

MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL OF THE
METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

March 13, 1986

Councilors Present: Councilors Cooper, DeJardin, Frewing,
Gardner, Hansen, Kirkpatrick, Kafoury,
Kelley, Oleson, Van Bergen and Waker

Councilors Absent: Councilor Myers

Also Present: Rick Gustafson, Executive Officer

Staff Present: Don Carlson, Eleanore Baxendale, Dan Durig,
Doug Drennen, Norm Wietting, Dennis
Mulvihill, Jan Schaeffer, Vickie Rocker,
Phillip Fell, Sonnie Russill, Randi Wexler,
Peg Henwood, Mel Huie, Ed Stuhr, Patrick
Minor, Randy Boose, Jill Hinckley, Kay
Rich, Chuck Geyer and Ray Barker

Presiding Officer Waker called the meeting to order at 5:35 p.m.

1. INTRODUCTIONS

None.

2. COUNCILOR COMMUNICATIONS

2.1 Intergovernmental Project Review (IPR)

Councilor Kirkpatrick, Chair of the Intergovernmental Resource Committee, explained the IRP was an informational report reflecting the status of federal grants in the region. The report had traditionally been placed on the Consent Agenda for Council approval. She proposed, since Council approval was not necessary, the item not be placed on the agenda but the report be circulated to Councilors for their information.

In response to Councilor Frewing's question, Councilor Kirkpatrick said her proposed change was not a shift of approval from the Council to staff. Metro's responsibility was to coordinate the report rather than approve it, she said. She and Mel Huie also explained that reference in the IRP to "favorable action" meant the District had received no negative comments about a specific project's status from local governments. Staff agreed the "Staff Response" results should be reworded to reflect they were not action items.

3. EXECUTIVE OFFICER COMMUNICATIONS

West Transfer and Recycling Center Program. Executive Officer Gustafson introduced Bill Young, chairman of the Governor's task force to find an alternative location for the west transfer station. Mr. Young presented a report on the status of the task force's work to date. He said the group held its first public meeting March 6 to establish a schedule and program. The group determined they would seek locations in substantial compliance with Metro's criteria and would not hold hearings on sites that had already been considered by the Metro Council. Mr. Young reported eight sites had been reviewed and a site near 209th and T.V. Highway was identified for a public hearing on March 20. After the hearing, the task force would meet to determine whether they should recommend the site to Governor Atiyeh. A site could be recommended to the Council by the Governor as early as March 27, he said.

In response to Councilor Kafoury's question, Mr. Young said he believed the 209th/T.V. Highway property was currently under the control of a willing seller. He then responded to the Councilor's question regarding the process for notifying citizens of the public hearing on that site. He explained Metro staff had provided a list of over 700 Sunset Corridor names and the CPO #6 had supplied names of residents in the immediate area. Notices had been mailed to all those parties, he said. No newspaper articles had been published in advance of the meeting.

Councilor Frewing asked what the task force's response would be if more sites were brought to them for consideration. Mr. Young explained sites had continued to surface, but the task force was carefully applying Metro's criteria to screen locations for suitability. He said if the 209th/T.V. Highway site was not recommended, at least two more sites warranted further consideration.

Dan Durig said he was pleased the Governor's task force had demonstrated a commitment to Metro's criteria and time schedule. Mr. Young thanked staff for their continued cooperation and said he would report back to the Council on March 27.

Solid Waste Reduction Program Schedule. Executive Officer Gustafson distributed the written schedule to Councilors and noted several items listed on the schedule would be before the Council for consideration. Presiding Officer Waker said he thought it might be appropriate to schedule a Council work session on the waste reduction program in April to discuss the program further.

Tax Base Measure Ballot Title. The Executive Officer reported Metro's ballot title had been successfully challenged in the

Metro Council
March 13, 1986
Page 3

Multnomah County Circuit Court and the revised ballot title filed with the Secretary of State.

Councilor DeJardin said he appreciated Councilors Kirkpatrick and Myer's work on preparing the ballot title. He also disagreed with The Oregonian's report which seemed to indicate the original ballot title was disguising non-Zoo funding. He noted the decision to seek a tax base was a bold move and was surprised by the Multnomah County Circuit Court's decision.

In response to Councilor Frewing's question, Presiding Officer Waker said if the tax base measure were successful, Metro could continue the 51¢ per capita dues assessment until 1989, at which time it could be reevaluated by the State Legislature.

4. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS TO COUNCIL ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS.

None.

5. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS TO COUNCIL ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

None.

6. APPROVAL OF MINUTES of the Meetings of January 23 and February 13, 1986

Councilor Frewing pointed out the minutes of February 13 had omitted his name as a candidate interviewed for the vacant District 8 Council position and he requested the minutes be corrected accordingly.

Motion: Councilor Kafoury moved the minutes be approved as amended and Councilor Kirkpatrick seconded the motion.

Vote: A vote on the motion resulted in:

Ayes: Councilors DeJardin, Frewing, Gardner, Hansen, Kirkpatrick, Kafoury, Kelley, Oleson, Van Bergen and Waker

The motion carried and the minutes were approved as amended.

7. ORDINANCES

7.1 Consideration of Ordinance No. 86-196, for the Purpose of Adopting a Final Order in Contested Case No. 5-2 (Tualatin Hills) and Amending the Metro Urban Growth Boundary in Washington County as Petitioned (Second Reading)

The Clerk read the Ordinance a second time by title only.

Main Motion: A motion to adopt the Ordinance was made by Councilors Kirkpatrick and Kafoury at the first reading of the Ordinance on February 27, 1986.

Jill Hinckley noted Mr. William Moore, who was against adoption of the Ordinance, had distributed a document entitled "Further Evidence Regarding Staff's Report on Ordinance 86-196." Mr. Moore requested this evidence be accepted as new testimony against adoption of the Ordinance. Eleanore Baxendale explained that any new testimony accepted by the Council must meet the following criteria: 1) was there must be a valid reason the testimony was not given at the first reading; 2) the new testimony must be relevant; and 3) it must be likely the new testimony would result in a different decision by the Council. She said staff recommended not accepting Mr. Moore's further evidence because it did not meet the above criteria.

Councilor Van Bergen said he had reviewed Mr. Moore's written statement and did not feel it met the criteria explained by Ms. Baxendale.

Motion to Reject Testimony: Councilor Van Bergen moved to deny William Moore's request to remand Contested Case No. 85-2 back to the Hearings Officer and not to accept Mr. Moore's new testimony on the basis it was irrelevant to the case. Councilor DeJardin seconded the motion.

Councilor Kelley asked staff to clarify the city of Tualatin's position of the applicant's use of the City's fire hydrant. Ms. Hinckley explained because the church was outside the UGB, the City would not allow the church to use the fire hydrant which was inside the UGB. The Councilor said it would be her preference to have the case reviewed again by the Hearings Officer.

Vote on Motion to Reject Testimony: The vote resulted in:

Ayes: Councilors Cooper, DeJardin, Prewing, Gardner, Hansen, Kirkpatrick, Kafoury, Oleson, Van Bergen and Waker

Nay: Councilor Kelley

Absent: Councilor Myers

The motion carried.

Vote on Main Motion: The vote resulted in:

Ayes: Councilors Cooper, DeJardin, Frewing, Gardner, Hansen, Kirkpatrick, Kafoury, Kelley, Oleson, Van Bergen and Waker

Absent: Councilor Myers

The motion carried and Ordinance No. 86-196 was adopted.

7.2 Consideration of Ordinance No. 86-197, for the Purpose of Revising the Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Plan (First Reading and Public Hearing)

The Clerk read the Ordinance a first time by title only.

Ed Stuhr reviewed highlights of the staff report, explaining any agency receiving funds from the U.S. Department of Transportation was required to create and administer a Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Plan. The changes to Metro's DBE Plan as proposed by this ordinance would make the plan consistent with internal contracting procedures and recent federal requirements, he said.

Motion: Councilor Kelley moved the Ordinance be adopted and Councilor Kirkpatrick seconded the motion.

Councilor Frewing asked Mr. Stuhr to review staff's process for involving citizens and the business community in the DBE Plan. Mr. Stuhr explained citizens and the business community were involved in making recommendations when the initial plan was established. At that time, the Executive Officer had appointed a review committee to receive public comment. He said some of the DBE amendments now before the Council were responses to community requests for plan changes. As required by law, proposed changes to the DBE Plan were published 45 days to allow opportunity for public comment, he said. The notification was published in The Oregonian, one minority-owned publication and in a publication of the federal government.

In response to Councilor Hansen's question, Mr. Stuhr said the proposed ordinance would not change the Council's adopted DBE goals. Specific ways of administered those goals, however, would be amended.

Presiding Officer Waker opened the public hearing on Ordinance No. 86-197. There being no public comment, he closed the public hearing and announced the Ordinance would be considered again on March 27, 1986.

8. RESOLUTIONS

8.1 Consideration of Resolution No. 86-634, for the Purpose of Amending the FY 1985-86 Budget of the Metropolitan Service District, and Adding a Program Assistant 1 Position to the Zoo's Budget

Randy Boose reported Zoo staff had requested this budget adjustment in order to provide for more coverage of live animal demonstrations and traveling animal exhibits. FY 1985-86 funds previously budgeted for temporary staff could be transferred to the new position. He explained staff were requesting the change at this time in order to have a person hired by the start of the summer season. Funds for next fiscal year would be requested as part of the FY 1986-87 budget process.

Councilor Kelley asked Kay Rich whether the Zoo-To-You Program was being discontinued. Mr. Rich said the summer parks program would be replaced by the live animal demonstrations and traveling exhibits. The September to May Zoo-To-You programs for schools and nursing homes would continue.

Motion: Councilor Kafoury moved for adoption of Resolution No. 86-634 and Councilor Kirkpatrick seconded the motion.

Councilor Kirkpatrick requested the Program Assistant 1 position appear as a new position in the FY 1986-87 budget.

Vote: A vote on the motion resulted in:

Ayes: Councilors Cooper, DeJardin, Frewing, Gardner, Hansen, Kirkpatrick, Kafoury, Kelley, Oleson, Van Bergen and Waker

Absent: Councilor Myers

The motion carried and Resolution No. 86-634 was adopted.

8.2 Consideration of Strategy and Time Schedule for the Successful Execution of the Resource Recovery Project; and

Consideration of Resolution No. 85-635, Authorizing Exemption to the Public Contracting Procedure Set Out in Metro Code Section 2.04.001 Et Seq for Solid Waste Disposal Services from a Resource Recovery Facility(ies)

Debbie Allmeyer introduced resource recovery project consultants with the firm of Gershman, Brickner & Bratton, Inc., Harvey Gershman, president, and Bob Zier, manager for Metro's project.

Metro Council
March 13, 1986
Page 7

She explained the consultants would be providing management and engineering consulting services.

Ms. Allmeyer then noted Councilors had received an updated project schedule and revisions of the proposed Resolution. The Resolution had been changed to recognize material recovery technology, to include public acceptability as an evaluation criteria for technologies, and to describe the various approaches Metro could take in implementing alternative technology(ies).

Ms. Allmeyer reviewed major events that had shaped Metro's resource recovery program including passage of Senate Bill 662, the Metro Resource Recovery Symposium and the Symposium Panel's recommendations, submittal of the Solid Waste Reduction Program to the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) and commencement of the resource recovery project. She explained staff were currently involved in Phase I of the resource recovery project, the procurement planning phase. A key step in Phase I would be the distribution of Request for Qualifications and Information (RFQ/I) documents on March 13 to technologies.

Ms. Allmeyer then explained staff was requesting an exemption from the public bidding procedures for the resource recovery project because price could not be the only factor on which proposals could be judged. Eleanore Baxendale added that if the Council wished to consider proposals according to factors other than the lowest cost, an exemption would be required. It would be especially important to have an exemption for this project, she said, because several factors would not be known until initial proposals were reviewed including the type of technology that would be chosen, the cost of the project, and where the facility(ies) would be located. She said an exemption would preserve the Council's options. Finally, she noted such an exemption would comply with Metro's Code and the state law.

Regarding the RFQ/I, Councilor Kafoury noted she would have preferred staff had distributed copies of the document to Councilors before it was distributed to the public. She also noted the project schedule did not contain information about when RFQ/I's would be returned, what would happen to the RFQ/I's once they were returned, who would review and qualify them, by what criteria would they be evaluated, and what role would the Council play in the review process. She also asked what events were planned during the six-month period of June through December after certain vendors were qualified and the Request for Proposals (RFP) was issued.

Ms. Allmeyer reviewed the RFQ/I schedule with Councilors. She said a selection committee would review all responses to the RFQ/I and would screen the responses down to a "short list" of those deemed most qualified according to predetermined criteria. The criteria, she said, was listed in the RFQ/I and in the staff report. She

Metro Council
March 13, 1986
Page 8

explained the project consultant was currently working with staff to refine a RFQ/I evaluation process and staff could report these project developments to Councilors on a periodic basis. Doug Drennen added staff were open to input from Councilors on the role they would like to play in evaluating the proposals.

Councilor Kafoury said the process of screening prospective vendors would be the most important part of the project. She urged staff to involve the Council in decisions and to keep them informed.

Ms. Allmeyer then reviewed key dates for the project including the date responses to RFQ/I's would be due (May 19), interviewing firms (May 28), and presenting the short list to the Council (June) via audio/visual presentations.

Ms. Baxendale noted the provisions for a short list (narrowing down qualified vendors to most qualified vendors) needed to be included in the Resolution. She asked staff to note why such a process would be appropriate, explaining the rationale must also become part of the Resolution.

Ms. Allmeyer first responded to the second part of Councilor Kafoury's earlier question. She said six months might not be needed between the time specific vendors were qualified and RFP's were issued but it was necessary for certain events to take place and decisions to be made before Phase II could commence. The DEQ and the EQC had to approve Metro's Solid Waste Reduction Program. This was scheduled to occur in late June. Other major decisions to be made included the cost of the technology, which vendors would receive the RFP, the extent of risk Metro could assume and the mode of financing for the project.

Councilor Kafoury stated she wanted staff to operate on an accelerated but thoughtful schedule. She thought some preliminary work could be done in advance of the EQC's approval of the Solid Waste Reduction Program and she urged an RFP be issued no later than late fall 1986.

Councilor Oleson said it was also his understanding the schedule would be accelerated and agreed with Councilor Kafoury's concerns. He also requested Councilors receive copies of the RFQ/I as soon as possible.

In response to Presiding Officer Waker's question, Ms. Allmeyer said the RFQ/I did limit technologies to materials recovery, mass burn and refuse-derived fuel types.

Councilor Van Bergen said he was concerned about proceeding with the alternative technology project when the DEQ had not yet accepted

Metro Council
March 13, 1986
Page 9

Metro's Solid Waste Reduction Program. He requested DEQ's position on Metro's alternative technology plans be substantiated before the project commenced further. Dan Durig and Presiding Officer Waker said the correspondence received from the DEQ clearly indicated the Department supported immediate implementation of Metro's plans for an alternative technologies program.

In response to Councilor Hansen's question, Mr. Durig discussed planned activities between April 1987 and October 1988. He said the time would be needed to complete the negotiation process with the selected vendor. Councilor Hansen expressed concern that the negotiation period was too long. He thought one of the reasons the Oregon City project had failed was because negotiations had continued longer than necessary. Mr. Durig said staff would certainly work to keep this phase of the project as short as possible.

Councilor Hansen requested staff clearly indicate to the Council the extent of Council involvement in the process of narrowing down vendors to those receiving RFP's and considered for contract negotiation. He also requested the alternative technologies project timeline be based on the closure of the St. Johns Landfill in 1989.

Councilor DeJardin said he was uncomfortable with Councilor Hansen's request because he did not want the Council to be in the position of dictating how staff should do their job. He said Councilors had shared their concerns with staff and staff should have an opportunity to respond to those concerns. To operate otherwise might lengthen the entire process, he said.

Presiding Officer Waker said he would schedule a Council work session to discuss the entire project, the proposed timeline and the extent of Council involvement in the project.

Although Councilor Gardner thought the Council had been adequately involved in the planning process, he was concerned about staff's plans to develop a "short list" before responses to the RFQ/I's were received. Narrowing down vendors to five could pose limitations to vendors or technologies and he urged keeping the process competitive as long as possible.

Councilor Frewing asked why Resolution No. 86-635 had to detail the exact process, particularly the proposed "short list" procedure. Ms. Baxendale explained state law required if an exemption from the public bidding procedure were to exist, findings must be made that applied to two sections of the statute: 1) the exemption was unlikely to encourage favoritism or substantially diminish competition; and 2) the bidding process would result in substantial cost savings. She said staff had been careful to mention in the

Metro Council
March 13, 1986
Page 10

Resolution all the basic criteria proposed to be used in the bid process. It was, therefore, important to include the process of a "short list" in the resolution and to demonstrate it would meet the two criteria stated above.

In response to Councilor Frewing's question, Ms. Baxendale said the condition of a vendor's financial viability was addressed under the third "WHEREAS" of the Resolution.

At Ms. Baxendale's request, Mr. Gershman explained why staff recommended narrowing down vendors to a list of five before RFP's were issued. He first explained the highly competitive nature of this type of project. Prospective bidders would want to know the exact extent of the competition during each phase of the procurement process, he said. Because the bidding process was a substantial financial investment to prospective bidders (estimated at between \$250,000 to \$500,000 per bidder), the bidder would submit a high quality proposal if it were known in advance he had a one in five chance of being awarded the bid. On the other hand, if it were known in advance as many as ten vendors would be asked to submit proposals, bidders would invest substantially less in preparing proposals, or they might not submit a proposal at all. In short, the quality of proposals submitted would diminish as competition and risk increased. He also explained if the RFQ was too restrictive in determining the criteria by which vendors would be evaluated, competition would be decreased. He recommended each proposal be evaluated on its own merits, thus, the need for an exemption to the standard competitive bid process.

A discussion followed regarding the merits of restricting the competition to five vendors before RFP's were issued. At the Presiding Officer's request, staff agreed to prepare language for the Resolution that would incorporate the concerns of the Council. The Presiding Officer announced he would call the Council into Executive Session and would continue discussion of Resolution No. 86-635 later in the meeting.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

At 8:00 p.m., Presiding Officer Waker called the meeting into Executive Session under the authority of ORS 192.660(1)(h). Present were Councilors Cooper, DeJardin, Frewing, Gardner, Hansen, Kirkpatrick, Kafoury, Kelley, Oleson, Van Bergen and Waker. The Presiding Officer called the meeting back into regular session at 8:27 p.m.

9.1 RESOLUTIONS

9.2 Consideration of a Contract with Coates Advertising for Solid Waste Reduction Program Education

Dennis Mulvihill presented the history of the project, explaining \$145,000 had been budgeted for the contract for FY 1985-86. Senate Bill 662 had preempted work on the project, however, until now. The public education program was an important component of the Solid Waste Reduction Program, he said.

Janet Schaeffer outlined the program objectives as listed in Attachment A of the staff report. She also explained the project would be performed in two phases, the first phase involving planning the program. Staff would return to the Council at the end of Phase I (April, 1986), she said, to seek approval for Phase II. Ms. Schaeffer reviewed the contractor selection process. Staff recommended awarding the contract to Coates Advertising. She then introduced Michael and Jeanie Coates to the Council.

Motion: Councilor Kafoury moved to approve the contract with Coates Advertising and to instruct staff return to the Council at the end of Phase I for approval of subsequent phases. Councilor DeJardin seconded the motion.

In answer to Councilor Frewing's question, Ms. Schaeffer said the contract could be terminated at any time upon five days notice to the Contractor.

Councilor Hansen requested the consultant and staff include Clark County, Washington, in promotional efforts and involve that county in planning and funding the project.

Councilor Van Bergen said he would not support approving the contract because it was not yet known whether the DEQ would approve Metro's proposed Solid Waste Reduction Program. He also did not think the \$186,000 proposed contract sum was sufficient to guarantee a successful public education campaign.

Councilor Kelley said she would support contract approval because a promotional campaign would be beneficial in presenting a good image of Metro. She thought \$186,000 could accomplish the desired goal if the funds were used wisely.

Presiding Officer Waker said he was supporting the contract. He had met with Coates Advertising personnel and was confident they would do a good job.

Vote: A vote on the motion resulted in:

Ayes: Councilors Cooper, DeJardin, Frewing, Gardner, Hansen, Kirkpatrick, Kafoury, Kelley and Waker

Nay: Councilor Van Bergen

Absent: Councilors Myers and Oleson

The motion carried and the contract was approved. Presiding Officer Waker requested staff return to the Council on April 22, 1986, to seek approval for implementation of Phase II of the contract.

9.1 Consideration of a Contract with Duraquip Inc. for the Fabrication and Installation of a Disc Screen and Conveying System for Metro's Yard Debris Program

Chuck Geyer discussed the purpose of the yard debris program and the process for selecting the recommended contractor as outlined in the meeting agenda materials.

Councilor Kirkpatrick asked if staff were satisfied with Duraquip's qualifications since their bid was far lower than other bidders. Mr. Geyer explained the high bidder had not conformed to staff's specifications which explained the wide range of amounts bid. Staff were more than satisfied with Duraquip's qualifications, he said.

Councilor Hansen said he was excited about the program and encouraged staff to seek other uses for the equipment such as manufacturing composting material for sale. He suggested a separate disposal rate could be established for yard debris. Mr. Geyer reported staff were investigating these possibilities as part of the Solid Waste Reduction Program.

Motion: Councilor Kafoury moved the contract with Duraquip Inc. be approved and Councilor Kirkpatrick seconded the motion.

Vote: A vote on the motion resulted in:

Ayes: Councilors Cooper, Frewing, Gardner, Hansen, Kirkpatrick, Kafoury, Kelley, Van Bergen and Waker

Absent: Councilors DeJardin, Myers and Oleson

The motion carried and the contract was approved.

Councilor Van Bergen requested staff return to the Council in one month and report on operations costs for the contracted project.

10. REPORTS

McLoughlin Corridor Improvement Program. Eleanore Baxendale reported the City of Portland had adopted a resolution approving the McLoughlin Corridor Improvement Program which had been challenged in the courts by Cash's Nursery. She requested permission to file an explanatory brief before the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA).

Motion: Councilor Kirkpatrick moved Counsel be authorized to file a motion to intervene in the City of Portland's case before LUBA and Councilor Kafoury seconded the motion.

Vote: A vote on the motion resulted in:

Ayes: Councilors Cooper, Frewing, Gardner, Hansen, Kirkpatrick, Kafoury, Kelley, Van Bergen and Waker

Absent: Councilors DeJardin, Myers and Oleson

The motion carried.

Response to City Club Report on Metro. Councilor Van Bergen said he had read the report prepared by the City Club and although he was pleased with some of the report's findings, he took exception to the reference of the Oregon City garbage burning plant, the attempt to site a landfill at Wildwood, and the Johnson Creek drainage program as Metro failures. He urged the Council to prepare a formal response to the report.

Councilor Frewing agreed a response was necessary. He noted a reference in the report to Metro's "invisible" functions. The Councilor said although those functions did not capture headlines, they were very important and successful efforts and cited transportation planning as an outstanding example of important work that had been well performed.

Councilor Kirkpatrick reported she had discussed the report with State Representative Ron Cease and other individuals who were the authors of Metro's enabling legislation and encouraged their participation in a formal response.

Presiding Officer Waker appointed Councilor Kirkpatrick to work with the Executive Officer, staff and other individuals to prepare a formal response to the City Club's report on Metro. The draft report would be brought before the Council for review.

Metro Council
March 13, 1986
Page 14

Councilor Hansen said he would prefer to see a broad-based group analyze the Metro organization. He questioned whether many of his constituents were represented in the City Club.

The Executive Officer said he was pleased the City Club had chosen the Metro organization for a study, but thought Metro's response to the report should point out recent activities and changes the report had not taken into consideration since the study commenced 18 months ago. The report, however, discussed the new priorities to support a regional governance study and to examine the future role of Metro in the region.

8.2 Consideration of Resolution No. 86-635, for the Purpose of Authorizing an Exemption to the Public Contracting Procedure Set Out in Metro Code Section 2.04.001 Et Seq for Solid Waste Disposal Services from a Resource Recovery Facility (ies)
(Continued Discussion)

Staff returned to the meeting and distributed a revised Resolution No. 86-635 which incorporated new language on the competitive bidding process.

Motion: Councilor Kirkpatrick moved to adopt the revised version of Resolution No. 86-635 and Councilor Kafoury seconded the motion.

Vote: A vote on the motion resulted in:

Ayes: Councilors Cooper, Frewing, Gardner, Hansen, Kirkpatrick, Kafoury and Waker

Nay: Councilor Van Bergen

Absent: Councilors DeJardin, Kelley, Myers and Oleson

The motion carried and Resolution No. 86-635 was adopted.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



A. Marie Nelson
Clerk of the Council

amn
5372C/313-2
04/01/86