

CITY OF GEARHART
Public Hearing and Regular Meeting of the City Council
Wednesday, September 3, 2025
6:00 pm On-site and Virtual/Telephonic

A public hearing and a regular meeting of the Gearhart City Council was held Wednesday, September 3, 2025. Council members, City staff, and the public were able to attend on-site, virtually, or by dialing in on a telephone.

Present were Mayor Kerry Smith, Councilor Paulina Cockrum, Councilor Preston Devereaux, Councilor Dana Gould, Councilor Sharon Kloefer, City Administrator Chad Sweet, Interim City Attorney Chad Jacobs, Fire Chief Josh Como, Police Chief Josh Gregory, City Planner Garrett Phillips, Executive Assistant Krysti Ficker, and City Treasurer Justine Hill. A quorum of the Council was present.

At 6:00 pm, Mayor Smith went over the hearing's disclosure statement and opened the public hearing for a street vacation request for a portion of the Hemlock right-of-way (ROW). There were no conflicts of interest, ex-parte contact, or personal bias declared by any member of the Council. Councilor Gould noted she rented RV space at an adjacent business. There were no challenges to the City Council's ability to make an impartial decision.

City Planner Phillips went over the application submittal timeline. He indicated that the Planning Commission has had discussions and the decision making process was now at the City Council level. He identified the site location and noted that it was originally platted as Hemlock Avenue; however, current maps (e.g., Google) do not have it specifically identified. He indicated that the staff report supported the minimum approval requirements that had been established by the Gearhart Zoning Ordinance (GZO). He noted the City Council had the discretion to decide if the vacate was in the best interest of the City. He mentioned that the staff report also had recommended conditions of approval suggested by City Staff and the Planning Commission. He said that there was no public testimony given while the application was being discussed and reviewed by the Planning Commission. He indicated that the Planning Commission was agreeable to the application request; however, did provide conditions of approval. He noted that one piece of written testimony had recently been submitted that raised a concern about protecting the wetlands that were on the site. He mentioned that the location did include a locally significant wetland, which if the ROW is vacated would still be regulated by the City's wetland ordinance that would prohibit development and restrict vegetation removal.

City Planner Phillips referenced GZO Article 12 (Street and Alley Vacation) as the guidance used to evaluate the request to vacate. He indicated that one of the requirements was that all of the adjacent property owners needed to submit a signed consent form, which was completed. He also noted that another completed requirement was that $\frac{2}{3}$ of owners representing the area extending 400 ft to the north and south of the vacation area needed to submit consent forms, which was also completed.

City Planner Phillips explained that Article 12 provided the assessment compensation requirements, which provides a simple formula for defining the value of the ROW and the compensation that is due to the City. He noted that the formula does not take local conditions into consideration. He mentioned that Section 12.030 in the Staff Report outlined the estimated compensation costs by property section. He indicated that the City would be indifferent to who pays the property costs; however, it would be one or all of the adjacent property owners. City Planner Phillips referenced a previous City decision that adjusted the compensation amount based on some local factors. He indicated that there has been a concern expressed over the compensation for the vacation area because it was unusable wetlands. In his interpretation, Article 12.030 clearly defines the compensation calculation. He noted that the vacated property area was divided 50% to adjacent property, which was 15 feet to the east and 15 feet to the west and does not create new lots.

City Planner Phillips referenced Section 12.050 in the staff report, which established some approval considerations and requested the applicant provide reasons why the vacation of the ROW area was requested. He indicated that the Planning Commission felt that the City Council should investigate more into the reason for the application to vacate this particular area. He also noted other considerations were whether or not the City may need the ROW area for anything in the future (e.g., access to other lots, public infrastructure, public access to a waterway). He did go over a hypothetical purpose of the ROW area, which was to provide access to the continued City owned ROW to the south that would have no other legal access. He noted that another recommended condition of approval was to retain an access easement or have the applicant provide another access through a different piece of property.

City Planner Phillips referenced Section 12.060 in the staff report, which goes over how the ROW vacation would be recorded and how some of the next steps unfold. He noted that the proposal was fairly preliminary given there was still a public hearing meeting, potential issue over compensation amounts, and the applicant's interest in acquiring the adjacent owners' 15 feet. He indicated that the public hearing was for the Council to consider the merits of the proposal and whether or not it was in the best interest of the City. He mentioned that if the City Council did approve the request with the recommended conditions, there would still be continued work to be done with the applicant (e.g., final survey, legal description with surveyor's stamp, compensation, recorded with County). He went over recommended conditions of approval, which

included private access easement; reminders of procedures and steps that would need to be completed (#2-#5); and a solidified timeline for completion.

- Mayor Smith introduced the applicant's report.
 - Terry Lowenberg, Beach Development (925 11th Ave, Seaside). He indicated that he did not see a reason why the City would need access to the vacated property area. He noted that the property has restrictions on building and that there are lots of wetlands that are not accessible by the City. He noted that he would like the property to clean-up the property line; as well as incorporate an already existing structure on the ROW into his property. He indicated that the \$75,000 assessed compensation amount was absurd because the property is totally unbuildable by anyone. He felt that it would be a benefit for the City to grant the vacation because it puts the land back on the City's tax rolls.
 - Councilor Cockrum requested clarification on what Applicant Lowenberg referenced as "clean-up the property." He indicated that a survey of the property had been done and submitted. He mentioned that some of the overhanging foliage needed to be trimmed.
 - Mayor Smith requested clarification on the structure Applicant Lowenberg referenced earlier that was located on the ROW property. Applicant Lowenberg showed Mayor Smith on a map where the shed was located, which he indicated had been there since the 50s. Applicant Lowenberg clarified about building access and location of another shed (garbage).
 - Mayor Smith requested clarification from City Planner Phillips on Section 12.050 of the staff report regarding the following statement: "Staff do not understand the applicant's reason for vacating ROW south of that area adjacent to Pacific Way." City Planner Phillips clarified it was simply responding to a section of the GZO code requirement that asks the applicant what was the reason for vacating that particular area and that there was not clarity from application on the reasoning for needing the entire 400 feet south of Pacific Way. He felt that the applicant had provided adequate clarification at this public hearing meeting.
 - Applicant Lowenberg also clarified that the property line adjustment would also be a benefit because it would provide access to one of his property's buildings on the northwest corner, which currently requires access through the City's ROW. He also commented that the value of the land was predicated on land surrounding it; however, the surrounding land used for valuation is not swamp. He indicated having issues with the price.
- Mayor Smith asked if there were any proponents, which there were none.
- Mayor Smith asked if there were any opponents, which there were none.

- Mayor Smith asked if there were any neutral comments, which there were none.
 - Councilor Devereaux inquired on how Applicant Lowenberg came up with the \$75,000 asking price. Applicant Lowenberg indicated that it was \$37,500 for each half of the right-of-way property. Councilor Devereaux responded that the findings in the staff report were showing \$60,570. Councilor Devereaux also agreed with Applicant Lowenberg's assessment of the property's description of "swamp."
- Mayor Smith asked if there were any applicant's rebuttals, which there were none.

Mayor Smith closed the public hearing at 6:26 pm and opened the regular meeting of the Council.

There were no conflicts of interest declared by any member of the Council.

Approve Minutes.

- ON MOTION by Councilor Cockrum, 2nd by Councilor Kloefer to approve the minutes of the July 29, 2025 worksession meeting, MOTION was approved 5 yeas (Cockrum, Devereaux, Gould, Kloefer, Smith) - 0 nays.
- ON MOTION by Councilor Kloefer, 2nd by Councilor Cockrum to approve minutes of the August 6, 2025 regular and public hearing meeting, MOTION was approved 5 yeas (Cockrum, Devereaux, Gould, Kloefer, Smith) - 0 nays.

Mayor Smith requested that the Planning Commission President also sign the Planning Commission minutes. He would like to see that the Commission President agrees with what is being submitted as the official minutes.

Mayor's Report. Mayor Smith reported that he participated in the Trails End Art Association (TEAA) annual judged show by awarding the Mayor's Award. He shared a story about the images in the picture. He attended the annual Gearhart Association picnic, in which he indicated that both Presidents resigned. He had several meetings with Administrator Sweet and Councilor Cockrum. Mayor Smith reported he attended a three day Oregon Mayor's Association conference in Baker City. He met with the Building Official, Chief Como, and Administrator Sweet regarding the Public Safety Building project.

Councilor Reports.

- Councilor Kloefer participated in a three hour vegetation removal event on the airport's tarmac. She also assisted in the Hood-to-Coast event as a Ham Radio operator, which resulted in an incident

free four hour shift. She has been talking with citizens and trying to get their input on the Public Safety Building project. She also gave an update on the Second Street property purchase and noted that the North Coast Land Conservancy (NCLC) has been assisting with collecting donations. She indicated that NCLC's intent is to turn the property over to the City with some stipulations. She advocated for donations to the project by contacting NCLC, which are tax deductible.

- Councilor Cockrum noted that donations to the Second Street project could also be made online through NCLC. She and Administrator Sweet have been meeting weekly and focusing on an action plan to share with the Council to collaboratively work on the Public Safety Building project options. She noted that she also has Councilor Paulina Cockrum accounts on Facebook and Instagram.
- Councilor Gould also attended the Trails End Art Association (TEAA) annual show. She and Meyer Freeman (Small Business Development Center Lead Advisor) walked to local businesses where she was able to introduce him and distribute some flyers. She reviewed Councilor Cockrum's Public Safety Building project task document and appreciated all the hours of work that were put into it. She worked on suggestions for the contractor work hour ordinance. She signed up for the FEMA BioP zoom discussion that is set for next week, which she received information via e-mail and would be happy to share if any other Councilors are interested.
- Councilor Devereaux reported he has been having a lot of discussion with the local citizenry regarding the Public Safety Building project.

City Officer Reports.

- Chief of Police. Police Chief Gregory reported that he had been on vacation and praised the officers for their good work while he was gone. He went over statistical data for the police department. He noted a current theft case and gave accolades to Officer Mares for his contributions to the case. Councilor Kloepfer requested additional clarification on the specific areas of traffic citation statistics. Police Chief Gregory noted the main areas of traffic citations were: Gearhart's business core on highway 101 where the speed drops to 40 mph; highway 101 near Bud's Campground; and the intersection area around Cottage/Gearhart Loop Road. He noted that he does try to monitor Pacific Way; however, the police car is so visible it is often hard to catch speeders. He also explained rear-facing radar on police vehicles. Councilor Gould was aware of some local transient activity and inquired if Police Chief Gregory felt that vacating the Hemlock ROW would have any impact on being able to access the area. Police Chief Gregory felt that cleaning up vegetation would be beneficial and that working with the property owner would allow the same access they have now. Councilor Kloepfer inquired if it was helpful to law enforcement to have the electric speed sign operational. Police Chief Gregory felt it was beneficial.

- Fire Chief. Fire Chief Como went over the department's statistical data. He mentioned that the Gearhart fire department participated in the Hood-to-Coast event and were able to help with flagging and drinking water distribution. Councilor Kloepper inquired about Gearhart's participation in an Oregon conflagration. Chief Como indicated that they did participate in the Central Oregon conflagration, in which both people and vehicles were dispatched. Councilor Cockrum inquired about the fire department employment vacancy. Chief Como indicated that he has posted internally an interim Division Chief position. Councilor Devereaux inquired about addresses on the fire log that were labeled as Seaside. Fire Chief Como explained that this is one of the issues with sharing a zip code with Seaside because the fire software automatically generates the City. He noted that on the same street, the system may automatically assign Seaside to one and Gearhart to the next. He admitted that it does cause confusion.
- City Treasurer. Financial reports were submitted in the Councilors' packets. She noted that City staff completed the annual site visit with the auditors. Noteworthy in revenues: quarterly franchise fees from Spectrum Charter Communication; a reimbursement check for expenditures on the Alder Springs Fire Conflagration; gained momentum in the building department due to increased permits; a decreased state revenue share apportionment payment (Fund 45); and a miscellaneous payment in the Fire Apparatus Reserve Fund for the sale of a surplus vehicle to Seaside Fire and Rescue. In expenditures, she mentioned that the police department had an annual renewal for access to Lexipol services; an interest payment in debt service on the remaining water treatment facility general obligation bond; a water payment to the City of Warrenton water; and purchases in Fund 50 for street restriping and sidewalk torch down. She mentioned that the City was notified in August that Umpqua Bank has renamed itself to Columbia Bank. She noted that although most customers will avoid account changes, the City was not so lucky. She mentioned that Columbia Bank had assigned a new account to the City and will be closing the City's old account on October 27, 2025.
- City Attorney. Interim City Attorney Jacobs indicated City staff have been working on various projects with attorneys at Beery, Elsner & Hammond (BEH), which he indicated has been going well. He gave an update on the request to try and retrieve Gearhart files from the previous City Attorney. He indicated they have been able to acquire a handful of paper files; however, there has been difficulty getting any electronic files. He cautioned that there may not be much access to historical data from Attorney Watts' office. Councilor Gould expressed concern about a project that the former City Attorney was actively involved in regarding inaccurate methodology calculations used in Portland State University population estimate, which impacts many Oregon cities. She was aware that the League of Oregon Cities (LOC) had also heard complaints from cities and was interested in collaborating to see what could be done. She does not want to see the investigation into the methodology forgotten. Attorney Jacobs said BEH would be willing to assist.

- City Administrator. Administrator Sweet's report was sent to the Councilors in their packets. He thanked the Council for their time working on the Public Safety Building project. He noted that code enforcement has been busy (e.g., vegetation, tree) and a short-term vacation rental permit expiration appeal filed with Planning Commission. He referenced an email written by City Planner Phillips that was an update on the Flood Hazard Overlay Zone (FHOZ) Amendment Option Ordinance (*placed on the back of Administrator's Report in Council's packet*). Administrator Sweet indicated that FHOZ discussion would be back in October. He also talked about signs that have been placed in an aquatic zone south of G street. He indicated that City staff would be contacting the owners and asking them to remove the signs. He mentioned that the signs were not permitted and/or approved by the City. He noted that there was an opportunity to place signs; however, not in that area. Administrator Sweet also mentioned the City has received one submittal on the City's RFP for attorney services, which he will review and report back to the Council. Councilor Kloepper inquired about the gentleman who had requested a water bill reduction credit at the last Council meeting. Administrator Sweet explained that the property owner was given an additional credit beyond the 40%.

Visitors. None.

Public Communications - Written & Oral. Mayor Smith read the oral public comment statement on the agenda. There was no written public communication submitted.

- Deanna Mancill (2945 Highway 101 N, Gearhart) indicated that she was one of many people upset about the property with the sign placement. She mentioned her background as a land survey assistant and indicated she was very familiar with the piece of property. She talked about the legally established boundary lines. She felt that it was inappropriate due to zoning and restriction of access to put signs where they are located. She pointed out that the entire estuary is privately owned and if the property owner was allowed to block access that has always been continuously used, other property owners would follow. She felt Gearhart residents needed access to the estuary, beaches, and public places.
- Pat Roberts (366 N Ocean, Gearhart) had a petition that Deanna Mancill created regarding removing the signs in the estuary and protecting access to public spaces, which she gave to Mayor Smith. She also indicated that if they were not removed, the property owner should understand the legal implications and be prepared for court. She stressed the importance and concern of the situation.

Ordinances/Resolutions.

Ordinance 949 - An Ordinance Amending the Zoning Map for the City of Gearhart by Applying a Floating Zone to Change 5,000 Square Feet of Property from R-2 (Medium Density Residential) to C-1 (Neighborhood Commercial). Mayor Smith introduced the ordinance.

- ON MOTION by Councilor Gould, 2nd by Councilor Cockrum for Ordinance 949 reading once by title only to amend the zoning map for the City of Gearhart by applying a floating zone to change 5,000 square feet of property from R-2 (medium density residential) to C-1 (neighborhood commercial), MOTION was approved 5 yeas (Cockrum, Devereaux, Gould, Kloefer, Smith) - 0 nays. Administrator Sweet read Ordinance 949 by title only.
- Councilor Cockrum commented that she reviewed the Planning Commission minutes that detailed some of the “year round” activities the property owner was planning. She felt the minutes were beneficial.

Ordinance 950 - An Ordinance Vacating a Portion of Hemlock Avenue Right of Way. Mayor Smith introduced the Ordinance. Administrator Sweet went over the staff report prepared by City Planner Phillips. City Planner Phillips noted that if Council did approve the Ordinance, it was not the end of the process because there was additional work required by the property owner; as well as City staff. Mayor Smith asked for confirmation that the \$60,570 was the proper compensation amount for the Hemlock ROW vacation, which City Planner Phillips said was accurate. City Planner Phillips also indicated that the current zoning of the adjacent property would extend to the middle of the center line of the impacted ROW property purchased (C-2 and C-3). He indicated that development may be possible where there were no significant wetlands and would require a wetlands delineation before the issuance of any permits. City Planner Phillips reiterated that the staff report and the Ordinance are set-up that if approved, conditions would have to be met before the process was finalized. Administrator Sweet confirmed that although the specific compensation amount was not listed in the Ordinance, it would be part of the approved conditions needing to be met.

- ON MOTION by Councilor Gould, 2nd by Councilor Devereaux for the approval of Ordinance 950 reading once by title only.
- There was discussion before approval of the motion. Councilor Kloefer requested clarification on if the ROW vacate was approved that it would extend the set back line for building on the property. City Planner Phillips did acknowledge that the property base line would be extended, which would impact the set back line. He did, however, mention that it would not change the zoning codes prohibition on building, development, or vegetation removal in the wetland designated areas. He indicated that the map that Councilor Kloefer was referencing in the staff report had approximate boundary lines based on the City-wide 2011 local wetlands inventory. City Planner Phillips confirmed that the City Council would be approving the street vacation without a DSL approved wetlands delineation. Administrator Sweet noted that he had walked the property and that the blue area defining locally significant wetlands in the vacation area was actually greater than reality. He

indicated that the City would require a wetlands delineation if there was any development on the property. Applicant Lowenberg noted that the center property would likely be the only area with buildable space; however, it is the septic field area so it would not be buildable. He indicated a stipulation could be added as another condition of approval. Councilor Kloepper understood that there would be an added cost to the property owner(s) to get a wetlands delineation; however, she felt uncomfortable approving the vacation without knowing the exact amount of increased buildable land because it may impact the compensation amount. Councilor Gould felt the Council should follow the recommendations of the Planning Commission, specifically in terms of allowing the City an access easement. Councilor Cockrum agrees with Councilor Gould in terms of City easement. She is interested in additional conditions of approval language that indicates: no fill, no use except use as a wetland left in its natural state with no tree cutting. She stressed that wetlands are useful and provide a benefit (e.g., drainage). She supported the language that required a wetlands delineation, required an easement, required providing a wetlands buffer, and/or reducing the size of the vacation area to omit wetlands. Applicant Lowenberg confirmed that as per ODOT, the wetlands area behind his property is a drainage area for highway 101 water. He indicated that ODOT notified him that they continue to plan to use that area as a drainage area when they enhance the intersection and that Applicant Lowenberg would not be able to do anything with it. Applicant Lowenberg felt that the location of the wetlands area was self-explanatory. Councilor Devereaux indicated that he agreed with Applicant Lowenberg that the value compensation amount should be reviewed. He felt that Applicant Lowenberg should make the City an offer. Mayor Smith mentioned there is language in Gearhart's zoning that designates a compensation assessment amount. Councilor Devereaux reiterated that it should be negotiated. Interim City Attorney Jacobs went over the language in the existing code and indicated that there was a process established to determine a compensation amount. He indicated that the code is ambiguous in terms of requiring that the actual calculation amount is required or if the Council has flexibility. He indicated that based on information from City staff, in previous street vacations, the City may have negotiated another price based on this ambiguity. He noted that the code requires the City Administrator to provide a compensation statement as part of the street vacation process, which is why it was in the staff report. He felt that Council, because of the ambiguity of the language, may have flexibility in negotiating a compensation amount. There was continued discussion on need for a wetlands delineation; fiscal responsibility of the City; Pacific Power property; previous street vacation approvals;

potential of reducing the amount of Hemlock ROW vacate; zoning language; length of ROW; and property ownership (e.g., Hansen/Palmberg).

- FIRST AMENDMENT TO ORIGINAL MOTION by Councilor Cockrum, 2nd by Councilor Gould to add language to the six conditions of approval, which would be: to add a seventh condition of approval, no fill, no use except use as a wetland left in its natural state with no tree cutting; as well as request a wetlands delineation and allow the City Administrator to negotiate a compensation amount with the property owner(s).
- There was continued discussion on the compensation assessment amount, which led to another component to the amended MOTION made by Councilor Cockrum.
- Interim City Attorney Jacobs went over the motion approval process. First, he noted that the order of business would be to vote on the motion to amend the original motion. He clarified that if Council voted no on the amended motion, the original motion to adopt the Ordinance would be on the table. He also mentioned that the amended motion could be withdrawn and each amendment could be voted on for clarity.
- WITHDRAWAL FIRST AMENDED MOTION by Councilor Cockrum, 2nd by Councilor Gould.
- SECOND AMENDMENT TO ORIGINAL MOTION by Councilor Cockrum, 2nd by Mayor Smith to add language to the six conditions of approval, which would be: to add a seventh condition of approval, no fill, no use except use as a wetland left in its natural state with no tree cutting except allowed by Gearhart zoning code; as well as require a DSL wetlands delineation to establish wetland boundaries and wetland conditions, MOTION was approved 5 yeas (Cockrum, Devereaux, Gould, Kloepper, Smith) - 0 nays.
- Administrator Sweet had concerns over the second amendment because current Gearhart zoning allows tree removal if dead, diseased, and/or dangerous, which would create a conflict with the current amended language of no tree cutting. There was continued discussion on why tree cutting would be required and reworking the language in the amended motion. Interim City Attorney Jacobs indicated that the intent of the tree cutting language would need to be defined in the minutes.
- THIRD AMENDMENT TO ORIGINAL MOTION by Councilor Gould, 2nd by Mayor Smith to add language to amend condition of approval #4, compensation, to delegate the authority to the City Administrator, negotiate a price and come back to the Council in October for approval.
- There was continued discussion. Councilor Kloepper has concerns over City Administrator Sweet being able to negotiate a compensation assessment amount if there is no wetlands delineation. She felt it was important to know how much of the property would be buildable

land. Applicant Lowenberg volunteered to have an appraisal; however, Councilor Kloepper noted they cannot accurately appraise without a wetlands delineation.

- Interim City Attorney Jacobs suggested that Council delay the vote on the Ordinance and continue the public hearing, allow Administrator Sweet to negotiate a compensation value with the property owner(s); and come back to Council with a proposal. Mayor Smith had concerns because he had already closed the public hearing; however, Interim City Attorney Jacobs indicated that the Council could agree to reopen the hearing next month.
- ON MOTION by Councilor Gould, 2nd by Councilor Devereaux to reopen the public hearing for Ordinance 950 and carry it forward to October after further investigation is completed and Administrator Sweet can negotiate a price, MOTION was approved 5 yeas (Cockrum, Devereaux, Gould, Kloepper, Smith) - 0 nays.
- Mayor Smith noted that the public hearing would remain open and continue next month.
- By consensus the Council withdrew all motions on the table because they voted unanimously to continue the public hearing (Cockrum, Devereaux, Gould, Kloepper, Smith).

Ordinance 951- An Ordinance Amending Named Sections of Ordinance #930 Known as the Contractor Work Hours Ordinance. Mayor Smith introduced the Ordinance and required Administrator Sweet to go over the staff report. Administrator Sweet indicated that based on input from legal counsel, it was being recommended that the Council and City staff be allowed more time to complete a comprehensive rewrite of the Ordinance to more efficiently target the objectives of the revisions.

- ON MOTION by Councilor Gould, 2nd by Councilor Cockrum to take legal counsel's recommendation to table Ordinance 951 for additional review, MOTION was approved 5 yeas (Cockrum, Devereaux, Gould, Kloepper, Smith) - 0 nays.
- Before the vote, Councilor Kloepper requested that Police Chief Gregory be involved in the process, especially in the area of code enforcement.

Resolution 1010 - LOC 2025 Annual Voting Delegate. Mayor Smith introduced the Resolution and requested Administrator Sweet review the staff report. Executive Assistant Ficker talked about the process that was followed the last time this type of request came before the Council. Several Councilors expressed issues with finding information on the LOC delegates. Councilor Gould indicated she would not be attending the LOC Conference.

- ON MOTION by Councilor Cockrum, 2nd by Councilor Kloepper selecting Mayor Smith as the LOC 2025 Annual Voting Delegate, which was withdrawn.

- ON MOTION by Councilor Gould, 2nd by Councilor Kloepper, for Resolution 1010 to assign Mayor Smith as the primary and Councilor Cockrum as the alternate for the LOC 2025 annual voting delegates, MOTION was approved 5 yeas (Cockrum, Devereaux, Gould, Kloepper, Smith) - 0 nays.

Old Business. None.

Council Concerns.

- Councilor Devereaux reported no concerns.
- Councilor Gould reported no concerns.
- Councilor Cockrum reported no concerns.
- Councilor Kloepper reported no concerns.
- Mayor Smith reported no concerns.

Adjournment.

- ON MOTION by Councilor Kloepper, 2nd by Councilor Gould to adjourn the meeting, MOTION was approved 5 yeas (Cockrum, Devereaux, Gould, Kloepper, Smith) - 0 nays. Mayor Smith adjourned the regular Council meeting at 8:13 pm.


Chad Sweet, City Administrator
Mayor Kerry Smith