

**MINUTES FOR THE REGULAR MEETING
ASHLAND CITY COUNCIL
July 19, 2016
Council Chambers
1175 E. Main Street**

CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Stromberg called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Civic Center Council Chambers.

ROLL CALL

Councilor Voisin, Morris, Lemhouse, Seffinger, Rosenthal, and Marsh were present.

MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mayor Stromberg moved agenda item #2 under Ordinances, Resolutions and Contracts regarding the healthcare ballot measure to follow the Public Hearing.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the Study Session of June 20, 2016 were corrected on page 1 changing "LED" to "LEED." The minutes of the Business Meeting of June 21, 2016 were corrected on page 4, paragraph three changing the word "extenuated" to "accentuated." Both sets of minutes were approved as amended. The minutes of the Goal Setting Session of July 5, 2016 was approved as presented.

SPECIAL PRESENTATIONS & AWARDS

1. Annual presentation by Forest Lands Commission

Forest Lands Commission Chair Frank Betlejewski explained the Commission completed the 2016 Ashland Forest Plan. Chair Betlejewski shared aspects of a recent Ashland Forest Resiliency Tour that included tree cutting trends, tree numbers, trunk diameter, the Composite Burn Index, and the need for continued outreach to the public.

2. Update on Climate and Energy Action Plan progress, goals and targets

The Climate and Energy Action Plan (CEAP) ad hoc Committee gave an update on the Climate and Energy Action Plan. Management Analyst Adam Hanks, Councilor Rosenthal and CEAP vice Chair Roxane Beigel-Coryell provided a presentation on the Committee's scope of work, members, the consultant hired, project timelines, and meeting highlights. They explained the greenhouse gas inventory, preliminary recommendations, goals, targets, and a plan. Next steps included an ordinance discussion, consumption related goals and targets, evaluating potential actions and impacts, adopting strategies and soliciting public input. The CEAP would host an open house in September regarding proposed actions and options with another review of the draft plan in December.

It was difficult to measure any change in consumption within the community using measurements based on regional or statewide models. Setting aggressive targets with sector based emissions and possibly addressing consumption as a separate target when tracking mechanisms improved made better sense. Mitigation strategies could be the City transitioning the fleet to electric vehicles, or vehicles with a lower carbon emission, changing lights, better building controls, or transportation changes.

Conlan Ellis/341 High Street/Explained he was 17 years old and thanked the CEAP and Council for their work on the plan. He had seen the effect of climate change on the community with severe drought, heat, and wildfire. As a young citizen of Ashland, he urged Council to adopt an ordinance to accompany the plan.

Zander Huston/1228 Calypso Court/Explained he was 14 years old. He was inspired and excited by the

efforts the Committee and Council were taking regarding climate change. Climate change was one instance where everyone could see the consequences of human behavior at a huge scale with potentially frightening outcomes. He did not think it was too late to reverse those wrongs. Preserving wildlife and wilderness areas made it possible for future generations to enjoy them. He supported a legally binding ordinance.

Allie Rosenthbluth/730 Liberty Street/Worked with Rogue Climate and collaborated with other groups to draft the climate action ordinance that they shared with the CEAP ad hoc committee. Rogue Climate wanted the plan integrated into an ordinance. The draft they proposed would have the City reduce greenhouse gases by 7.6% each year and was in line with what climate scientists determined will keep the planet at a livable temperature. The rate corresponded with the goals the ad hoc Committee was suggesting with similar interim goals. She requested a work session with the Council to discuss the ordinance.

Gillian Mullane/925 Bellview/Worked with the Ashland Youth Climate Action group. She recently graduated high school and addressed the future effects of climate change on the youth of today.

Robert Block-Brown/50 Pine Street/Represented the Interfaith Social Justice Coalition and expressed the need to address climate change. He spoke to climate change and energy action issues as a moral or spiritual imperative in which the community considered right action in the stewardship of the earth. The Coalition supported a science based ordinance and implementing action plan that was socially equitable.

David Wick/2560 Eagle Creek Lane/Was the executive director of the Ashland Culture of Peace Commission and shared their mission. He supported the work of the ad hoc Committee and the young people present. This was their future and they were taking action. Many of us would not be here in 2050 but they would. It was time for bold action.

Sam Becker/7352 Adams Road, Talent, OR/Encouraged Council to incorporate the plan into an ordinance and hold a work session regarding the ordinance as soon as possible. He spoke to the “downstream” effects the area would experience in the future due to the impacts of climate change.

PUBLIC FORUM

William Mansfield/916 W 10th Street, Medford/Expressed alarm and concern regarding an incident of the Ashland Police arresting an individual who resisted arrest May 19, 2016. This gave the City of Ashland a black eye. He was aware of the editorial in the paper justifying the action but did not see that in the video he watched. It was poor public policy to arrest the mentally ill and time to reexamine the Police Department and get them new training regarding mental illness. He wanted the Council involved.

Police Chief Tighe O’Meara explained every police officer received some basic level of training for dealing with people who were mentally ill. Every officer with the exception of newly hired staff received 40 hours of Crisis Intervention Training and recently training on recognizing levels of autism. The officers involved in taking the individual resisting arrest into custody acted appropriately. He was limited in what he could share until the case was adjudicated.

David Subia/115 Lincoln Street/Added to Chief O’Meara’s statement that the Ashland Police Department (APD) used a gentle hand. The community did not realize how lucky they were to have the APD.

CONSENT AGENDA

- 1. Minutes of boards, commissions, and committees**
- 2. Approval of a public contract exceeding \$75,000 for Workers’ Compensation Third Party Administrative Services**
- 3. Approval of contract for Gateway Island public art**
- 4. Approval of a change order in excess of 25% for the Chautauqua Walk replacement project**

Councilor Voisin pulled Consent Agenda item #2 for discussion. Administrative Services and Finance Director Lee Tuneberg explained scoring and the 10-point difference on the selection of a public contract for Worker's Compensation Third Party Administrative Services.

Councilor Seffinger/Marsh m/s to approve Consent Agenda items. Voice Vote: all AYES. Motion approved.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Public hearing and first reading of an ordinance titled, "An ordinance amending Ashland Municipal Code Chapter 10.110 Fair Housing" and move to second reading

Mayor Stromberg read the rules for the Public Hearing. Housing Specialist Linda Reid explained in 2014 Council directed the Housing and Human Services Commission (HHSC) to develop a recommendation regarding additional protection for students. The HHSC along with the Associated Students of Southern Oregon University (ASSOU) conducted a comprehensive analysis that resulted in the proposed ordinance. The amendments were similar to those presented to Council at the March 14, 2016 Study Session, would bring the ordinance in line with federal and state laws, and provide further clarity on source of income protections under the existing ordinance. It added two new protective classes for age and domestic partnership. Staff included language clarifying emancipated minors and recognizing them as a protected class under the newly proposed prohibition on age discrimination as well as penalties that made violations a class one.

There was a prohibition on discriminatory advertising in the existing ordinance but the Legal Department suggested removing the language. It was illegal to discriminate in advertisement and having that language in the ordinance was redundant. However, it was legal to state no students in an advertisement because they were not a protective class.

Public Hearing Open: 8:18 p.m.

Tyler Takeshite/70 Garfield Street/Explained he was the Southern Oregon University (SOU) Student Body Vice President and expressed support for the ordinance amendments. He urged Council to adopt the ordinance.

Megan Mercier/454 Chestnut Street/Explained she was currently a senior at Southern Oregon University (SOU) and former officer of student government and liaison between that body and the Housing and Human Services Commission. She discussed students unable to live in Ashland while attending SOU, some sleeping in their cars. The proposed ordinance change was not a whole solution but a step to finding a solution that would better protect students. It was a well-rounded and inclusive update to the policy.

Public Hearing Closed: 8:23 p.m.

Councilor Marsh/Voisin m/s to approve first reading by title only of the ordinance titled, "An Ordinance Amending Ashland Municipal Code Chapter 10.110 Fair Housing," and to move the ordinance to second reading. DISCUSSION: Councilor Marsh commented on the Commission's due diligence and student participation. This would not solve the issue since there was a 1%-2% vacancy rate and housing was at an all-time low regarding availability. It was reasonable to include age and domestic partnership. She appreciated the efforts to bring it forward. Councilor Voisin heard students discussing housing daily. The ordinance would let the students know they would be treated fairly in Ashland. Councilor Lemhouse appreciated the effort and the student involvement. Discrimination of any kind was unacceptable especially in this community. It was a good step forward. Councilor Seffinger noted this was not a new issue and shared her experience as an emancipated minor finding housing. Councilor Rosenthal

supported the university's efforts in educating students on campus regarding housing. Councilor Morris witnessed a similar incident with a student when he was in college and supported the ordinance. **Roll Call Vote: Councilor Rosenthal, Voisin, Marsh, Morris, Seffinger, and Lemhouse, YES. Motion passed.**

ORDINANCES, RESOLUTIONS AND CONTRACTS

- 1. Approval of a resolution titled, "A resolution of the City of Ashland, Jackson County, Oregon, to submit to Ashland electors at the November 8, 2016 General Election an advisory question to encourage the 2017 Oregon Legislature to design an improved comprehensive healthcare system for all Oregon residents, that would ensure choice of provider; have effective cost controls; provide timely and equitable access; emphasize prevention and be affordable for families, businesses, and society"**

Sandra Coyner and Joe Graf/1160 Fern Street/Was part of a statewide group following the discussion on healthcare finance in the state legislature. They were asking Council to place an advisory question on the November 2016 ballot. The key paragraph in the resolution was also in the explanatory statement on what a "Yes" vote would mean. It would encourage the 2017 legislature to use the results of their study to design a system that provided timely access to comprehensive healthcare for Oregon residents, ensure choice of provider had effective cost controls, equitable access, and a focus on preventative care.

The Affordable Care Act will allow states to devise programs that will differ from the national model and apply for waivers from the federal government. The Oregon legislature authorized a study in 2013 to finance healthcare. The study was in House Bill (HB) 3260. Oregon State had 400,000 people who could not afford healthcare. Moving the initiative forward would help businesses and people with affordable healthcare. Presently healthcare costs made up 40% of bankruptcies in the country. Ms. Graf confirmed mental health and reproductive rights coverage were included under **HB 3260 Section 1. (1)(p) Integrates physical, dental, vision and mental health care.**

Councilor Voisin/Seffinger m/s to approve Resolution #2016-18. DISCUSSION: Councilor Voisin explained the two values represented in the resolution were that Ashland was compassionate and smart. Councilor Seffinger added this was another issue where her generation needed to consider the young people. Councilor Lemhouse had attended a meeting in the past where the CEO of Regence Blue Cross/Blue Shield spoke on how the Affordable Healthcare Act had improved accessibility but had not effected increasing healthcare costs. He hoped this spurred the legislature to do something to control costs. Councilor Marsh was confident the 2017 legislature would do the right thing. This effort would keep the community focused on the issue and provided advantage.

Councilor Morris did not think this would change the state when only 7,000-8,000 people out of the 20,000 Ashland residents voted. He preferred to see this as an initiative and hoped this would not set a precedent of citizens expecting Council to put items on the ballot instead of going through the initiative process. He supported the intent but doubted it would sway the state legislature. He would support the resolution but did not want to see this happen again. Councilor Rosenthal supported the resolution and understood Councilor Morris' concerns. He thought of the one thousand people living in the community without healthcare and supported any possible influence this could have on an outcome that helped those people. Mayor Stromberg respected Councilor Morris' thoughts on the matter and commented that Ashland had a reputation for innovation and doing creative things particularly in the sphere of social benefit and it was worth trying. **Roll Call Vote: Councilor Marsh, Voisin, Lemhouse, Seffinger, Morris, and Rosenthal, YES. Motion passed.**

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

- 1. Agreement for services with Southern Oregon University for public access television services**
Management Analyst Ann Seltzer explained in 2008 the City reduced the budget for RVTV but verbally

agreed to a 3% increase every year to get the budget back. The agreement before Council now included Section 4.2 referencing the verbal agreement made in 2008. It also included language to retire the 3% increase and request that RVTV determine a fixed annual amount by Fiscal Year 2020. In Section 3.3, Ms. Seltzer added language that clarified Ashland citizens who take the video production classes received a 20% discount. She went on to confirm the City utilized all the services listed and if for some reason there was a cancelation on the City's part, it received credit.

RVTV PEG Coordinator Brandon Givens explained changes since 2008, current services, and that RVTV had run at a deficit until recent staff cutbacks. RVTV was interested in a cost analysis but needed to set parameters first. Usage costs were comparable to other primary users in the valley.

Councilor Voisin/Lemhouse m/s to approve the July 19, 2016 agreement for services with Southern Oregon University to provide public access television. DISCUSSION: Councilor Voisin thought television as a way to communicate with the citizenry was important. Councilor Lemhouse commented it was a small amount and would lead to a better decision in the future.

Councilor Rosenthal/Lemhouse m/s to amend section 3.5 to read... "for live broadcasts in the Council Chambers, RVTV shall provide on call technical support and respond within 30 minutes."
DISCUSSION: Councilor Rosenthal explained the amendment strengthened the language and thought it was a reasonable request. Councilor Lemhouse agreed. **Roll Call Vote: Councilor Lemhouse, Morris, Rosenthal, Marsh, Seffinger, and Voisin, YES. Motion passed.**

Councilor Rosenthal/Lemhouse m/s to delete Section 3.3 in its entirety. DISCUSSION: Councilor Rosenthal thought it was a nice gesture nice to provide a discount for video production services. However, this was a "slippery slope" for taxpayers to subsidize this particular item. Councilor Lemhouse added it would serve a small section of the community and preferred a fee based program for educational courses instead. Councilor Marsh would oppose the amendment. It provided access to classes and was a great asset particularly to the lower income members of the community. Councilor Voisin actually participated in the program and commented on her positive experience. It was incredible training and created community. She would not support the amendment. Councilor Seffinger also would not support the amendment.
Roll Call Vote: Councilor Lemhouse, Morris, Rosenthal, YES; Councilor Marsh, Seffinger, and Voisin, NO. Mayor Stromberg broke the tie with a NO vote. Motion failed 3-4.

Roll Call Vote on amended main motion: Councilor Lemhouse, Morris, Rosenthal, Marsh, Seffinger and Voisin, YES. Motion passed.

2. Continuation of Grandview Drive Discussion

City Administrator Dave Kanner explained Council needed to determine which of the options presented provided the greatest measure and safety for the citizens of Ashland. He suggested Council set aside the issues of code enforcement, encroachment permits, and cost estimates and focus on the options. The first option would remove the guardrail and restore the road to its prior condition. The second option would leave the guardrail in place and make no other changes to the road. The third option from Public Works would leave the guardrail in place and create a five-foot wide pedestrian refuge on each side of the road. In each of three options, the City would continue to plan to make the entirety of Grandview Drive a shared road.

Mr. Kanner referenced an email from Dr. Paul Rostykus and reiterated the City was not proposing to do this for the benefit of a single property owner but for the citizenry. This was an expenditure of tax dollars to protect the health, safety, and welfare of the citizens of Ashland. That was why the City collected public revenues and spent public revenues for the benefit of the taxpayers.

Public Works Director Mike Faught explained a contractor installed a non-permitted guardrail that met the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) standards. The traffic engineer determined the guardrail improved safety and should not be removed. The geotechnical engineer inspected the guardrail and confirmed the installation was correct and it met all of the standards. As the City moved forward on making Grandview Drive a shared road, it would require a guardrail in the same location.

The controversy surrounding the issue was the perception from neighbors the guardrail made the road less safe for pedestrians. Staff was interested in moving the shared road project to the next budget cycle. Grandview Drive functioned as a shared road already and it would be cost prohibitive to widen the street. The other issue was the eighty-fifth percentile speed in the area of the new guardrail was 25.6 miles per hour (mph). Alta Avenue showed 31.7 mph in one direction and 31.6 mph the other direction.

The City had not required the homeowner to submit a retroactive permit application after the fact and was waiting on Council's decision on the proposed options. Staff did not support option one to remove the guardrail. In the second option to leave the guardrail in place without further action, the traffic engineer determined it was actually safer for all modes of transportation despite a perception otherwise. The third option retained the guardrail and moved forward to make Grandview Drive a shared road. The traffic engineer did not recommend lowering the speed limit to 15 mph. Changing the environment to a shared road would encourage drivers to slow down. Staff would improve the drainage throughout the length of the street, install automated speed-reader signs as well as shared road signs. The traffic engineer concurred with a neighbor's suggestion to install a four way stop at Skycrest Drive and Grandview Drive. A four way stop at that location was possible and would help slow traffic going downhill. It would take a month to survey the area then 6 months to a year to develop a design option.

Kimberly Parducci from Southern Oregon Transportation Engineering addressed traffic speed and explained the state created an environment for speed based on the speed that 85% of the people drive. Lowering the speed limit to 15 mph when the eighty-fifth percentile speed was 31 mph would create a speed trap. Changing the environment by reducing the roadway pave width with different kinds of textures on the shoulders, drivers felt they could not drive as fast through that section. Ms. Parducci recommended leaving the speed limit at 25 mph on the lower section and post 15 mph where the improvements are in place.

The street was currently a neighborhood collector and not built to the standard of a neighborhood collector. If it were, 25 mph would be the posted speed and 5 to 10 mph higher would be the design speed. In this case, Grandview Drive was not built to standard so it was difficult to determine design speed. She clarified changing the width of road would change the environment for speed. Narrowing the road would naturally reduce speed because drivers would not feel they could go fast. The shared road would narrow the street to 18-feet with nine-foot travel lanes and a separate shoulder made of a different substance for bicycles and pedestrians. It provided a natural calming and reduced speed.

Guardrails were designed for different reasons. This was a longitudinal guardrail and should absorb the collision of a vehicle. A vehicle would hit then run along the guardrail and not bounce off and deflect. Any pedestrian-vehicle collision will always be severe. The guardrail was safer for vehicles and from the standpoint that most pedestrians could step over it and hold on if necessary. The guardrail could not make it safe in every instance. Ms. Parducci had heard different stories about 2-3 accidents occurring in the location over the last 40 years but there was not any crash data reports confirming the accidents.

Mr. Faught clarified Grandview Drive had always been the highest priority as the first shared road project.

Councilor Voisin expressed concern a citizen installed a guardrail without the City's knowledge until notified a week after the fact. She was also concerned that now the City was "jumping through hoops and

expense” to make the road safer when prior there was not any record of an accident. Mr. Kanner responded Ashland Municipal Code allowed guardrails in the right of way without a permit for protecting a driveway approach. It was not until after when staff did a visual inspection they realized the guardrail extended well beyond the driveway approach. By that time, the traffic engineer determined the guardrail should remain in place. At that point, staff began looking at solutions. It was common with code complaints to work out possible solutions without taking enforcement action. This situation took longer than intended due to Council adopting the shared road policy that was tied to the Normal Neighborhood Plan. Councilor Voisin commented a former city councilor went to the City and reported the installation in March 2015 and went to the Traffic Commission as well. Mayor Stromberg raised a point of order and explained the issue was what action to take, not whether the City did the right thing.

Councilor Lemhouse raised a point of order noting Council was in the question phase with staff, there were 10 speakers and argument was scheduled for later. Mayor Stromberg explained Councilor Voisin’s questions sounded more like an accusation instead of information gathering to resolve the situation. Councilor Voisin responded she was asking for clarification. If it was the City’s error in not responding to this more quickly she thought the City needed to take responsibility for anything that might happen with the guardrail as it exists. She asked the city attorney what kind of responsibility and liability the City had if they keep the guardrail and a pedestrian was killed or maimed due to the guardrail. City Attorney Dave Lohman explained the Council had great discretion to make decisions on taking or not taking precautionary actions as long it seemed reasonable. He presented examples of possible incidences where something “reasonable” came into question and thought a jury most likely would decide it was not reasonable to ignore a traffic engineer’s advice to keep the guardrail.

Allan Goffe the structural engineer for ACE Engineering explained the guardrail complied with ODOT standards. Guardrails had transition areas at the front back. If the guardrail were cut in half, a new transition area would have to be created.

Matt Burkholder/320 Grandview Drive/Owned the lot that bordered the guardrail. The guardrail made the precarious corner safer for all who drove down Grandview Drive. Two consultants independently supported the guardrail. Grandview Drive was one of few streets in Ashland without curbs and sidewalks. He was glad the guardrail got the shared road and road expansion discussion moving forward. He and his wife fully supported the shared road proposal. A majority of the neighbors who attended the Grandview Drive meeting June 2, 2016 supported it as well.

Tamara Reichenshammer/64 N Pioneer Street/Thought the curve at the top of Grandview Drive was dangerous and shared frightening experiences driving on the street. Speed was another issue. The guardrail was an asset.

Michael Meiring/565 Orchard Street/Explained he was a retired city planner and community development director. He used Grandview Drive often, on bicycles or in cars and it was not safe with the guardrail. Neighbors were so concerned with the guardrail they would not walk on the street. Improvements were now needed. His issue was using money earmarked for maintenance and commented on the disrepair of the roads.

Paul Rostykus/436 Grandview Drive/Explained his 91-year-old mother would no longer walk on the road and he had experienced three narrow escapes, one just today. He was frustrated with City staff for the lack of responses to his emails, his code complaint, and to his questions regarding material presented at the June 21, 2016 meeting. He suggested the homeowner or contractor apply for an encroachment permit to install a new guardrail that would protect the house below, it did not need to be 350 feet long, would retain the present pedestrian refuge areas and not cut off the pedestrian escape route. The new plan would require a variety of engineer studies along with inspection during construction. He thought they should remove the

existing guardrail no later than October 1, 2016 or when a certificate of occupancy was issued. His last point would develop a comprehensive plan for improving the access and safety of Grandview Drive.

Mr. Rostykus described areas on the guardrail where a pedestrian could step out as much as six feet from where the guardrail was while other areas were so steep an individual could roll down the hill. There were other options to consider that involved a retaining wall, building it farther, or putting the guardrail down lower on the slope.

Jeanette McCartney/795 Garden Way/Driving down the hill at night was frightening due to the steep turn and not safe. Now that there were lots, she could see it as a safety issue if a car went off the road. There was more traffic now with new homes. She thought a flashing light to warn drivers of the steep grade would be helpful.

Zak Ali/340 Grandview Drive/Thanked City staff, Council, and everyone involved in the matter. Explained the project involved his family and the Burkholder's. When they decided to start building, they were informed that in 2004 a car went off the road onto their lot and laid there for almost two days. The second incident involved a car coming around the bend and driving into a tree that prevented the vehicle from landing on their property. He realized his house was not protected from a potential future accident and was concerned for the safety of his children. That was the main reason for installing the guardrail.

Katie Ali/340 Grandview Drive/Thanked everyone at the City and Council for their help in the matter. Installing the guardrail made sense for the overall protection of their home, family and everyone involved. There were no trees to protect the home from a car veering off the road so they installed a guardrail. The strongly supported the shared road project and expansion.

Carlos Reichenshammer/64 N Pioneer/Explained he was the general contractor building the home for the Ali family and the Burkholder family. He had contacted the Public Works Department who informed him it was possible to install a guardrail at the location but there were no funds available. Dr. Ali decided to share the cost of the guardrail. Mr. Reichenshammer contacted the City again for the name of the contractor the City used for guardrail installation. He was informed at that time he needed a permit for street closure when the installation occurred. He first approached the City early March 2015 and applied for a permit April 14, 2015 to close the street April 16, 2015 for installation. He contracted with Gage-It Construction to install the guardrail. The contract stipulated Mr. Reichenshammer applied for the street closure permit with Gage-It Construction applying for any permit necessary for the performance of their work. Mr. Reichenshammer became aware Gage-T Construction had not applied for the proper permits six or eight months later. Gage-It Construction did work for the City often. Work done on City property did not require permits. ODOT approved the guardrail installation plans and they were the same as the plans used to construct guardrails throughout the city and the state. Neighbors were not contacted regarding the installation of the guardrail.

James Klug/329 Grandview Drive/Had owned the property on the upside of the guardrail for 43 years. He questioned the shared road concept and people having to jump over the guardrail in the event of an emergency. A twelve-foot retainer was too high although he supported a retainer wall in that location.

Shanrzad Sheibani/111 Sunnyview Street/Represented the Homeowners Association of East Village Subdivision on Sunnyview Street. She spoke for eight families who used that road daily and they were grateful for the installation of the guardrail. She thought the City should reimburse the homeowner for installing the guardrail. She shared several experiences when she or her family "wiped out" on the road explaining they called AAA instead of the police. The road needed to be wider. This was their only road when Wimer was not accessible.

Council Voisin/Marsh m/s to continue discussion of Grandview Drive to a date to be determined by City Administrator. Voice Vote: all AYES. Motion passed.

NEW AND MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS

1. Approval of the 2016 Water Supply Strategy

Item delayed due to time constraints.

2. Council input to the League of Oregon Cities regarding legislative priorities

Item delayed due to time constraints.

ORDINANCES, RESOLUTIONS AND CONTRACTS-continued

2. Approval of second reading of an ordinance titled, “An ordinance modifying the Verde Village subdivision’s development agreement to allow changes to the property lines, building envelopes, number of detached and attached units, approved landscaping plan, and approved public/private space plan for Phase II, the single family portion of the subdivision”

ABSTENTIONS, CONFLICTS, EX PARTE CONTACTS

Councilor Marsh spoke with the parties of the development about the fact Council had completed one piece of the vote. There was nothing substantive beyond that exchange. Councilor Lemhouse and Morris declared social contact with Valerie and Greg Williams but did not discuss the development. Councilor Rosenthal, Seffinger, and Voisin had nothing to declare.

Community Development Director Bill Molnar reviewed changes added at first reading. Fences would be allowed for property owners bordering the public path to the creek along the length of their property.

Councilor Marsh/Seffinger m/s to approve Ordinance #3130 and adopt findings. Roll Call Vote: Councilor Morris, Lemhouse, Voisin, Seffinger, Rosenthal, and Marsh, YES. Motion passed.

OTHER BUSINESS FROM COUNCIL MEMBERS/REPORTS FROM COUNCIL LIAISONS

Councilor Rosenthal announced the Sister City Baseball Classic started Saturday July 23, 2016 in Medford at the US Cellular Community Park, field 7 at 7:00 p.m. with a doubleheader Sunday at 5:00 p.m. and 7:00 p.m.

Councilor Seffinger announced Saturday July 30, 2016 volunteers would clean up travelers’ campsites in the watershed with an early crew meeting at 7:30 a.m. in the Bandersnatch parking lot and a flash trash crew meeting at 9:00 a.m.

City Administrator Dave Kanner announced there was a cougar siting on Gresham Street over the weekend. Staff posted warning signs in the area.

ADJOURNMENT OF BUSINESS MEETING

Meeting adjourned at 10:28 p.m.

Barbara Christensen, City Recorder

John Stromberg, Mayor