

**MINUTES FOR THE REGULAR MEETING  
ASHLAND CITY COUNCIL  
April 18, 2017  
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 Slattery, Morris, Lemhouse, Seffinger, and Darrow were present. Councilor Rosenthal arrived at 7:34 p.m.

**MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Mayor Stromberg announced a vacancy on the Citizen's Budget Committee. The deadline for applications was Wednesday, April 26, 2017.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The minutes of the Business Meeting of March 21, 2017, and the Study Session of April 3, 2017 were approved as presented. The minutes of the Business Meeting of April 4, 2017 were approved with a correction to page 4 of 6, second paragraph, correcting "Doge Way" to "Dodge Way."

**SPECIAL PRESENTATIONS & AWARDS**

**1. Annual presentation from Historic Commission**

Historic Commission Chair Dale Shostrom announced National Historic Preservation Week would occur the week of May 16, 2017. Commissioner Keith Swink explained the Historic Commission reviewed planning applications, building permits, and sign permits within the Historical Districts. The Commission worked with developers and property owners to ensure new construction and renovation complimented the Historic Districts. Accomplishments included recommendations on 15 land use applications, 70 building and sign permits, and over 450 volunteer consultation hours for the Historic Review Board. The Commission also provided input on several restoration and public art projects, and coordinated events for the 2016 National Historic Preservation Week.

The theme for National Historic Preservation Week 2017 was "Discover America's Hidden Gems." The awards ceremony would occur Tuesday, May 16, 2017 at the Ashland Community Center at noon. On Wednesday, May 17, 2017, the Ashland Memorial Mausoleum at the Mountain View Cemetery would be open for self-guided tours. Friday, May 19, 2017, at 2:00 p.m., the Historic Commission and Ashland Heritage Committee would host a walking tour of Hyde Street, Manzanita Street, and North Main Street. This tour would start in front of the Community Development building at 51 Winburn Way.

**2. Proclamation of May 2017 as National Historic Preservation Month**

The Mayors proclamation of May 2017 as National Historic Preservation Month was read aloud.

**PUBLIC FORUM**

**Tom Marr/955 North Mountain Avenue**/Asked that Council immediately lower utility rates. Neighbors had recently moved due to the high cost of Ashland utilities. Electricity, sewer, and water were basic human necessities. To use them as a revenue stream was inappropriate. Raising and taxing the rates was regressive and hurt the impoverished and lower income. Costs should reflect operations and the cost of providing those services.

**Huelz Gutcheon/PO Box 754**/Referenced Bangladesh's natural evolution from aid received due to the

1971 famine and the countries present use of technology and solar energy. Climate change action needed to happen immediately. In Ashland, the Southern Oregon University dormitories were a good fit for zero net energy. It was not happening because someone in Texas owned the buildings.

**Councilor Lemhouse/Slattery m/s to move New and Miscellaneous Business agenda item #1. 2016-2017 Social Service Grant allocation recommendation review below Ordinances, Resolutions, and Contracts. Voice Vote: all AYES. Motion passed.**

### **CONSENT AGENDA**

- 1. Approval of minutes of boards, commissions, and committees**
- 2. Tree Commission request to name the Southern Oregon University Spirit Tree a City of Ashland Heritage Tree**
- 3. Approval of resolution titled, “A resolution authorizing signatures, including facsimile signatures, for banking services on behalf of the City of Ashland”**
- 4. Rogue Credit Union Appeal Adoption of Findings**
- 5. EPA WaterSense Labeling Program, letter of support**

**Councilor Lemhouse/Seffinger m/s to approve the Consent Agenda. Voice Vote: all AYES. Motion passed.**

### **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

#### **1. Public hearing on the 2016 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Award and CDBG Action Plan development**

Housing Program Specialist Linda Reid explained the City received four applications for Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds totaling \$258,036. The City anticipated receiving \$158,726 for 2017. Program administration reserved 20% or \$31,745. The remaining \$126,981 plus an additional \$131,055 in reprogrammed funds from prior years would go to eligible projects benefiting Ashland’s low-income population. The total amount of funding available for capital improvement projects was the entire \$258,036 with 15% or \$23,808 of the 2017 allocation going to public service activities.

For public service project funds, St. Vincent de Paul was requesting \$25,500 in CDBG funding to continue their program assisting low-income and at risk households, preventing homelessness, and providing security deposits and rental assistance. Maslow Project requested \$10,000 to assist homeless and at risk families in the Ashland School District.

For capital improvement projects, the City received two applications. One from Ashland Tiny House Group requesting \$193,250 to purchase or lease land and public facility improvements to the site selected. Family Solutions requested \$59,348 to complete repairs to a public facility that served children engaged in the foster care system.

Staff evaluated the proposals and based recommendations on eligibility, the City’s Five-Year Consolidated Plan for the use of CDBG funds, agency experience, and capacity, and the readiness of each project to proceed. The Housing and Human Services Commission (HHSC) voted in support of staff’s recommendations. Both staff and the HHSC recommended the following allocations:

- \$59,348 to Family Solutions for the rehabilitation of their Ashland Facility
- \$16,665 to St. Vincent De Paul Home Visitation Program
- \$7,143 to Maslow Project School Based Services

St Vincent de Paul and the Maslow Project were public service activities and that limited the amount of money they could receive. The other projects fell under capital improvement projects and did not have a

limit.

The City would have a timeliness test in May and at that time needed to have less than one and a half times of the annual allocation in the federal government account. The City would be fine this year and would receive the new allocation in July. Awarding the recommended projects would draw down enough funding before the next timeliness test.

**Public Hearing Opened: 7:30 p.m.**

**Vicky Weiss/590 Fernwood Drive/St. Vincent de Paul/St. Vincent de Paul** was the only organization addressing the needs of the homeless and those in extreme poverty run exclusively by volunteers. All funds collected went directly to those in need. Last year with the CDBG funds, they placed 16 adults and 5 children into homes. Using their own funds, they housed some of the homeless temporarily until they found permanent housing. St. Vincent de Paul often worked with clients for a year or more.

**Councilor Rosenthal arrived at 7:34 p.m.**

**Karen Logan/261 Otis Street/Ashland Tiny House Group/Explained** they had two projects, the Angel House project and Ashland Tiny House Village. She noted \$160,000 not yet awarded and asked Council to consider a reservation of funds. The agency had obtained a financial commitment of approximately \$500,000 to purchase land. St. Vincent de Paul would refer clients and do the means testing required for low-income. The Ashland Tiny House Group intended to include low-income in addition to homeless, disabled, or elderly people. Maslow Project committed to referring their clients as well. They were currently working with the City of Medford and Hope Village at Rogue Retreat. She formally requested Council reserve the funds that would formalize their project once they identified land.

**Thomas Johnson/1836 Fremont Street/Executive Director/For 46 years,** Family Solutions previously known as Southern Oregon Child Study & Treatment Center (SOCSTC) in Jackson County and Family Friends in Josephine County provided community based mental health services to children and families. Their mission was “Develop and provide community based services that will serve as an alternative to having children placed in residential and institutional settings.” Family Solutions put counselors and behavior specialists in the home working with the children, parents, and family members. They kept children in school by providing counselors on site in the Medford, Phoenix, and Talent school districts. For children who cannot attend public school because of emotional or behavioral problems, Family Solutions provided a day treatment program where children attended school along with mental health and psychiatric care. The grant would benefit their treatment center in Ashland.

**Public Hearing Closed: 7:41 p.m.**

**Councilor Seffinger/Lemhouse m/s to direct staff to draft the 2017 Annual Action Plan for the use of Community Development Block Grant funds reflecting the award of CDBG funding for the 2017 Program year as follows: \$59,348 to Family Solutions for rehabilitation of their Ashland Facility, \$7,143 to the Maslow Project for school based services, and \$16,665 to St. Vincent De Paul - Home Visitation Program. DISCUSSION:** Councilor Seffinger explained the three programs chosen had proven their effectiveness over the years and were important to the community. Council Lemhouse added they showed a consistent record of success in the service they delivered. He appreciated Ms. Logan’s testimony but thought the program needed more work. Councilor Darrow noted the Ashland Emergency Food Bank referred people to the St. Vincent de Paul Home Visitation Program daily.

**Roll Call Vote: Councilor Seffinger, Morris, Darrow, Lemhouse, Slattery, and Rosenthal, YES. Motion passed.**

The City reissued requests for proposals (RFP) in the past usually when it was close to the timeliness cap

and they needed to expend funding. It was not necessary to do that at this time because the City was within the timeliness cap. The remaining amount would roll over into the next year for a combined total for potentially larger projects. The Housing and Urban Development (HUD) had addressed potential federal fund changes to the CDBG grant process and was assuming everything would remain the same as usual.

**Councilor Slattery/Lemhouse m/s reestablish the order of the agenda. Voice Vote: all AYES. Motion passed.**

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS** - None

**NEW AND MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS**

**1. 2016-2017 Social Service Grant allocation recommendation review and decision**

Housing and Human Services Commission (HHSC) vice Chair Rich Rhode explained the HHSC adjusted the process to reflect Council goals and how the Commission allocated funds. They structured standard questions to determine how the applicant participated in Ashland, number of volunteers, as well as budget information. After they made their recommendations, they realized there was \$1,033.50 less than allocated. Council would have to make those adjustments to the allocated amounts. Council could divide the applicants by the amount and remove \$86 from each.

Council commented HHSC minutes documented the vote for the CDBG funds but did not seem to capture the vote for the social services grants. Council raised concern that Commissioner Harris appeared to sit through the discussion and voted on the final recommendation when she was the board president of one of the applications, Options for Homeless Residents in Ashland (OHRA). Vice Chair Rhode explained the Commissioner declared a conflict of interest but thought she could make a fair decision based on her knowledge of services in the valley. Housing Program Specialist Linda Reid would review the tape and minutes of the meeting to determine whether the Commissioner voted or not. Staff received direction on a potential conflict of interest from the City Attorney who determined it was not an actual conflict of interest. For the sake of transparency, the attorney recommended that Commissioner Harris not participate in the process. Commissioner Harris agreed she would not take part in the discussion for appearances sake but would remain present during the meeting. She then proceeded to participate in some of the discussion.

City Attorney Dave Lohman did not have a complete understanding of all the facts. It appeared Commissioner Harris did not participate in the voting and did not suggest allocation amounts. Ms. Reid would listen to the tape and confirm if Commissioner Harris actually voted. Mr. Lohman noted this was not a violation of the state ethics rules. City rules of conflict were stricter and required a participant to disclose a conflict and refuse to participate if their judgment might be impaired. He had recommended if there was any possibility of impaired judgment, the person should not participate at all primarily for appearance purposes. It sounded like in this case, Commissioner Harris did both, participated in the discussion and maybe voted or not. It was in a gray area.

Council commented that people could influence others in passive ways. Everything had influence on outcomes. Mr. Lohman agreed. Even under state rules, if a person had an actual conflict, they should not participate at all. Although, they did not have to leave the room, the Attorney General's office recommended leaving to remove the possibility of non-verbal communication influencing a decision. The same would apply to the City's rules. At the least, not participating meant going to the back of the room.

Vice Chair Rhode explained applicants spoke during their presentations to the HHSC on the disparity in their allocation requests between the City of Medford and the City of Ashland if they served both jurisdictions. They also provided the number of people they were serving in each area. Applicants used

grant allocations from the City of Ashland for people in Ashland.

Mr. Lohman confirmed there was no issue allocating funds to faith agencies if the recipient was doing work the City decided was important for civic purposes rather than advancing religion. Mayor Stromberg explained the First Presbyterian Church of Ashland had experienced plumbing issues following winter shelter nights and were asking for help from the City. Ms. Reid added they were also requesting funds for laundry, replacing blankets, and heating and lighting for shelter nights.

**Councilor Lemhouse/Rosenthal m/s that Council allocate the following under social services grants:**

- **CASA - \$5,000**
- **Center for Non Profit Legal Services - \$10,595**
- **Community Volunteer Network–Foster Grandparent Program - \$2,060**
- **Community Volunteer Network-RSVP Program - \$4,120**
- **Community Works-Dunn House - \$16,000**
- **Community Works-SAVS - \$3,500**
- **Community Works-Helpline - \$10,625**
- **Jackson County SART - \$7,500**
- **RVCOG-Meals on Wheels - \$12,000**
- **St. Vincent de Paul-Housing Program - \$40,000**
- **OHRA-Housing, Employment & Health Program - \$4,000**
- **Maslow-At Risk Youth - \$12,600**
- **First Presbyterian Church-Shelter Improvements - \$1,000**
- **Jobs with Justice-Social Services - \$5,000**

**For a total of \$134,000. DISCUSSION:** Councilor Lemhouse liked the pre-set questions and the responses they elicited. He wanted to fund agencies that had a proven record of success. He also tried to allocate funds to agencies not necessarily served by other applicants. Councilor Rosenthal explained few communities in the state had a social service grant program. He thought St. Vincent de Paul was underfunded. They historically invested more non-Ashland funds into the community and were a proven performer. There was an issue whether the public process administered by the HHSC was fair. There were also questions whether OHRA was a proven performer yet. He had asked OHRA for their strategic plan but they had not provided it to him. Having a commissioner who may have influenced the Commission in some way was also a concern.

Councilor Slattery thought St. Vincent de Paul deserved the full amount. The reduced allocation to OHRA was a harsh penalty. The City had invested in OHRA and there were some issues along the way but OHRA had become more effective over the two years. The penalty damaged OHRA and he wanted Council to reconsider the amount.

Councilor Seffinger was glad the Meals on Wheels program was included in the allocation. There were not many services for seniors in the area.

Councilor Darrow thought the reduction to OHRA was significant. The agency did a lot of work on housing and employment support through the Resource Center. She did not want their funding cut to the point of making them ineffective. Councilor Morris noted OHRA received a \$100,000 grant from the City and had used it for sustaining their organization. He was concerned that 52% went to payroll, 48% went to facilities, and nothing for services. He did not want the reduction to make OHRA ineffective either. St Vincent de Paul and the Meals on Wheels program should be funded at 100%.

Councilor Lemhouse clarified his decision was not strictly penalty based. He was unhappy with the process and did not think it served the public well. Council supported an earlier endeavor to provide

\$100,000 of initial funding for OHRA with the intent it was seed money. OHRA had remained reliant on the City and needed to find other funding mechanisms in order to become sustainable. OHRA also needed a strategic plan. Councilor Slattery did not want to make an investment over the last two years only to have it come up short. He was uncomfortable having the HHSC making the recommendations on the social service grants. Alternately, he had concerns about not taking their allocation suggestions. He would not support the motion. **Roll Call Vote: Councilor Rosenthal, Morris, Seffinger, and Lemhouse, YES, Councilor Slattery and Darrow, NO. Motion passed 4-2.**

### **ORDINANCES, RESOLUTIONS AND CONTRACTS**

- 1. Approval of second reading by title only of an ordinance titled, “An ordinance amending AMC 9.30.020 to extend the current smoking ban to include 130 N. Pioneer Street and any space within 20 feet of pathways for smoke to enter places of employment or enclosed spaces open to the public”**

City Attorney Dave Lohman explained there were two changes proposed to the existing ordinance. One included the parking lot at 130 North Pioneer Street. The second increased the distance from 10 to 20 feet as a buffer between people smoking and doorways, windows, and air vents. A third minor change was the ordinance referred to the downtown by means of a map instead of a verbal description. The map referenced the downtown area described in **AMC 10.120.010(B)(1)** that related to persistent violations. A correction to the map would move the boundary line to include the sidewalk. The corrected map was included in the packet for second reading.

**Councilor Rosenthal/Lemhouse m/s to approve Ordinance #3140.**

**DISCUSSION:** Councilor Rosenthal made the motion to ban smoking in City parks. He preferred not allowing smoking in the downtown area at all. He hoped the ordinance would make a difference. **Councilor Darrow, Morris, Slattery, Seffinger, Lemhouse, and Rosenthal, YES. Motion passed.**

- 2. Approval of second reading by title only of an ordinance titled, “An ordinance amending Chapter 11.26 to limit the use of public parking lots for purposes other than parking vehicles”**

City Attorney Dave Lohman explained there was one change between First and Second Reading in the fifth Whereas that now read, **“Whereas, exclusionary unpermitted occupancy of public parking spaces and access to them for uses other than vehicle parking inconveniences the general public and imposes undue financial burdens on the City; and.”** The ordinance applied to any City owned parking lot. The City would provide signage for the parking and smoking ordinances.

**Councilor Rosenthal/Morris m/s to approve Ordinance #3141. DISCUSSION:** Councilor Rosenthal appreciated the ordinance coming forward and thought it was common sense.

**Roll Call Vote: Councilor Slattery, Rosenthal, Seffinger, Darrow, Lemhouse, and Morris, YES. Motion passed.**

- 3. Approval of second reading by title only of an ordinance titled, “An ordinance amending Chapter 10.120.010 to include City of Ashland’s 130 N. Pioneer Street parking lot within the Enhanced Law Enforcement Area”**

City Attorney Dave Lohman explained there were no changes between the First and Second Reading. The ordinance would include the west side of the street and sidewalk in addition to the parking lot. The Enhanced Law Enforcement Area (ELEA) map would also include the west side of the street on North Main Street as it crossed Ashland Creek.

The persistent violator ordinance adopted in 2014, made three violations, misdemeanors, or felonies, a misdemeanor itself. The Municipal Court Judge could expel anyone with three violations of the six ordinances pertaining to the persistent violator code for three months to a year. The defendant had four opportunities from the first violation to the Judge making the determination for expulsion to make a case.

**Councilor Slattery/Lemhouse m/s to approve Ordinance #3142. Roll Call Vote: Councilor Morris, Darrow, Rosenthal, Slattery, Lemhouse, and Seffinger, YES. Motion passed.**

**4. Approval of a resolution to assess utility fees to fund additional Police positions**

Police Chief Tighe O'Meara made a correction to a statement he made at the last Council meeting regarding population. Ashland population was over 18,000 twenty years ago. Staff proposed three options to fund five police officers. One added a \$4 surcharge on each electric meter to fund public safety operations. Another was a \$5.35 per month surcharge on each water meter. The third was a hybrid option that added a \$3 surcharge per water meter and \$1.75 for each electric meter.

**Dave Helmich/468 Williamson Way/**Requested Council "take a beat" in the approval of increasing police staff and the proposed methods to pay for the positions. The public process had not been informed soon enough or allowed input. He wanted Council to postpone and hold a public hearing to gauge public response.

**Andrew Kubik/1251 Munson Drive/**Had several concerns regarding the item and the process. He thought it was overriding the Budget Committee. He brought a copy of the employment agreement with the Police Association, and the City's Administrative Policy 2004.01.020. Both documents contained information on hiring. He asked Council to pull the agenda item and meet with the Budget Committee.

**Garrett Furuicti/264 Van Ness/**Was a Budget Committee member but spoke as a citizen regarding the process. He read from a document submitted into the record asking Council to reconsider the process they were using.

**Debbie Neisewander/1159 Tolman Creek Road/**Was not happy with the process either. She did not understand why the funding did not come up for this item when Council was re-appropriating the meals tax. She did not have utilities for half the winter and would not be able to get utilities if Council kept raising the rates. Other concerns included the homeless crisis, issues on the streets, and that the community had not had time to discuss what was happening. She wanted Council to slow down the process, involve the community, and address the issues appropriately.

Mayor Stromberg responded there were programs for citizens unable to afford utilities and encouraged Ms. Neisewander to contact the Utility Billing Division at City Hall.

**Councilor Slattery/Darrow m/s to bring forward the requested police officers as an add package separate from a funding source similar to the other add packages coming up on Wednesday and Thursday night. DISCUSSION:** Councilor Slattery was sensitive to the budget process. Elected Budget Committee representatives created policies, priorities, and strategic plans. Appointed Budget Committee members reviewed, advised, and voted on the tax rate and the budget. The Wednesday and Thursday meetings were about putting together add package recommendations for the full Budget Committee. He did not support biennial budgeting and thought it decreased the influence of appointed Budget Committee members. He supported increasing police staff. However, it needed to be within the context of the budget.

Mayor Stromberg clarified the meetings for Wednesday and Thursday. Council would review and prioritize Council Goals and determine possible funding. The outcome would go to the Budget Committee. They would not be add packages. Councilor Lemhouse raised a point of clarification regarding the motion. Councilor Slattery clarified the motion would bring the request for increased staff as an add package or priority package to the budget officer who would work them into the budget for the budget process. Mayor Stromberg clarified they would be part of the budget, not add packages.

Councilor Darrow was concerned about affordability regarding a utility surcharge. She wanted to find a way to support the addition of these officers and have room to fund them in a long-term perpetuity. The next two meetings would be looking at priorities, policy, and identifying revenue stream. She wanted more time to explore different revenue streams to fund the positions.

Councilor Lemhouse agreed with the motion but might not support it. He supported Chief O'Meara's recommendation to add officers and understood what he was dealing with. A citizen to officer ratio was a guide only and not a way to determine staffing. The best way was trusting City staff to analyze needs. Limited staffing would create limited results. Tying it to utility rates was proper. Everyone would contribute fairly. A \$4.75 monthly surcharge was manageable. City utility rates were lower than Pacific Power rates. However, with the upcoming budget season, it was wise to delay making a decision until Council saw the entire budget before deciding on funding. He did not think it should be an add package and would not support the motion.

Councilor Morris did not support tying it to the electric meter. He preferred to see it as something Council enacted, and then reviewed later. He supported a biennial budget specifically for the off year review. He thought the Police Chief should get the hiring in place and determine if the funding stream was correct or if there were different options. Councilor Seffinger explained there were safety issues for the police in the city. When one officer took someone to jail in Medford, it left other officers in danger if something occurred. She supported moving forward on the hiring portion.

Councilor Rosenthal read the primary role of the Budget Committee posted on the City website was to "ensure expenditures did not exceed revenues and the overall budget was consistent with the priorities of the Mayor and Council." He read further, "The Budget Committee does not change staffing levels, salary schedules, or negotiate salary contracts. It is not the committee's role to adjust policies or priorities set by the Council or to add, delete, increase or decrease programs." The discussion was on police staffing levels and a potential new funding mechanism. He appreciated the input and volunteer service of the appointed members of the Budget Committee. It was legitimate to question whether Council was moving too fast. During the past election, Council heard from citizens that public health and safety were high priorities. This was a response to the electorate. Having a public forum for input on funding might be a good idea. He did not support it going to the Budget Committee.

Councilor Slattery thought the item should come forward with the other items Council would work on at the Wednesday and Thursday meetings. The issue was the funding mechanism. He wanted to see the item in the context of everything else at the two meetings.

Mayor Stromberg explained currently the Police Department had four 6-hours shifts that consisted of a sergeant and three patrol officers. Due to health problems, trainings, turnover, and vacations, it was typically a sergeant and two officers. If an event occurred in two separate areas, there were not enough officers to respond resulting in assistance from neighboring city police departments. Adding an officer to each shift and another officer as the School Resource Officer provided better coverage. He suggested Council pass the policy decision to authorize staffing and discuss revenue sources Wednesday or Thursday.

Councilor Slattery withdrew his motion.

**Councilor Slattery/Darrow m/s to approve the hiring of five police officers and wanted the funding issues brought forward to the priorities discussions on Wednesday and Thursday.**

**Roll Call Vote: Councilor Seffinger, Slattery, Rosenthal, Lemhouse, Morris, and Darrow, YES. Motion passed.**

**5. Approval of first reading by title only of an ordinance titled, “An ordinance amending AMC Chapter 1.08 General Penalties, Section 1.08.005F to reflect prior amendment to AMC 10.120.020 persistent violation” and move onto second reading**

City Attorney Dave Lohman explained there were five violations in the Enforced Law Enhancement Area (ELEA) that might qualify for a persistent violation if someone committed one or a combination three times within a 3-month period. Council added two more November 2015. One required a dog license and the other involved smoking marijuana in public. These violations were not added to the penalty section of **1.08 General Penalties** that made it clear a court appearance was mandatory. The proposed ordinance would add them to that section.

**Councilor Lemhouse/Seffinger m/s to approve First Reading of an ordinance titled, “Ordinance Amending AMC Chapter 1.08 General Penalties, Section 1.08.005F(2) To Reflect Prior Amendment To AMC 10.120.020 Persistent Violation” and move onto Second Reading.**

**Roll Call Vote: Councilor Morris, Seffinger, Lemhouse, Darrow, Rosenthal, and Slattery, YES. Motion passed.**

**6. Approval of first reading by title only of an ordinance titled, “An ordinance amending AMC 14.04.060 Water Connections outside the city limits” and move onto second reading**

City Attorney Dave Lohman explained Council passed the first reading December 2016. Council discussed the impacts the ordinance might have during a subsequent Study Session. Council then tabled the item. It was now back with one addition that made it clear Council had the discretion to decide whether to allow someone to make use of water outside city limits even if they met the criteria in the statute. He indicated an error in **14.04.060(B)(3)(i)** that “...at the Council’s direction,” should read, “...at the Council’s discretion.”

**Councilor Seffinger/Lemhouse m/s to approve First Reading of an Ordinance titled, “An Ordinance Amending AMC 14.04.060 Water Connections Outside the City Limits,” and move on to Second Reading. DISCUSSION:** Interim City Administrator John Karns explained with the City’s mutual aid agreements throughout the two County area, using city water for fire outside city limits was a moot point. The Ashland Fire Department used resources outside city limits. **Roll Call Vote: Councilor Rosenthal, Morris, Seffinger, Slattery, Darrow, and Lemhouse, YES. Motion passed.**

**OTHER BUSINESS FROM COUNCIL MEMBERS/REPORTS FROM COUNCIL LIAISONS**

Councilor Lemhouse appreciated Council’s ability to deal with the agenda, disagree, and still work through the issues.

**ADJOURNMENT OF BUSINESS MEETING**

Meeting adjourned at 9:48 p.m.

---

Dana Smith, Assistant to the City Recorder

---

John Stromberg, Mayor