

## EDMOND CITY COUNCIL MINUTES

February 9, 2009

Mayor Dan O'Neil called the regular meeting of the Edmond City Council to order at 5:30 p.m., Monday, February 9, 2009, in the City Council Chambers.

Councilmember Lamb introduced the Leadership Edmond Class of 2009.

**2. Approval of January 26, 2009, Minutes.** Motion by Waner, seconded by Lamb, to approve Minutes. **Motion carried** as followed:

AYES: Mayor O'Neil, Councilmembers Page, Waner, Lamb and Miller

NAYS: None

**3. City Council Presentations:**

- A. **Presentation of proclamation recognizing February as AMBUCS National Visibility month in the City of Edmond.**
- B. **Recognition of recipients for the Edmond Beautiful "Keep It Clean, Keep it Green" award.**
- C. **Presentation of the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) for the year ending June 30, 2008, by Arledge and Associates, P.C.** Andy Cromer addressed Council and stated there were no significant findings of reportable conditions of internal control or material instances of noncompliance and that the financial statements received an unqualified opinion. He outlined several changes regarding accounting standards that will be changing in the future regarding accounting standards for derivatives regarding the forward sales contracts. He noted this accounting change will involve additional funds being spent to hire a consultant to establish a value of those derivatives. Mr. Cromer stated the new accounting standards will also require the City to account for differently insurance costs for retirees who remain on the City's insurance plan. He stated there will be additional costs to hire an actuary to figure those costs. He also addressed problems with the Utility Customer Services billing software reporting. He noted his firm had to make a \$2M deduction in revenues to balance the financial statement.
- D. **City Manager's Progress Report.** Larry Stevens addressed Council and stated a contract for the FY 2008/09 reconstruction and resurfacing of streets program has been

awarded to All Roads Paving for \$1.7M. A change order is being negotiated by staff to include an alternate bid for the Fisher Hills area because they felt the project could be accomplished within the additional funds that have become available.

Mr. Stevens stated the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board and a representative from the adult softball leagues have recommended the design firm of Jacobs Carter Burgess for the 4<sup>th</sup> Community Park and adult softball complex. Staff is in the process of finalizing the scope of work. The recommendation will be presented to the Capital Projects and Financing Task Force on February 17<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Stevens stated the City is involved in a joint effort with many other cities in this region to explore the possibilities of delivering raw water to central Oklahoma from the Kiamichi drainage basin. Camp Dresser and McKee (CDM), completed a feasibility study in December and several options have been evaluated, including cost estimates. A follow-up meeting with all the entities will be held on February 6, 2009, and a workshop will be scheduled with Council to review the findings.

Mr. Stevens stated the draft report of the 50-Year water supply study has been completed by CDM and the citizen's Stakeholder Committee reviewed the results last week. Staff will be presenting an overview of the study and the Committee's recommendations in the near future.

**4. Appointments to Boards and Commissions:**

- A. **Appointment to the Edmond Arts & Humanities Council.** Mayor O'Neil nominated Duane Onarecker for appointment to serve a term expiring February, 2010.

Motion by Waner, seconded by Page, to approve General Consent Item 4.A. **Motion carried** as follows:

AYES: Mayor O'Neil, Councilmembers Page, Waner, Lamb and Miller  
NAYS: None

**5. GENERAL CONSENT ITEMS:** (General Consent Items were voted on collectively except where noted.)

- A. **Approval of Administrative Items:**

- 1) **Approval of agreement with the Oklahoma City-County Health Department to allow the use of City property to continue to operate a Ropes Course.**
- 2) **Approval to utilize the law firm of McAfee and Taft as outside legal counsel for the City of Edmond Employee's Retirement Plan.**
- 3) **Approval of transfer of appropriations for the Park Tax Fund - \$22,000**
- 4) **Acceptance of public improvements and maintenance bonds for the following:**
  - a) Edmond Community Park, Phase II trail
  - b) Tinker Federal Credit Union
  - c) 2<sup>nd</sup> Street and Air Depot

Motion by Lamb, seconded by Waner, to approve General Consent Items 5.A.(1-4). **Motion carried** as follows:

AYES: Mayor O'Neil, Councilmembers Page, Waner, Lamb and Miller  
NAYS: None

**B. Approval of Purchases:**

- 1) **Approval of budgeted fund for capital and operating expenditures for the Guthrie/Edmond Regional Airport in the amount of \$6,717.15.**
- 2) **Award of bid disposition by the Purchasing Manager for vegetation control services (including renewal options) for various City properties in the estimated annual amount of \$30,000.**
- 3) **Award of bid for a SAN disk array, including all associated hardware for the Information Technology Department (IT Department). Purchasing Manager recommended accepting bid from Hewlett Packard in the amount of \$164,997.50.**

Motion by Waner, seconded by Miller, to approve General Consent Items 5.B.(1-3). **Motion carried** as follows:

AYES: Mayor O'Neil, Councilmembers Page, Waner, Lamb and Miller  
NAYS: None

- 4) **Award of bids for mowing of City owned properties including renewal options.** Mr. Stevens requested this item be continued to the next meeting in order for staff to meet with one of the bidders regarding the bid recommendations.

Motion by Miller, seconded by Page, to continue General Consent Item 5.B.(4) to the next meeting. **Motion carried** as follows:

AYES: Mayor O'Neil, Councilmembers Page, Waner, Lamb and Miller  
NAYS: None

Motion by Miller, seconded by Lamb, to recess the City Council meeting in order to convene the Edmond Public Works Authority meeting. **Motion carried** as follows:

AYES: Mayor O'Neil, Councilmembers Page, Waner, Lamb and Miller  
NAYS: None

**Mayor O'Neil reconvened the City Council meeting.**

**8. PLANNING CONSENT ITEMS:**

- A. **Consideration of extension of Final Plat for Hidden Prairie at Kelley Pointe II, located north of 33<sup>rd</sup> Street on Hidden Prairie Way (Kelley Pointe Development Company, Inc., applicant) Case No. PR070006.**

Motion by Lamb, seconded by Page, to approve Planning Consent Item 8.A. **Motion carried** as follows:

AYES: Mayor O'Neil, Councilmembers Page, Waner, Lamb and Miller  
NAYS: None

- B. **Consideration of Final Plat for Astoria Executive Park, located south of Willowood Road, east of Coltrane (Titan Development Partners, LLC, applicant) Case No. PR080049.** The site consists of 11.4 acres on property zoned for Neighborhood Commercial since 1966. Drainage detention will be accomplished on each lot. A new water line will be installed connecting Coltrane and Willowood Road to serve all the lots. Sanitary sewer will also be extended to serve each lot.

Councilmember Page stated he was concerned about the drainage and that each lot will be responsible for their own drainage facility which he felt would be problematic. He stated he was also concerned with the drainage structures being so close to the flood plain. He suggested a regional detention facility be installed on the southeast portion of the site rather than requiring each lot to provide their own detention.

Steve Manek, City Engineer, addressed Council and outlined the drainage for the site. He stated the storm sewer line needed to be extended along the west property line all the way to the current drainage area on the east. Mr. Manek stated this will reduce the overland water flow from flowing onto the adjacent residential properties. He stated the storm sewer pipe will not be located under the street but will run parallel to the street.

General discussion was held regarding the direction of the water flow and whether the drainage plan submitted by the applicant will be adequate and not increase the flow from what it is currently. Councilmember Page asked if underground detention was possible and Mr. Manek stated it was possible. He noted parking can and has been installed over storm sewer pipes in past projects.

Martin Teuscher, representing the applicant, addressed Council and stated the intent is to construct executive offices and not retail businesses. He noted that several of the lots will likely be combined in order to get the size of building they desire as well as to be able to comply with City requirements. He stated the applicant has agreed to extend the storm sewer line as requested by staff. Mr. Teuscher stated the floodplain area will become a park and common area for the businesses as well as the public. He noted the applicant will maintain the park as it will not be a publicly designated park. He stated the water flow will be slowed down and more will be detained with each building that is constructed and that the project will not create additional flow than is historically present.

Motion by Lamb, seconded by Miller, to approve Planning Consent Item 8.B. **Motion carried** as follows:

AYES: Mayor O'Neil, Councilmembers Waner, Lamb and Miller  
NAYS: Councilmember Page

**9. Consideration of variance for a wall sign extending at right angles to the wall, located on the southeast corner of Broadway**

**and 1<sup>st</sup> Street, 100 N. Broadway (Citizen's Bank, applicant).** The applicant is requesting several variances for this project. City codes prohibit wall signs from extending over the right-of-way. Signs also are not permitted to extend more than 15 inches from the wall and must be located on the vertical surface of the building. The proposed sign would extend over the sidewalk on Broadway, 10 feet above the sidewalk allowing more than adequate clearance. The sign will be lighted but has no flashing lights. The size of the sign is 65.79 square feet and the applicant agreed to eliminate all wall signs on the north elevation along 1<sup>st</sup> Street. Staff feels the sign is in character with the core downtown district. Similar signs have been allowed at Hideaway Pizza and the Jazz Lab on 5<sup>th</sup> Street. The Central Edmond Urban Development Board reviewed the application but did not vote on this sign. Planning Commission recommended approval.

Councilmember Lamb stated a study conducted by the Thomas Small Group during the streetscape study on Broadway represented early Edmond's look and this type of sign was the type shown on the study.

Councilmember Page stated the Urban Board did not vote on this application but he spoke with the Urban Board Chairman, David Forest, who thought the sign was too large. He noted the Urban Board did not vote on the sign variance because they did not feel it was in their purview to do so but they requested they be given the authority in the future to review sign variances in the downtown area. Councilmember Page stated he felt approval would set a precedent and that the sign was out of proportion with the area. He stated he had no opposition to the sign other than the size.

David Hornbeek, architect representing the applicant, addressed Council and stated the Thomas Small study felt that blade signs should be encouraged. He noted a study was also conducted in 1998 called the Edmond Master Plan which also encouraged gateway signage in downtown Edmond. He stated the proposed sign will have the name Edmond prominently displayed and Citizen's Bank very subtly along the top of the sign. Mr. Hornbeek stated the sign will be 16 feet 10 inches tall and 5 feet 10 inches wide at the widest point. He stated the applicant wants the sign to have the historical look of an old theater sign. He noted if the north side of the building was included in the overall square footage of the building's exterior, the size of the proposed sign would be within normal range. He stated the applicant felt because the sign does not have their name prominently displayed, it is more of a community sign. Mr. Hornbeek stated the sign would have incandescent bulbs of the same type as an old theater sign.

Randel Shadid addressed Council and stated as a downtown business owner, he is in favor of the sign.

Saundra Naifeh also addressed Council and encouraged Council to find out how bright the lights will be on the sign as sometimes pictures are different than the real thing. She also encouraged Council to ensure that each variance request is reviewed on an individual basis as there could be problems in the future if a blanket approval is granted. She stated she felt that the signs were important to the life and beauty of Edmond and the pollution of signs could be a detriment to the community and she urged Council to make their approval very specific to this particular sign variance request.

Jim Ramsey also addressed Council in favor of the sign because he felt the sign highlighted Edmond as a community.

This item was discussed at length regarding the brightness and type of the lights and their brightness, the size and whether it fit with the character of the downtown area.

Councilmember Lamb stated blade signs are the type of signs that were in the historical downtown area and he felt that if Council really aspired to bring the downtown back to the historical look, blade signs will more than likely be the type of signs that will be preferred. He also stated he felt the Urban Board's role would probably need to be expanded to allow them to address sign variances in the Downtown Business District.

Councilmember Waner stated she felt it would set a precedent and that other businesses in downtown would also want the same type of sign. She felt the suggestion to define the variance very tightly is something that should be done.

Mr. Hornbeek stated the precedent set by the applicant's sign is that the name of the business is not the primary name on the sign and that it becomes more of a community sign announcing the City of Edmond. He stated he did not know of another business that would spend the amount of money his client has and not have their name prominently displayed on the sign. He stated each sign variance in this area should be evaluated on each individual sign's merits.

Mayor O'Neil stated he did not feel the size was a major precedent and that he would in favor of the sign if the motion includes language that does not make this variance a precedent setting event. He stated he wished the downtown area was more lit up because he thought that is the way downtown should be.

Councilmember Waner requested the motion include approval of a maximum of 65.79 square feet for any future signs of this type in the downtown area. General discussion was held on this issue and Councilmember Lamb suggested the motion contain language that the sign variance was approved on the proposed sign's size in order to set a precedent for future signs in the downtown area.

Motion by Lamb, seconded by Miller, to grant the sign variance on this sign's size on the Broadway frontage with the understanding that it counts the frontage on the north with a restriction of no sign on the north face, includes the extension of the sign over the right-of-way with the understanding that the variance is approved due to the sign copy being a community message and not a business message or text. **Motion carried** as follows:

AYES: Mayor O'Neil, Councilmembers Waner, Lamb and Miller  
 NAYS: Councilmember Page

**10. Consideration of variance request to modify a non-conforming time, temperature and business name sign, located at 1 North Broadway (Citizen's Bank, applicant).** The legal non-conforming sign is located on the roof of the bank and the applicant is proposing to change the time and temperature display to LED standards. As long as the sign is not an electronic message center, LED lighting is allowed for the time, temperature and date as that type of lighting is more efficient and less expensive to maintain. The existing sign is 48 square feet not including the time and temperature portion and has been in existence since the late 1960's. The bank's logo has changed and the applicant would like a 96 square foot sign. The height of the sign would remain the same so the sign is not more non-conforming that it is currently. In April 2003, Council approved a sign modification for *The Edmond Sun* which was also a legal non-conforming sign. Planning Commission recommended approval.

David Hornbeek addressed Council on behalf of the applicant and stated the existing sign has been in place for 48 years and is antiquated, very expensive to maintain and uses more energy than a newer sign would. He stated the applicant wanted to replace the sign with a sign as similar as possible to the original sign. He presented slides showing how the new sign would look and stated the only portion that would be changed is the white portion of the sign containing the name of the bank. He stated a logo would be added to the top of the text on that portion of the sign which would add two feet to the height of the sign. He stated the proposed sign would require less energy and would be a greener product. Mr. Hornbeek stated the applicant has recently found out that they have been leasing the existing sign and now would like to install a sign that they own.

Motion by Page, seconded by Miller, to approve Item 10. **Motion carried** as follows:

AYES: Mayor O'Neil, Councilmembers Page, Waner, Lamb and Miller  
NAYS: None

Mayor O'Neil announced the meeting would be recessed for five minutes.

**11. Discussion and Consideration of variance to an approved Site Plan for a convenience store/service station requiring sight proof fence, located on the northeast corner of Broadway and 9<sup>th</sup> Street (OnCue Express, applicant) Case No. SP080006.** The site plan was approved on May 12, 2008, and was continued at the last meeting in order for the applicant to provide the landscaping plan. Originally Council required the existing sight-proof fence be replaced on the east side of the alley next to the single family homes. When the application was originally approved, the applicant agreed to replace the existing fence if requested by Council and the neighbors to the east. The applicant's attorney has submitted letters from the adjacent property owners who do not want a fence on their property and are not interested in a sight-proof fence at this location. The Central Edmond Urban Development Board recommended approval during the site plan review process without a fence requirement. As a result of the Urban Board's action, the variance request was not reviewed again by the Board.

Jan Ramseyer-Fees, City Planner, addressed Council and stated the applicant has agreed to install a three-foot landscaping berm north of the building approximately 20 feet to the existing landscaped area. She stated the landscaping area also includes a row of trees located west of the loading area. The alley will be paved in an inverted v in order to capture the run-off which will then flow into a storm sewer. There will be no parking in the alley because the applicant plans a loading area on the north side of the building next to the alley. Ms. Fees stated the applicant has stated that the store will be stocked from the front so use of the loading area would be limited.

Councilmember Page stated he was concerned about the area along the back of the building which is at a higher grade level than the alley. Steve Manek, City Engineer, addressed Council and stated the area along the back of the building can be sloped to the alley and either landscaping or paving can be installed.

Randel Shadid, attorney representing the applicant, addressed Council and stated when the site plan was previously approved the

applicant agreed to replace the fence on the two adjacent properties. He noted previous to the last meeting both adjacent residents submitted letters to him stating they did not want the fence on their property to be replaced. Since that meeting, one of the residents had changed his mind and now wants the fence but he wants it to be placed on the applicant's property and not his property. Mr. Shadid stated the site plan contained a combination of an earthen berm and evergreen trees extending from the north side of the building to provide sight-proof screening for the residents to the east. He stated the applicant has agreed to install either the landscaped berm or the fence but not both but they felt the landscaping berm would be more aesthetically pleasing. He stated the applicant would prefer to pave the alley from their building to the east to widen the alley and eliminate the need to maintain a small grassy area.

Jim Ramsey, adjacent resident to the east, addressed Council and stated he changed his mind regarding the fence because he thought the proposed fence would be installed on the applicant's property and not his property. He requested a sight proof fence on the applicant's property next to the alley. Mr. Ramsey stated he felt a sidewalk should be installed along the applicant's property to provide a walkway rather than requiring pedestrians to walk in the alley. He stated he also was not aware that when the site plan was approved a loading area would be located next to the alley on the north side of the building. He stated he was opposed to the loading area's location due to the noise and debris from the applicant's business.

Councilmember Waner stated she originally requested a fence on Mr. Ramsey's property to shield the vehicle lights from shining in the adjacent resident's homes when vehicles used the alley which Mr. Ramsey stated would not be a problem for him. He stated if a fence is installed on his property the vehicle lights would shine over the fence due to the elevation of the applicant's property. He requested a fence be installed on the west side of the alley which the applicant would not agree to do.

Councilmember Waner stated several public meetings have been held regarding this issue and the current site plan was adopted. She stated the issue before Council was whether to require a fence or landscaping berm, either of which the applicant's has agreed to do, and not to discuss or change any other aspects of the site plan.

Mr. Ramsey did not state a preference between the fence or landscaping. Council determined that Mr. Ramsey would need to negotiate with the applicant over whether to install a fence on his property.

Consensus of Council was that the site plan did not need to be amended because the original site plan included either a fence or landscaping and that the applicant preferred a berm and landscaping.

**12. Public Hearing and Consideration of Ordinance No. 3197 closing a portion of an easement at 1745 W. 33<sup>rd</sup> Street, Lot 1, Block 1, Bristol Office Park (Danforth Development, LLC, applicant) Case No. ES080006.** The existing office building encroaches into the 10 foot easement but there is no electric improvements in the easement. The applicant has discussed this issue with Edmond Electric and all the improvements have been placed in the easements to the west. Edmond Electric was the only intended use for the easement and staff has no objection to closing the entire 10 foot easement. Planning Commission recommended approval.

Motion by Page, seconded by Miller, to approve Ordinance No. 3197 as read by title by the Mayor. **Motion carried** as follows:

AYES: Mayor O'Neil, Councilmembers Page, Waner, Lamb and Miller  
NAYS: None

**13. Public Hearing and Consideration of extension of The Falls Condominiums to include Site Plan for the Special Use Permit, located east of Vista Lane, south of 2<sup>nd</sup> Street (The Falls, LLC, applicant) Case No. SP050043.** This project has been continued several times in the past and no changes are requested to the previous approval. This item was discussed on November 24, 2008, and continued to January 12, 2009. This applicant was not ready to discuss this item at the January 12<sup>th</sup> meeting and it did not appear on that agenda. This is the first discussion since the item was continued on November 24<sup>th</sup>. The original Site Plan did not provide for the possibility of a connection to the south. The plat for the Tuscany Villas IV Addition, located immediately south of this project, was amended to include a provision for a street or public access to be extended north to connect with Wade Martin Drive to allow a future access connection. Because of the change to Tuscany Villas IV Addition, the plat for The Falls development would need to be amended to address the public access issue as well as any future plats for this property. Planning Commission recommended approval.

Randel Shadid, attorney representing the applicant, addressed Council and stated prior to issuing any building permits, right-of-way will be granted allowing access for the Tuscany Villas IV Addition to Wade Martin Drive. He noted he has been in contact with a firm from Boston regarding this site but at this time no

decisions have been made. Mr. Shadid stated the project complied with all code requirements at the time the site plan was approved and he did not see a reason not to grant the extension which will allow the applicant to continue to build out the project.

Mayor O'Neil stated he recently met with one of the principles of this project and that the City Attorney had received a letter stating they would be willing to install hydro-mulching by March 25<sup>th</sup> and he was in favor of allowing the applicant the time to proceed with the hydro-mulching.

Mr. Shadid requested this item be continued to April 13<sup>th</sup> in order to allow the hydro-mulching to take effect and the applicant to comply with other items requested by Council.

Motion by Lamb, seconded by Miller, to continue Item No. 12 to April 13<sup>th</sup>. **Motion carried** as follows:

AYES: Mayor O'Neil, Councilmembers Waner, Lamb and Miller

NAYS: Councilmember Page

**14. Public Hearing and Consideration of Ordinance No. 3198 amending the Edmond Municipal Code, Section 22.4.23, Central Business District (CBD), Section(E) Other District Provisions by adding New Subsection 22.4.23(E)(3) Residential Conversions; amending Section 22.4.24, Downtown Residential District (DRD), renaming Subsection(E) Other District Provisions and adding new Subsection(2) Residential Conversions; and providing for Repealer and Severability.** The previous Title 22 set limitations for residential conversions in the Central Business District (CBD) and Downtown Residential District (DRD). Staff discovered the revised Title 22 was silent on converting residences to commercial usage.

At the November 24, 2008, meeting Councilmember Lamb requested the wording be amended to encourage conceptual review/pre-applications on residential conversions before review by the Central Edmond Urban Development Board. The Urban Board recommended the pre-application reviews with their Board be optional, not mandatory. The mandatory pre-application conference as contained in Title 22 will continue to be with City staff.

The proposed ordinance was returned to the Planning Commission for their review and recommendation as requested by Council. The Planning Commission recommended unanimous approval of the proposed ordinance which includes the additional wording suggested by Councilmember Lamb.

Mayor O'Neil stated he was pleased with the wording but he would have preferred the ordinance to be more definitive.

Councilmember Lamb stated due to the density and unique qualities of the downtown area, he felt the Urban Board should have the opportunity to participate in an applicant's proposal prior to the applicant investing a large amount of money to have plans designed. He noted by appearing before the Urban Board for a conceptual review, the applicant would be able to ascertain whether the Urban Board would approve the type of conversion they were proposing.

General discussion was held on this issue and the wording of the proposed ordinance. Councilmember Waner stated she was opposed to using the word "encourage" in the ordinance as it would be difficult to enforce and she asked if the ordinance could be rephrased. Councilmember Miller stated the City would not enforce the ordinance but it would be a means for the applicant to save money. Ms. Fees noted the Urban Board strongly felt the conceptual review continue to be optional and not mandatory. She recommended the language be amended to "All applications for residential conversions are encouraged to submit for conceptual review before the Central Edmond Urban Development Board." Councilmember Lamb noted the applicant would potentially have two hearings before the Urban Board, one the conceptual review and one the formal review with all the engineering and other details included. Consensus of Council was to amend the ordinance as suggested by Ms. Fees.

Motion by Miller, seconded by Waner, to approve Ordinance No. 3198 as read by title by the Mayor as amended above. **Motion carried** as follows:

AYES: Mayor O'Neil, Councilmembers Page, Waner, Lamb and Miller  
NAYS: None

**15. Executive Session to discuss the purchase of real property, generally located in the vicinity of central Edmond (Executive Session authorized pursuant to 25 Okla. State. Sec. 307 (B)(3)):**

Motion by Waner, seconded by Page, to meet in Executive Session to discuss the above item. **Motion carried** as follows:

AYES: Mayor O'Neil, Councilmembers Page, Waner, Lamb and Miller  
NAYS: None

Mayor and Councilmembers recessed to the City Council Conference Room at 8:27 p.m. and returned to the City Council Chambers at 8:52 p.m.

Motion by Miller, seconded by Lamb, to adjourn Executive Session.  
**Motion carried** as follows:

AYES: Mayor O'Neil, Councilmembers Page, Waner, Lamb and  
Miller  
NAYS: None

**16. Consideration of action with regard to the purchase of real property generally located in the vicinity of central Edmond.**  
Mayor O'Neil stated no action would be taken on this item.

**17. NEW BUSINESS:**

Mayor O'Neil invited the public to attend a dedication on February 17<sup>th</sup> at Arcadia Lake for their wildlife conservation area. He also invited the public to attend the 15<sup>th</sup> annual Edmond Neighborhood Summit sponsored by the City of Edmond and the Edmond Neighborhood Alliance on February 21<sup>st</sup>.

Councilmember Waner offered her congratulations to Councilmembers Lamb and Miller for being re-elected without any opposition.

**18. Motion by Lamb, seconded by Miller, to adjourn meeting.**  
**Motion carried** as follows:

AYES: Mayor O'Neil, Councilmembers Page, Waner, Lamb and  
Miller  
NAYS: None

---

**City Clerk**

---

**Mayor**