



**SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES**

**COUNCIL CHAMBER, 401 CALIFORNIA AVENUE
BOULDER CITY, NEVADA 89005**

Tuesday, November 30, 2021 – 2:00 PM

CALL TO ORDER

The special meeting of the Boulder City Council, County of Clark, State of Nevada, was called to order at 2:00 p.m., Tuesday, November 30, 2021, in the Council Chamber, City Hall, by Mayor McManus in due compliance with law, the Charter, and the Council's Rules of Procedure.

CONFIRMATION OF POSTING AND ROLL CALL

Council members present: Mayor Kiernan McManus, Council member James Howard Adams, Council member Claudia Bridges, Council member Matt Fox, Council member Sherri Jorgensen (5)

Absent: None (0)

Also present: City Manager Taylour Tedder, City Clerk Tami McKay, and City Attorney Michael Oh

Mayor Kiernan McManus called the meeting to order.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

PUBLIC COMMENT

Ms. Judy Hoskins provided a brief history of the sale of Tract 350, noting that in 2010, Tract 350 was approved for sale by the voters. She said the City made prior attempts to sell Tract 350 with the last attempt in 2016 but failed to receive any bids. As a Council member, she said she evaluated the situation and decided the attempts had been too restrictive. She requested that the sale of Tract 350 be placed on an agenda to allow developers to develop. She said it was placed on the agenda as Item No. 8. A motion was approved to direct staff to formulate criteria for developers to provide a design proposal for Tract 350 as a Request for Information (RFI) and bring it back to Council. She said the Finance Department came up with a brilliant plan for distributing the proceeds of the sale setting aside 90% of the proceeds for the funding of the new pool. She said she read and analyzed the packet and said two of the three developers had presented a comprehensive plan for the development of the property and have offered a reasonable dollar amount for the purchase. She said she was impressed with the

evaluation by staff and agreed with their recommendations. She thanked them for a job well done. She said she agreed the developer should install the stormwater conveyance facility so they are responsible for possible damage to properties that could occur from improper installation. She said this would remove the responsibility from the City. She said she was so pleased to be part of this project and excited to see it come this far with such excellent results. She thanked the staff again.

Mr. Victor Miller stated he was speaking as a resident only. He had not received notice of the agenda item to be discussed. He opposed changes to the zoning in that area. Only one response did not recommend zone changes. He said per the City's Master Plan, Bristle Road and Clubhouse Drive had traffic islands, and no proposals included them. That would need to be an agenda item discussed. He wanted to be on record in opposition to R1-5 zoning. It is a way to turn Boulder City into Henderson. He reiterated his concerns about noticing and zoning.

Ms. Sharon Newby stated that she wanted to thank everyone for working on the website because it was easier to download packets. She was excited about the project and the funds for constructing a new pool. The developer installing their sewer system was a good idea. She was anxious to proceed so the pool construction could begin in approximately three years. She felt Toll Bros and Story Book had done an excellent job working within the odd shape of the land.

Ms. Judy Dechaine stated she reviewed the packet, and Story Book and Toll Bros. would be good to do the work. It was a good idea to include duplexes to expand the housing market. The duplexes would be more reasonably priced. She liked the street layout. She expressed concern about completing the project in phases. There was a drainage problem from the houses along Bristlecone, and she wanted everyone in the area to pay for the infrastructure being added if the City was installing it. It was better for the developer to install the sewer system.

There being no further comments offered, the public comment portion was closed.

Mayor McManus stated that there was a comment made that matters involved in the discussion could require changes to the Master Plan and if the issue had been properly put on the agenda.

City Manager Taylour Tedder responded that any zoning changes would require separate noticing and brought back to the City Council.

Mayor McManus noted they had faced allegations about items being on the agenda correctly in the past. He asked if the plans presented would require changes to the Master Plan.

Brok Armantrout, Contracts and Real Estate Manager, commented that the zoning might require a change, but boundary changes were not known. He said the Master Plan itself would not require modifications.

Mayor McManus noted that the statement made was that the plans provided did not indicate traffic islands and created a change to the Master Plan. He asked if that statement was correct.

Contracts and Real Estate Manager Armantrout replied that it was not correct. Anything within the right of way for improvements was not considered at this time.

Mayor McManus asked if the traffic islands were a requirement of the current Master Plan.

Contracts and Real Estate Manager Armantrout deferred to Public Works Director Keegan Littrell.

Public Works Director Littrell said a median would not be included in a Master Plan. Instead, the street width or street type would be specified within the Master Plan.

Mayor McManus stated that this type of issue had resulted in a reversal of Council action. He wanted to be sure if what was being presented was a deviation from the Master Plan.

Public Works Director Littrell would need to check if medians were specified, but the proposed street width was in accordance with the Master Plan.

Mayor McManus asked if there was a designation for Bristlecone in the Master Plan.

Public Works Director Littrell stated there was a designation but did not know if it was a major or minor collector. However, he could look it up and bring it to the Council.

Mayor McManus was hesitant to proceed without knowing if it was in the Master Plan and properly put on the agenda.

Mayor McManus called for a recess at 2:23 p.m. and said the meeting would reconvene at 2:45 p.m.

Mayor McManus called the meeting back to order at 2:45 p.m.

City Attorney Oh stated the meeting was properly noticed. If amendments need to be made regarding zoning matters, it would come before the Council and be given notice at that time. He said this matter was the awarding of a request for proposal only. Any discussion would need to pertain to what was in the recommendations. There would need to be a land sales agreement presented to and approved by the City Council later. No decisions would be made on the Master Plan or zoning changes at the meeting.

Mayor McManus commented that the proposals held a storm drain channel on the property's eastern edge.

City Attorney Oh stated that was an additional requirement the City put in the RFP. Therefore, it was something considered in the award of the RFP.

City Manager Tedder stated that the Public Works Director researched that matter if they needed additional information.

Mayor McManus stated his question was whether the item had been appropriately put on the agenda based on the proposals.

City Manager Tedder commented it was correctly put on the agenda as they were not looking at any changes to zoning or the Master Plan. Instead, they were focusing on the RFP's during the meeting.

Mayor McManus invited the applicants to present their proposals.

1. For possible action: Matters pertaining to the award of the Request for Proposal (RFP) to sell land known as Tract 350, lands around the north and east sides of Boulder Creek Golf Course

A staff report was provided by Finance Director Diane Pelletier and included in the November 30, 2021, Agenda Packet.

Contracts and Real Estate Manager Armantrout noted that the RFP was issued in July to purchase Tract 350. It was an oddly shaped parcel. They wanted to see multiple options, a bid price including stormwater infrastructure, and a bid price where the City would construct the stormwater system, sample elevations, floorplans, draft subdivision layout, and state any zoning changes proposed. On July 29th, they held a nonmandatory pre-proposal conference, and then the applicants could visit the site. The bid closed on Dec. 16th with three proposals. Story Book and Toll Brothers provided what was requested.

- Story Book Homes would cost 28.5 million dollars with the sewer and 21.5 million dollars without. The zoning would remain at R1-5 and R1-7.
- Proposal 2 was estimated at 24 million dollars with the sewer and just under 25 million without. The proposed zoning was R-2 and R1-7.
- William Lyon had three different scenarios, all for 29 million dollars, and did not provide a cost if the City provided the sewer. The options were a mix of R1-6 and R1-7.

The staff had considered the SID option to construct the sewer. Suppose the City was to construct the improvement, they had to follow state law on contracting and payment which inflated the cost. They estimated the cost for the City at 1.5 million dollars and would require bonding. They could not hold a meeting to approve a bond until November of 2022. There was no guarantee that it would be approved or that there would be a home cost reduction to offset the cost difference if the City installed the improvements. The evaluation committee decided only to review the developer build option.

- A. Receive presentations, review, and discussion of three (3) submitted proposals from Story Book Homes, Toll Brothers, and William Lyon Homes to purchase Tract 350

Story Book Homes

Janet Love and Isaac Summers from Story Book Homes presented.

Ms. Love stated that they had worked with the City for parcel 349. They would answer any questions raised and use their experience in the City to provide a result preserving Boulder City's esthetic. Story Book Homes was acquired by Toll Brothers, who would also present. Both brands had worked on the proposals before the acquisition and had submitted them separately. They offered two site plans for the proposal.

Mr. Summers provided an overview of the proposals.

- Proposal 1 included 122 lots, including 44 lots designated as R1-15, 67 defined as R1-10, and 13 set as R1-7. It kept the same zoning intent as what existed. The Northern entry was designed to accommodate traffic. They tried to configure open space with the parcel shape and resulted in four open space elements throughout the community.
- Proposal 2 consisted of 144 lots, including 34 lots with designation R1-15, 45 lots with R1-10, and 65 lots with R1-5. There could be adjustments in the Southern portion for more dense zoning. There would be no zoning changes to the Master Code. It had the same entrance option. This plan utilized open space in three areas throughout the community.

Additionally, both proposals had three separate takedowns of the land. They would focus on the Southern portion of 13 ½ acres, the second/middle at 15 ½ acres, and the 16 acres to the North along Adams Blvd. The proposal was configured based on the site proposal, improvements and considered the growth regulations of 30 permits per development.

Ms. Love commented that the lot sizes varied. The product would include what they were building in the Boulder Hills Estates community. New and existing floor plans would be offered. She detailed what was provided in Boulder Hills Estates. The homes had buyer options that covered the residents' recreation needs, including large side yards, RV garages, and covers and gates. The variety of plans would bring a diverse group of buyers. If they were approved for the R1-5 designation, they could offer smaller floor plans to increase the range of homebuyers in Boulder City. They currently had single-story plans from 1500-1800 square feet and two-story plans from 2000-2300 square feet. They would uphold their standard of product. She asked if there were any comments or questions.

Mayor McManus asked if they could state what the two proposals entailed along Adams Boulevard and the difference in lot size between the proposals along that street.

Mr. Summers replied that they proposed to use the median with turn lanes already existing. So the lots would be R1-10, and the Southern portion of that section would be R1-15.

Mayor McManus stated he appreciated the parks broken up within the neighborhoods, and with the new conservation laws, it was a good idea. However, he was concerned with the affordability of the homes.

Ms. Love commented that the site plan most closely followed the existing zoning. She thanked the Council.

Toll Brothers

Land Entitlement Manager Jeff Borchardt introduced Robin Hogan, Dan Wright, Jeremy Stone, and Kevin Hermann, who would manage the project. Mr. Herman was a resident of Boulder City. Toll Brothers would be new to building in Boulder City. He detailed their company's accomplishments. They believed that they were beyond just building houses and contributed to the communities. They gave buyers many options. Their proposals described their commitment to quality.

Vice President of Community Planning, Dan Hogan, detailed Community Planning at Toll Brothers. They had a department dedicated to collaboration and protecting their luxury brand. They focused on the neighborhood design and architecture of the homes. He took pride in the community. He showed examples of their architecture.

- Proposals 1 consisted of the top section containing 78 home sites for single-story homes and two-car garages. There would be two floor plan types with four elevations. The square footage ranged from 1750 to 1850. They had proposed R1-5 zoning in that section. There would be larger, single-story homes with three car garages in the smaller area. There would be three floorplans with three elevations and square footage ranging from 1850 to 2450. The zoning would be R1-7.
- Proposal 2 planned the upper section with 82 duplexes with two stories and two-car garages. There would be four floorplans with different elevations, and the square footage would range from 1454-1495 with R-2 zoning. They proposed the same plan as the first proposal for the lower part of the community.

Both proposals contained walking paths, multiple pocket parks, and one linear park along Bristlecone. He concluded the overview.

Mr. Borchardt noted that they also offered to manage the design and build of the Boulder City Community Pool in their plan. They were willing to work with the City for that project. They believed their community embodied the Master Plan. He summarized the proposals. They would pay for the utility improvements and work with the City to achieve a need like the pool or fire station. Boulder valued its history, and they wanted to offer that esthetic in their art deco motifs. They would incorporate any input from the City. He highlighted that they were a for-sale product and would meet any standards in the Master Plan.

Mr. Kevin Hermann commented that he is a Boulder City resident and loved the community. He would oversee all the civil infrastructure to be installed and highlighted Toll Brothers' efforts as they were perfect for building in the City. He would represent Toll Brothers and be there through all parts of the process and available anytime. John Willaby, a Boulder City resident, would oversee the housing construction.

Council member Adams commented that the current zoning did not match the proposal and asked how Toll Brothers would adapt if the zoning were not changed.

Robyn Hogan with Toll Brothers stated their proposals were based on the number of units and product types offered. Therefore, if they did not get the proposed zoning, it could affect the price.

Mayor McManus asked if they would pay less for the land if there were fewer units. He asked for a figure on the price difference of an R-2 or R1-5 versus the R1-7.

Ms. Hogan replied that was correct and the price difference for proposal one, the 7,000 sq ft lot, would be \$40,000 more than the 5,000 sq ft lot. Proposal two would be a price difference of \$78,000.

Mayor McManus asked how high the perimeter wall would be and the appearance of the development regardless of lot size.

Ms. Hogan replied that there would be six-foot perimeter walls. In addition, the homes would have rear elevation articulation, and the rear housing façades would all be different.

William Lyon Homes

Eddie Duenas, Vice President of Acquisition for Taylor Morrison, presented the proposal. They were now officially Taylor Morrison. He gave a brief history of William Lyon Homes. They build a variety of homes for many buyers. Their team included multiple people who had worked for the company for over 20 years. He had worked there for more than nine years. They built first-time homes and luxury homes in the Ridges. In 2004 they purchased Mountain Falls master-planned community in Nye County, and they knew what it was like to develop in smaller towns with pride. Their corporate office and the local team were diligent in loving the customer. They noticed they needed to do something new in Nye County and adapted to the community. They were in a partnership with the National Wildlife Federation, and each division met with them quarterly to look for opportunities to create wildlife habitats. With the help of the Federation, they had 15 acres approved for habitat.

The product with all three proposals would bring both 40 and 50-foot single-story products. The home designs were proven throughout Nevada. The plans offered entry-level buyers an opportunity with a square footage of around 2000 sq ft. There were four floor plans. The 50-foot projects were larger, with square footage ranging from low to high

2000. Three car garages came standard and side yards. There was a demand for single-story communities. The product lines include healthier options such as smart thermostats, advanced water filtration, handsfree faucets, and low VOC paint. Their mission was in line with the City and enhanced quality of life. They would provide high customer service.

- Proposal 1 was a mix of 40 and 50-foot products for 185 units. The designation would be R1-5 and R1-7.
- Proposal 2 had larger lots for a total of 155 units with a zoning of R1-7 and a variance to allow homes on a 60-foot wide lot. In addition, they had five open space areas.
- Proposal 3 was all 50-foot floor plans for a total of 147 lots. It would adhere to all R1-7 zoning requirements.

Council member Adams noted that he didn't see planned park space.

Mr. Duenas responded that they designed small areas easy for homeowners to access. There would be a series of small pockets throughout the community.

Mayor asked if narrower lots would result in larger back yards and if the lots would meet the 15-foot side yard setback requirement.

Mr. Duenas answered, yes. There would be at least a 40-foot deep rear yard. The side setbacks would require a variance, and those lots would be in the R1-5 designation. So they would not need a zone change for those lots.

Mayor McManus asked if the plans with a narrower lot would not comply with current setback standards.

Mr. Duenas responded that he was correct for option 1. Option 2 would adhere to R1-7, and option three would adhere with no concessions.

Contracts and Real Estate Manager Armantrout stated they had met with a committee including the Public Works Director, Parks and Rec Director, and the Fire Department to evaluate both versions of the SID and non-SID versions of the proposals. The non-SID versions were preferred. The top recommendation was for the Toll Brothers proposal one that best met the RFP and needs of the community. They liked the linear park, scattering of parks, and homes' size. They proposed a three-phase takedown with a total purchase price of \$28,571,000. 2.8 million would be designated to public safety, and 25.7 million would be the swimming pool recreation project. The following steps, regardless of choice, would be to modify the resolution to identify which proposer and option were selected. They would then need to direct the staff to negate a sales contract. Next, the developer would prepare a draft tentative map and work with community development for rezoning. Finally, the land would be reappraised to negotiate the contract. It would be roughly 12-18 months before homes would be constructed. The staff requested they deliberate, and all representatives could answer their questions.

Mayor McManus stated that the Boulder Creek Golf Course was built before a vote of the people for the sale of more than one acre and going over \$1 million in debt. Utility reserve funds were used to construct the golf course, but the golf course never profited. The money that went back to the utility fund was never from the golf course. The land sale was approved in 2010, but there had been no interest. The focus should always be on growth paying for growth, which was not the case with this project. The standard procedure was that developers pay for infrastructure costs, but Boulder Hills wasn't the case. He was disappointed that Story Book didn't pay for the drainage and that answers were not provided on how that would be handled. Furthermore, he had serious concerns about phased purchases. It was stated before that there is an appraisal on this land. It was more than a year old, and therefore it's no longer valid. However, state law asserted that the appraisal must be less than a year old. This issue hadn't been addressed in this proposal either. The offer from Toll Brothers to help with the pool was generous but should not be part of the conversation. He appreciated developers putting forth plans that had some variety in the types of homes they were building. Having variety was important to the community.

Council member Bridges stated that people want affordable housing. She experienced duplexes around golf courses when she lived in Scottsdale, but she wasn't sure a duplex would be considered affordable housing. She appreciated that there was a community next to it with large homes. Boulder City had been made up of smaller houses, especially in the Avenues and the Historic District. She also knew many people who had moved from smaller homes into the new developments, which resulted in releasing some more affordable housing to those who want to move into Boulder City. She asked about current demands for golf course properties and what properties people seek.

Mr. Duenas stated that Mountain Falls properties demand larger side yards and RV storage. The buyers were primarily over the age of 55, from California, and looking for smaller homes. William Lyons Homes provided drainage development and did not want a SID.

Council member Bridges asked about addressing sidewalks, street widths, and creating HOAs.

Story Book said they would create an HOA. The proposed street sections would follow the City Code. Sidewalks would be developed on both sides.

Jeff Warkhart stated that the street standards would be met, and sidewalks would be built on both sides. Furthermore, they planned to connect the regional trail to Bristlecone and the golf course. There was more demand for mixed housing sizes than larger single-family homes.

Council member Jorgensen stated that Story Book was the only one who offered homes with consistent zones. She thought that zoning should be similar and consistent with the houses on Bristlecone. She asked if home sizes could be made larger or more consistent with current zoning.

Jeff Warkhart replied that the minimum size for larger lots was 7,000 square feet.

Council member Jorgensen stated that it costs more to live in Boulder City because of the growth restriction. Homes near a golf course should not be explored as affordable. The golf course was the City's asset, and they should be mindful of that. She appreciated the presentations. She wanted a place that represented the needs and wants of the community. Most of her constituents did not wish for zoning changes.

Council member Fox stated that a nice golf course should warrant larger homes. He did not believe R1-5 would be consistent with the area.

Mr. Duenas noted that the larger homes would be built along the golf courses near the existing larger homes. Therefore, the third option was consistent with current zoning.

Mr. Warkhart stated that R1-5 would not accommodate toy storage, but R1-7 would accommodate it, along with a three-car garage.

Mayor McManus noted that R1-7 is typical of homes built after the 70s. All Louis Homes are R1-7.

Council member Adams stated that he liked the diversity offered by Toll Brothers. The green space was important to the community. The Master Plan discussed diversity because of limited growth. He did not believe only the affluent had an opportunity to purchase a home. Due to the growth control ordinance, the City should consider additional housing types during rare development opportunities. None of the proposals would detriment neighborhoods, and none of them would invite certain kinds of neighbors or a particular culture. It seems like Proposal 2 for Toll Brothers would decrease the price per acreage.

Robin Hogan stated that Proposal 2 included duplexes and explained the difference between lots with single-family homes and duplexes.

Council member Adams stated that looking at the majority of downtown and historic area. Beautiful homes could be built on small lots. Sizes of homes didn't detract or create an adverse neighborhood or culture within the community. Adding duplexes would allow a more diversity and available housing. He asked if R1-5 would require a zoning amendment.

Contracts and Real Estate Manager Armantrout replied that the zoning text was created for R1-5, but it hasn't been applied within the community. Therefore, a map amendment would be required, and not a text amendment.

Council member Adams asked what staff requirements would be to implement a SID.

Contracts and Real Estate Manager Armantrout replied that they would create a SID district to collect taxes. A third-party administrator would collect funds, and the proceeds would be used to pay off any bonds.

Mayor McManus asked if many assessments were utilized with a SID.

Contracts and Real Estate Manager Armantrout replied that it would be a traditional way to pay many assessments through a property tax bill. However, other models would include billing directly, separate from the property tax, and they are collected and act as a lien against the property.

Mayor McManus stated that the assumption was that the only way to implement this project was via a bond. The developers could implement the project, but they would reduce costs. The City was told that there are serious questions about this without answers.

Contracts and Real Estate Manager Armantrout stated that because of the growth control orders, they would only have so many lots created at any given time. Those would be the ones that they could guarantee, impose the SID assessment and collect it, leaving the other two-thirds of the property to be imposed in the future. However, they would still need to construct the improvement of the entire project and take advantage of the economy and cost. They would have to bond the whole thing.

Mayor McManus stated that he thought the current approach was that there was only one way to implement the project and didn't think that was the case.

Council member Bridges asked if the project for storm sewer lines would be approximately \$1 million.

Public Works Director Littrell replied that the project was initially designed in 2015, and inflation was added. The estimate calculated in March of this year was approximately \$1.4 million.

Council member Bridges stated that she thought the developer building the improvements made the most sense. Otherwise, the project would be delayed because taking a bond over \$1 million requires a public vote a year from now.

Mayor McManus stated that the City either takes less money by having a developer do it or pays for it. Without an assessment of individuals who benefit directly from the work, all residents would pay for it.

Council member Jorgensen asked if the developer was required to complete the infrastructure at once or in phases.

Public Works Director Littrell replied that both the City and the developer would do it in phases.

Council member Jorgensen stated that going to a vote would postpone the project.

Mayor McManus stated that he wasn't sure if that legal question was answered.

Public Works Director Littrell stated that they could do it as a CIP project. The City would have to decide how to collect the money from the applicable residents. Another option was using the general fund.

Mayor McManus reiterated that they don't have all the answers needed in this matter.

Council member Bridges asked if anyone could speak to it.

Mr. Warkhart stated that they would build all at once. However, they would need to install the storm drain system first.

Toll Brothers commented they would establish drainage all at once, install the storm drain facility at the beginning and use one plan set. They saw rising construction costs, so it would be beneficial to start it soon.

Mr. Hermann stated that they would install the storm drain facility as one of the first items. He had seen a rise in construction costs, and it would save costs if the storm drain were built sooner than later.

Council member Fox stated that he was torn between Story Book and Toll Brothers. He was not in favor of duplexes.

Council member Adams said that the current resolution contained a price and asked if that was problematic since appraisals were needed.

Contracts and Real Estate Manager Armantrout replied that the current resolution could be amended.

- A. Resolution No. 7368, a resolution of the City Council of Boulder City, Nevada, awarding an RFP for the land sale of Tract 350

Motion: Approve Resolution No. 7368 and award the RFP to Toll Brothers Proposal Number 1

Moved by: Council member Adams **Seconded by:** Council member Bridges

Vote:

AYE: Council member James Howard Adams, Council member Claudia Bridges, Council member Matt Fox, (3)

NAY: Mayor Kiernan McManus and Council member Sherri Jorgensen (2)

Absent: None (0)

The motion was approved.

2. Public Comment

Doug Scheppmann, a resident of Boulder City, stated that he was in favor of Toll Brothers. He was on the initial Golf Course Construction Committee, and back then, the City Council and residents of the City decided to lay out the land around the golf course for future development. He hoped that the money would not be the driving force behind this project and that the project would be done in the right way. This was one of the last available golf course developments in Clark County. However, he was disappointed with the concept of Toll Brothers' homes, namely changing the R1-15 zoning. He said the Mesa Ridge development was a spot where larger homes could be built that were indicative of homes along Bristlecone Drive. He said there had been a discussion way back when about the possibility of having some single-story duplexes, which he believed, are in high demand. They could only be on the area of Club House Drive. He said he didn't think it would be appropriate to have duplexes, as shown on the plans, across the street from R1-15 homes bordering the golf course. He said he didn't believe it was a wise plan; however, he agreed with adding diversity on the smaller parcel along Club House Drive. He also addressed the "temporary" tent facility (Pavilion) at Boulder Creek which had been used as a convention center for a long time. He suggested it would be nice to have a value-added project and build a permanent larger facility that would allow larger groups to gather since the proposed project borders with the tent facility.

Judy Hoskins thanked the Council for taking a recess to answer the questions. She referenced a former OML violation that was dismissed regarding discussion during a former RFP process.

Mayor McManus clarified that there were no violations.

No further comments were offered, and public comments were closed.

There being no further business to come before the Council, Mayor McManus adjourned the meeting at 4:32 p.m.


Kiernan McManus, Mayor

ATTEST:


Tami McKay, City Clerk