescott Highland Games at Loch Watson on Saturday, May 13.

II. PRESENTATION

A. Presentation on formulation of a planned growth strategy for the City of Prescott.

Public Works Director Craig McConnell explained a planned growth strategy:

- would give the city the capacity to grow and continue to do so;
- would be growth management and not growth limitation;
- provided information not currently available to base decisions on;
- would coordinate transportation and other public infrastructure investments with land use decisions.

Prescott needed to:

- coordinate with Prescott Valley and Chino Valley on the most efficient service provision and land use compatibility while each community maintained their individual character;
- maintain levels of service within the existing built up areas through balanced residential and commercial growth as well as control traffic congestion and service deficiencies on the fringe;
- develop more detailed land use plans, policies and financing mechanisms;
- focus on transportation and utility infrastructure;
- look at areas of traffic congestion and design ways to move traffic more efficiently.

Council priorities for 2006 –

Top priorities were:

- Long term water policy and safe yield;
- Sewer extension policy into undeveloped lands;
- Annexation of the Point of Rocks/Granite Dells Ranches;
- 2030 CYMPO Regional Transportation Plan.

High priorities were:

- Comprehensive growth-management study;
- Annexation of Storm Ranch.

Mr. McConnell said that Dr. Robert H. Freilich, Special Land Use Counsel, had reviewed all the General Plans of the quad-cities, the CYMPO 2030 study, water model population estimates and capital needs, and discussions with city/town officials, a report was provided with the findings and suggestions for pursuing a planned growth strategy.

Action Plan Steps for creating and implementing a planned growth strategy. Key steps included:

1. Retaining a growth management expert to craft the project objectives and scope for Council approval.
2. Forming a technical advisory committee (mostly current City personnel)
3. Soliciting proposals for a team encompassing the areas/expert members indicated on the attached organization chart.
4. Budgeting for the project in the upcoming fiscal year (FY-07).
5. Contracting with the selected team leader/firm.
6. Forming a steering committee of objective community leaders, experts, and stakeholders.
7. Formulating alternatives for land use/growth patterns, mobility, management tools, and regional coordination.
8. Selecting alternatives and tools to manage the location, timing, and financing of future growth at specified planning horizons, primarily through transportation and utilities infrastructure availability.
9. Amending General Plan, City Code, etc., as necessary for implementation and consistency.
10. Deploying growth management tools.
11. Monitoring effectiveness and adjust tools/policies.

The report suggested:

- buying property now that would be needed for future multi-modal transportation projects.
- building commercial property first and then the homes around it, instead of the other way around, such as the village center concept.
- Different plans were needed for each area of the community, as each was very different. A plan for the airport area would not be appropriate for the downtown area, and vice versa.

Council suggested putting a team of staff members together to decide how the city would finance road, water and sewer projects and staffing and budget needs needed to be discussed as well. There was only a certain amount of water available to distribute to growth and a growth management plan was essential.

Paul Cloke, 1713 State Street, disagreed with planned growth development being based on the growth rate of the population and stated the math in the General Plan was incorrect.

III. DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. Public Hearing (April 11) on Liquor License Application No. 12133330 for a Series 12, Restaurant License for Sophie Duran Brambila, Agent for Brambila Trust Restaurant, L.L.C., for El Chaparral located at 628 Miller Valley Road.

City Clerk Elizabeth Burke explained the Public Hearing would be held April 11 for the liquor license for El Chaparral.

B. Application to the Governor's Office of Highway Safety for FY2007 grant funds in the amount of $41,500.00 for the continued operation of the Northern Arizona DUI Task Force.

Police Chief Randy Oaks explained the city was the administrator of the funds for the Northern Arizona DUI Task Force and the FY2007 application for $41,500 was due by April 3; the funds would be used for overtime and aggressive driving enforcement and for the purchase of two new radar units and additional breath alcohol testing equipment.

C. Application to the Arizona Community Foundation "2006 Canines in Law Enforcement Grant Program" in the amount of $10,000.00 for the purchase, maintenance, care and training of a police canine.

Police Chief Randy Oaks explained the request was to purchase a second canine for illegal drug searches, patrol, tracking and search and rescue operation and the funds would be used for the maintenance, care and training as well; a second dog was requested to allow the first dog and handler a rest from having to respond to every call-out.

D. Adopt Resolution No. 3747 – A resolution of the Mayor and Council of the City of Prescott, Yavapai County, Arizona, supporting the efforts of law enforcement to designate State Route 69 as a Traffic Safety Zone and authorizing law enforcement agencies with jurisdiction along the S.R. 69 Corridor to solicit the Arizona Department of Transportation, on behalf of the Prescott City Council, to place signs along the S.R. 69 Corridor declaring it a "Traffic Safety Zone – Zero Tolerance."

Police Chief Randy Oaks explained the resolution would show Council support for the designation of State Route 69 as a Traffic Safety Zone and to request Arizona Department of Transportation put up signs declaring zero tolerance for speeding; all local law enforcement agencies met recently and decided to divide the highway up and assign responsibilities for various sections of the roadway.

E. Adopt Resolution No. 3748 – A resolution of the Mayor and Council of the City of Prescott, Yavapai County, Arizona accepting a grant

from ADOT Aeronautics in the amount of $148,500.00 for airport lighting improvements at Ernest A. Love Field. (Grant No. E6S08)

Airport Manager Rick Severson explained Arizona Department of Transportation, Aeronautics Division would fund 90% of the project to remove the rotating beacon and tower and relocate it closer to the hangars; the beacon was put up in the 1950s, and now illuminates the yards of nearby homes causing complaints from the residents; new beacons and towers were designed for reliability, safety and ease of maintenance and the City share of the $165,000 was $16,500.

F. Approve Water Service Agreement with John and Janie Beck for a six-unit apartment building located at 629 Dameron, allocating 2.1 acre feet annually.

Management Analyst Connie Tucker explained the project met all codes; the property was zoned multi-family; this had been reviewed by the Development Review Committee and 2.1 acre feet would be allocated out of the water budget for this project.

G. Adopt Resolution No. 3749 – A resolution of the Mayor and Council of the City of Prescott, Yavapai County, Arizona accepting a grant from the Federal Historic Preservation Fund Certified Local Government Pass Through program in the amount of $9,160.00, approving a Participant Agreement with the State of Arizona for 60% of the pre-conference planning costs for the June 2007 Statewide Historic Preservation Partnership Conference to be held in Prescott.

Assistant Community Services Director George Worley explained this was a pass-through grant to host the Statewide Historic Preservation Partnership Conference to be held June 2007 in Prescott; the funds are available to those cities designated Certified Local Governments as Prescott has been since January 3, 1986; the City share is a 40% match or $6,106 and the grant will provide 60% or $9,160.

H. Adopt Ordinance No. 4534 – An ordinance of the Mayor and Council of the City of Prescott, Yavapai County, Arizona accepting the dedication of certain right-of-way within the Cloudstone Development at South Blooming Hills Drive as a public roadway.

Engineering Services Director Mark Nietupski explained Ordinance No. 4534 will dedicate right-of-way within the Cloudstone Subdivision; a development agreement with Goodman/Savage defined the responsibilities for dedication and construction of South Blooming Hills Drive from Rosser Street south through Cliff Rose and Cloudstone Subdivisions.; Canavest Holdings, LLC was the current owner of the property and dedicating the right-of-way.

I. Final Plat for Pinnacle IV at Prescott Lakes, comprising 95 lots on approximately 36.25 acres, located generally east of the southern portion of Trail Walk, FP05-014.

Assistant Community Services Director George Worley explained the property was previously preliminary platted as the Anasazi Subdivision and The Pinnacle Unit III at Prescott Lakes; the final plat was based on the original master plan which allowed for movement of lots/units provided the total number of lots or the exterior boundary were not increased; the plat met all code requirements for lot sizes; Trail Walk would connect with Solstice Street to provide the connection from Willow Lake Road to Smoke Tree Lane.

Council asked if the water allocation had changed and Mr. Worley clarified it was below what was originally anticipated. He said that 2,718 units were originally proposed and currently total projected buildout was proposed to be 2,235 units - and had a pre-1998 water allocation.

J. Preliminary Plat for Estancia Estates, consisting of 5 lots on 4.9 acres, located on Brillante Lane near East Soaring Way, and associated Water Service Agreement in the amount of 1.75 ac. ft., SP05-013.

Assistant Community Services Director George Worley explained the plat consisted of 5 unusually shaped lots on 4.98 acres with access through the existing Estancia de Prescott Subdivision; a connection would be established on the east side for future development; the developer was requesting a waiver of the minimum lot width requirements in the Land Development Code for Lots 2 and 4 which were triangular shaped lots.

It was clarified the homes would have fire sprinkler systems and the property was within the Willow Lake South Area Plan.

K. Purchase and installation of an Uninterruptible Power Supply from Gruber Power Services for $26,732.00 plus tax, shipping and permits.

Budget and Finance Director Mark Woodfill explained the City computer network serviced 37 facilities with over 450 users and encompassed 50 applications which included utility billing, financials, building permits, geographical information systems, assets management, payroll, public safety, project management and the City's website; there were only two primary server farms that housed 78 servers and were located in two separate geographic locations to provide backup and redundancy to the City's critical operations; both facilities had emergency generators and one had an uninterruptible power supply; the facility without the UPS experienced a power outage of less than 5 minutes several months ago that caused data contamination that took over three months to resolve and a direct

cost of over $18,000 and the figures did not include the lost productivity by employees; the funds would come from the Facilities Maintenance budget.

L. Award a contract to Olsson Associates, for engineering design services for the Rosser Street Improvement Project, Phase I, Willow Creek Road to Campbell Avenue, in the amount of $149,245.00.

Engineering Services Director Mark Nietupski explained the contract was Phase I of the design for water and sewer upgrades to be included in the reconstruction of Rosser Street from Willow Creek Road to Campbell Avenue; traffic calming would be accomplished by narrowing the pavement in the amount of the sidewalk width with parking allowed on the south side only in a striped aisle similar to South Mount Vernon Avenue; and the project would be completed within six months after the notice to proceed was issued.

M. Adopt Ordinance No. 4535 – An ordinance of the Mayor and Council of the City of Prescott, Yavapai County, Arizona amending Title II, Chapter 1, Section 12, Subsection (A) of the Prescott City Code to prohibit the installation of city water meters to irrigate undeveloped land; and declaring an emergency.

Ranch Project Manager Jim Holt explained there were a number of meters requested for parcels where there was no structure erected or building permit requested and this was not a wise use of the City's water supply and irrigation meters would only be considered for land with a developed plan; the emergency clause was requested to make it effective immediately; the intent was that native landscape and trees had existed long before man bought the property and did not need to be watered; irrigation was not an appropriate use of the city's potable water supply;

Councilman Blair did not agree with being denied an irrigation meter for a vacant lot with no development plans and Councilman Lamerson supported the ordinance saying until effluent could be delivered for irrigation purposes, potable water should not be used and irrigation meters should not be issued.

Mr. Holt clarified:

- the ordinance applied to new meter requests and those in existence were grandfathered in;
- a resident would switch over from an irrigation meter to a domestic meter when the property was built on;
- a domestic water meter size was based on number of fixtures; an irrigation meter was charged the impact fee, not a buy-in fee;
- the ordinance would prevent any meter on an undeveloped lot.

Steve Morgan, 1885 Arrowhead Drive, member of the Water Conservation Committee made the point that the problem was the ponderosa pines were too dense in the forests and took a lot of water to survive and if the pines were thinned it would save water as well as having healthier trees.

Councilman Blair asked to see figures on how much undeveloped land was being irrigated and Management Analyst Connie Tucker replied the percentage was not available as the uses of issued irrigation meter were not categorized.

N. Adopt Ordinance No. 4536 - An ordinance of the Mayor and Council of the City of Prescott, Yavapai County, Arizona amending Title III, Building Regulations, Chapter 10, Water Conservation Code, Section 12: Time of Day-Outdoor Watering Restrictions; and declaring an emergency.

Ranch Project Manager Jim Holt explained Ordinance No. 4536 would limit the outdoor watering period to between 8:00 P.M. and 8:00 A.M., April 15 through November 1; the Water Conservation Committee supported this action; the Committee had suggested removing the word “potable” from the ordinance and to changed Section 3 (v) to say “special” events, but staff was requesting those changes not be made.

Councilman Luzius attempted to make points about blunders he thought the city had made over the years selling the Central Arizona Project water, building a pipeline that could deliver 16 million gallons per day but allowing ERAU and other subdivisions to tap into it; losing 7.55% of water between the point of provision and point of delivery, and using 7% for irrigation. Mayor Simmons explained those points had nothing to do with time of day watering restrictions and this conservation measure should not be delayed.

Jack Wilson, 1514 Eagle Ridge Road, asked if there should be any conflict between using potable water or effluent; that effluent used on golf courses had contracts and Attorney Gary Kidd responded the ordinance would not override a contract and there was no conflict.

Ed Parry, 228 Park Avenue, commented there were two ordinances and a perception of not letting people know; there were some lots that had houses on them and they had irrigation meters and some houses that had gardens and if they wanted an irrigation meter they couldn’t get it and asked if that was correct.

It was clarified the home could not get an irrigation meter.

O. Implementation of treatment for compliance with the new EPA standard for arsenic in drinking water -

1. Implementation of the Action Plan to design, permit, and construct arsenic treatment at the Chino Valley Water Production Facility;

Public Works Director Craig McConnell explained the City was mandated to provide water to its customers that contained arsenic levels of less than 10 parts per billion (pbb) and the deadline was December 31, 2007; Resolution No. 3727 was adopted showing the City's intent to the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ); the City would be using the Construction Manager at Risk method to build the arsenic facility at the Chino Valley Water Production Facility.

The key actions to take next week were to approve two contracts, one to Damon S. Williams Associates for additional design services and preparation of packages for advanced procurement of long leadtime items and the second contract to PinnacleOne for design phase project management services.

Councilman Blair asked how the water from the two new wells being drilled at the Airport would be treated if it contained arsenic and Mr. McConnell responded all indications were the wells would produce water that would not need to be treated for arsenic; if that was not the case, arsenic treatment would have to occur at the airport and there were various options for treating the water.

Speaker:

Paul Cloke, 1713 State Street – There were alternative ways of treating water and was not convinced the City had chosen the best method of taking arsenic out of the water. He was aware of a company in Bernalillo, New Mexico that had built a filtration plant for $2-$3 million and it handled one million gallons of water per day, reduced the arsenic level from 15-20 ppb down to 5-8 ppb; if multiplied out to 2 wells it would cost approximately $9.4 million to treat the two wells; if treated 12 million gallons per day would cost about $14 million total investment; the waste was small in volume like sludge and the arsenic level was below the EPA level for calling it hazardous waste; he suggested sending someone to New Mexico to evaluate their plant and a delay of a week or so in approval of these items would not delay the project.

Public Works Director Craig McConnell appreciated Mr. Cloke's remarks and he was aware of the facility; the City did an arsenic analysis and pilot test run a year ago that looked at all available technologies; the arsenic treatment was a Federal mandate and the compliance deadline was the end of 2007. He clarified the City was not suggesting a reverse osmosis facility but rather a coagulation filtration system; the time for discussion of alternatives had long passed.

Mr. Cloke responded it seemed worth looking into saving between $7 to $14 million dollars.

2. Approve **Supplemental Agreement No. 2** to Contract #04-273 with DSWA (Damon S. Williams Associates) in the amount of $254,890.00 for additional design services and preparation of packages for advanced procurement of long leadtime items; and

3. Award contract with PinnacleOne, Inc., in the amount of $227,000.00 for **design phase project management services**.

P. Discuss North Prescott area sewer improvement options.

Public Works Director Craig McConnell explained the project was part of Council and management 2006 priority of extending the sewer system and how to finance and operate the sewer systems; staff was directed to prepare a survey of interest of the property owners and that was sent out in December, 2005; 26% supported the district, 31% were opposed, 43% were undecided or did not respond. When the sewer district was proposed, excluding on-lot work, buy-in fees or hookups, the estimated cost was $4.2 million or $10,500. The projected costs were now around $6 million and that amount would be put in FY2007 budget if Council wished to proceed with the project; the goal was to provide city sewer service and the goal was a policy issue as it had implications for existing and future city sewer customers who pay rates into the sewer fund.

Mr. McConnell explained there were three (3) alternatives:

- 1) Improvement District.

  a. Formal process.
  b. Number of opportunities for a property owner to object or protest being in the district.
  c. Proceed with 30% engineering and refine estimate and then adopt a Resolution of Intention.
  d. If majority support the district, the final design would be completed.
  e. If still had majority support, improvements would be built and each property owner would be assessed his system cost share.
  f. The hookup and on lot work and monthly service charge could be deferred if immediate connection was not mandatory.
  g. Two options – mandatory connections as soon as available or let property owner decide when they want to hook up.

- 2) Reimbursement District –

a. Complete design, arrange bond financing, create reimbursement district, put in the improvements.
b. Not mandatory to connect; would be up to individual property owner.
c. Would pay cash, not have option of multiyear financing; would be at municipal rate.
d. Hookups and on-lot work would be property owner's responsibility.

Two types of reimbursement districts – one privately initiated; other publicly initiated.

a. City reimbursement district – city creates boundary, city puts in sewer system, funds it, and decides if and when someone wants to hook up to it they have to pay the current cost of the capital investment with interest.
b. Property owner not under any obligation to connect unless septic tank failed, went to County Health Department to get a new septic tank permit and Health Dept would deny their request and they would have to connect to the sewer line at that time.
c. No end date to the district, when cost was repaid.

- 3) Full project costs paid from sewer fund –

a. Final design completed, project constructed
b. Current sewer fund didn't have $6 million in it and would have to finance by bonding.
c. Hook ups and on-lot work would be the responsibility of each property owner.
d. Impact on existing sewer customers because they would be fronting the capital for the project.

Council comments:

- It was important to get city water customers on to the sewer system and use the resources and credits in the future.
- Find out what Council was willing to do and step up and do it.
- Setting precedence.
- Some areas were in violation of ADEQ standards.
- Look at dividing the district to do the area with the greatest septic tank failures first.
- Would cost more to phase the project.

Speakers and the points made:

Bob Remp, 2206 Sandia Drive –

- Residents don't want an improvement district
- If City wants the effluent, the City should put in the sewer system and then the property owner would decide whether to connect.
- He wanted to make sure everyone had a say and he offered to hand carry a survey around to property owners after the costs were calculated.

Attorney Gary Kidd explained the City fronted the money for the design of the district system and if the district wasn't formed, the sewer fund would have to absorb the loss. If the district was formed the design costs became a part of the district costs.

Peter Buscaino, 2260 Alta Vista Place –

- Survey was not a true picture of what people wanted because some people voted yes based on the city paying part of the costs;
- On February 28 he appeared before Council saying he had heard that someone said a long time ago the city had promised to pay for some of the sewer costs and he had been trying to determine if that was correct or not; he had not received any response or phone call from city staff and had only met with delays;
- He presented a public records request and the City Attorney called him and discussed it and he would be coming in to see City Clerk staff tomorrow morning to look at the city records;
- There were seven subdivisions in this area annexed together in 1973;
- Suggested the city pay for the trunkline and the property owner pay for the hookup.

Paul Dunn, 2155 Nolte Drive –

- Sewer project was desirable and beneficial to the City.
- Estimated cost two years ago was $7,000-$8,000 per connection.
- New survey information estimated current cost at $14,000.
- Cap the cost for each residential hookup at some affordable figure if expect to get 50% plus 1 to support it.
- Many homeowners can't afford even deferred payments.

Mayor Simmons explained after the design and engineering were done, the project estimate was prepared and the district property owners were given a "not to exceed" amount for their share of the project costs; if bids came in higher than city estimates, the city would have to absorb the difference or not proceed with the district.

Howard Mechanic, 309 Bloom Place –

- Would set precedence.
- Didn't think past improvement district participants could come and ask for subsidy or reimbursement.
- Costs would come out of the sewer fund that existing sewer system users pay into and why should they subsidize the project.
- The city would get the effluent which would be more valuable in the future.
- City needs a policy in place instead of taking each project on a case by case basis. Set a policy that the city would participate financially in the project and dedicate all effluent towards permanent recharge to help the present consumer with the overdraft problem.

Jim Hazelbaker, 2096 Mark Avenue –

- Eight years ago a petition showed over 50% wanted an improvement district.
- Sewage was still running through the creek and more septic tanks were failing.
- Some property owners have alternative systems and they were starting to fail.
- Many property owners were on fixed incomes.
- Suggested Council take Alternative 3, pay for it, let residents hook up to it and stop talking about it.
- Estimates only scared people.

Brad Veek, 2480 Ridge Road –

- Lives on top of the hill and has a good septic tank system; it was checked in October and it was still in good shape.
- Large and small lots in the area.
- Cut project in two phases.
- Suggested city subsidize Phase A.
- Annoyed at city's way of putting out propaganda on costs. The cost of funding it was always left out.

Art Matsen, 422 Bruces Corner –

- Area became a part of the city in 1973.
- Homes built in the lower section in 1970 and he had owned his property since 1979.
- They deserve prompt and fair treatment.
- Part of the city's assets were the sewer system paid for by the city.
- Charge residents a connection fees.
- The area had been bypassed over and over again.

Debra Corda. 712 El Camino Corvo –

- Her septic system was failing and she didn't know what to do, whether to buy an alternative system or wait.
- Chino Valley received a grant for putting in a sewer system and asked if the city couldn't find a grant to help her area out.
- Sewer service was a basic city service.

Council discussion took place on which needed to be done first, a policy change on financing methods or proceed with the design to get an estimate of the cost of the district.

It was clarified this was a discussion item and could be brought back whenever Council wanted and wouldn't automatically be placed on next week's agenda.

It was further clarified the amount invested so far was $250,000 from the sewer fund and to complete the design to the point of forming an improvement district would be another $750,000, for a total investment of $1 million into this area for the design costs.

Manager Steve Norwood explained:

- The costs would be necessary regardless of which option was chosen;
- property taxes did not support water and sewer projects, water and sewer fees went towards the maintenance of the system;
- there would be opportunities in another fiscal year to look at other areas, such as Mullen Way, etc.;
- this was a major precedence and staff would follow Council direction;
- if Council chose to proceed using the existing funds in the sewer fund and the City paid 100%, the sewer rate study had not contemplated this action;
- there would have to be a rate increase across the board to debt service this amount of money;
- would have to look at the water rates again and adjust those rates;
- this could have tens of millions of dollars of implications;
- some major changes in financing of projects if the City did this project alone;
- need to keep eyes wide open.

Consensus was to proceed with the 30% design and enter into an engineering contract for phase 2 for the amount of $350,000. The scope of work would include looking at phasing from the system standpoint and from the cost standpoint and this phase would take approximately 12 weeks to complete.

Questions to be considered were –

- which method of financing to explore;
- whether mandatory hookups would be required or allow deferred hookups;
- whether or not to phase the project

Q. Approval of Minutes of the Prescott City Council Workshop of March 21, 2006; the Prescott City Council Study Session of March 21, 2006; and the Prescott City Council Regular Meeting of March 28, 2006.

R. Selection of items to be placed on the Consent Agenda for the Regular Meeting of April 11, 2006.

Items B through L, and Q were selected as Consent Agenda items.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Prescott City Council, Mayor Simmons ADJOURNED the meeting at 6:50 P.M.

_____
ROWLE P. SIMMONS, Mayor

ATTEST:

_____
ELIZABETH A. BURKE, City Clerk