

Meeting of 2004-3-16 Special Meeting

MINUTES  
LAWTON CITY COUNCIL SPECIAL MEETING  
CIP WORKSHOP  
MARCH 16, 2004  
WAYNE GILLEY CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBER

Mayor Cecil E. Powell,                      Also Present:  
Presiding                      Larry Mitchell, City Manager  
   Frank Jensen, Assistant City Attorney  
   Kathy Fanning, City Clerk

The meeting was called to order at 6:03 p.m. by Mayor Powell. Notice of meeting and agenda were posted on the City Hall notice board as required by law.

ROLL CALL

PRESENT:                      Randy Bass, Ward One  
   James Hanna, Ward Two  
   Glenn Devine, Ward Three  
   Amy Ewing-Holmstrom, Ward Four  
   Robert Shanklin, Ward Five  
   Jeffrey Patton, Ward Six  
   Stanley Haywood, Ward Seven  
   Randy Warren, Ward Eight

ABSENT: None

DISCUSSION/DETERMINATION OF ELECTION DATE

Powell said we are here to continue the work on the 2005 CIP. We have had a couple meetings on this and Mitchell and staff have prepared three options for Council to consider.

Mitchell said this is the third in a series of workshops we are having to try to structure and formulate a plan for our 2005 CIP. This agenda includes discussion of an election date, consider and set term and scope of CIP Program, and talk about individual projects and once we have done those we could move forward with drafting the necessary resolutions that will be required for this Council to consider. He said we cannot take any formal action tonight, but would like to try to get some discussion going about the election date. The first attachment to the agenda packet includes a list of dates set aside by the State Election Board. He said part of the reason for having this discussion and try to get some consensus on an election date is because by the first part of April we will be moving into our budget. We are planning to provide Council with results of our third quarter and year-end projections on or about April 20<sup>th</sup>, so we would like to wrap up discussion on our CIP Program sometime in the next 30 days.

Warren said he would like to push for August 24<sup>th</sup> simply for the fact that gives us one more day, which would be November 2<sup>nd</sup>. If something happens where we failed to be able to do it in August, we still have the ability to come back and do it in November.

Patton said what about July?

Powell said August is fine with Ewing-Holmstrom. Patton said he doesn't have a problem with August. Hanna said August was fine. Shanklin said it didn't make a difference to him. Haywood said August is fine. Powell said alright, August 24<sup>th</sup> appears unanimous. He asked Jensen to speak with Vincent and make sure everything is in order for the election to be held on August 24<sup>th</sup>.

2. CONSIDER AND SET TERM AND SCOPE OF CIP PROGRAM

Powell said Mitchell has given Council a 5 year plan, a six year plan and a 7 year plan, with items attached for consideration. He said Council's first order is the entire list of projects that were put on by Mitchell and staff. Next you will see the 5 year plan with a \$65 million package; a 6 year with a \$75 million package; and a 7 year plan with an \$85 million package.

Hanna said he would like to see us go with the 7 year plan.

Powell said he has heard 7 years on the floor and thinks Council should talk about the amount, which is \$85

million. He asked Mitchell to explain how we get to \$85 million.

Mitchell said your sales tax on a 7 year would be \$70 million and \$15 million on the ad valorem. The 10 mills on your ad valorem would make up your \$85 million package for funding. He asked Council to note that under the 7 years they have moved some money around because they feel given the added dollars in the 7 year package, we need to look at putting more money into the Phase II Sewer Rehab Program and in the Meter Replacement Program. They also think it important to put additional dollars into the Street Reconstruction and Repair line item, as well as the Water Distribution Storage line item. He said those numbers are just preliminary. Should Council decide to go to the 7 years and fund that with \$85 million, the following discussion would be on how to allocate those dollars. Some discussion is needed on which projects should be included and which projects should not. It's a two part question.

Powell said the first part is determining the years. The next discussion would be are those projects listed in concrete and then is the dollar amount for each one, in concrete? Or would you want to delete or add on to anything attached to each one of those projects. He asked what the feelings of the Council was.

Hanna asked if this would increase our taxes or stay the same. Mitchell said it would not increase, it would stay the same.

Haywood said he would like see a Convention Center. We need something that's going to be for our youth, like a gym or something for Cameron. We need something for our youth.

Powell said he hears Haywood say Cameron University and a Convention Center. He asked Haywood if he had any feelings on the length. Haywood said 5 years, we are going to have to sell this to the people. He said he has received a lot of calls and they are just taxed out. He said the County is doing something and the Lawton Public Schools are doing some things and it's going to be hard. We have to have something appealing to everyone. Powell said he hears Haywood leaning more towards the five year. Haywood said yes.

Warren said he was leaning towards the 7 years. The major reason is it puts so much more money into the Sewer Rehab without dropping projects off the list. He said with what's included in there, the \$9 million plus the \$1.5 million we have received from the feds, puts us almost halfway there. That puts us 2-3 years down the road before we are going to have to start talking about how we are going to raise more money to do that project. He said \$9 million is not going to get us there and we are going to have to come up with it somehow. He said maybe we can find some grants between now and then and maybe some other way to help us along.

Powell said he hears Warren favoring the 7 year plan. Warren said yes.

Bass asked how much money it takes to replace the meters. If you did a third of all the meters in Lawton, will the \$4 million on this one get it? Endicott said we are looking at about \$200 per meter. We estimated around \$6 million to replace the entire system. Bass said you are talking, in a 5 year program, \$2 million would replace one third of them, and in three years be finished with the meter program? Endicott said yes.

Powell asked Council for comments. He said we are trying to zero in on the length of this. It's the length that dictates the amount of the CIP.

Ewing-Holmstrom said this is where some of us newer Council members are going to look to City staff and some of the more senior Council members to give us some guidance on how hard it was to sell previous CIPs. She said 5 years seems to be the standard. Some of them have been a little difficult from what she understands, to sell and promote. She said if we go 6 or 7, it's going to be that much harder and if it doesn't pass, we are in a heap of trouble. She said she would like to get some feelings from some of the more senior Council members such as Haywood and Shanklin.

Powell said Shanklin can probably give us more history than anybody on past CIP Programs. He asked if Shanklin would care to speak on this.

Shanklin said we have had them in 3s, 5s, and some have been defeated. It depends on what you're going to spend it on and where you're spending it. He said you are going to have to share some of this money all over the City. It cannot be all out west. There's 40-50,000 people out there and 40-50,000 people out here, and one's just as important to us who lives in the central and east side as it is to Wards 6 & 8, etc. He said he thinks 5 years is what we should try to sell.

Powell asked Ewing-Holmstrom if he heard her say 5 years. Ewing-Holmstrom said yes and she feels if we go any longer than that it might make us look like we're greedy.

Haywood said if we don't come to an agreement, it's not going to pass. We have something everybody needs in the community, so we have to be for everyone.

Patton said he feels that no matter what Council decides, we all need to be behind it 110%, even if it's something we don't necessarily completely agree on. He thinks we need to all be uniform and support it. If it doesn't pass, we are looking down the barrel of these things that are mandated and that's going to be pretty tough on our budget. He said he would really like to see Council united and really be behind it, no matter what the outcome.

Shanklin asked if we were going to give the voters/tax payers more than one option at the poll or are we going to go with 5, 6, or 7 and say this is it. Mitchell said the way he understands the way you structure your ballot is, you have projects that would be funded under a 5 year program for sales tax and a list of projects that would be funded through 5 years under ad valorem. You would vote once on the sales tax and then on the ad valorem projects. You would vote for each individual project. Shanklin said we have not done that yet, correct? Mitchell said we have not yet structured that.

Ewing-Holmstrom said she thinks, from what she hears on the streets and from people she has talked to, citizens are still stinging from increasing the water rate. She said she believes we need something as Haywood referred to; something the community is going to agree with. If we go 6 or 7, that seems to be out of the norm of what we've done in the past. She said obviously no one is here to speak on it. We don't seem to have a lot of citizens who seem too concerned with CIP, except for some emails each of us are getting. It would be nice if the citizens were a little bit more interested in what we are doing up here, as far as CIP goes.

Bass said if you pass a 5 or a 7, does it matter, because you are not raising the ad valorem at all, so if you go ahead and go 7 years, you are just going to pass another one after 5 years, so what difference does it make if you go 5 or 7?

Shanklin said credibility in the past. Credibility if you do what you say you'll do and do you really need to do what you have projected to do?

Warren said that's why he feels pretty safe because we've got a pretty good track record of putting it before the people, saying this is what we're going to do, and doing that. He thinks 7 is the way to go because of the biggest emphasis on sewer rehab. He said he is scared of what will happen if we go with 5 years. Even if we tweak it a little bit, we are still looking at a year and a half, two would be stretching it, and we're going to have to put it on the water bill. That's the only place to put it, we don't have any other way to raise \$28 million. We need to take as big a bite out of it as we can in the CIP, to give us time to figure out some other way to fund it.

Devine said he doesn't think we need to go more than 5 years. He said within 5 years you have a turn over with Council. Those people replacing us will be left with the decisions we made and are not going to be able to make any changes. Some of them may not be able to help make any changes their whole term, if they only stay one term, when you stretch it to 7 years. He said he has a problem with that because when you come on this Council is to be part of the City and your people have elected you to make some of those changes and some of this stuff that is set in concrete, as in a 7 year CIP, you have no say so and never will have on that CIP. You could come and go and never have any part of that decision making. He thinks a 5 year period of time, we do what we say we will do and keep a good track record, the people will vote for it again.

Powell said we have had Haywood, Ewing-Holmstrom, Shanklin, Devine, speak in favor of the 5 year plan, we have heard no one speak in favor of the 6 year, and Warren has spoke in favor of the 7 year plan. Patton said he would be in favor of the 6 year plan. He said the only reason he says that is if you look at the projected cost estimates, some of the areas, with that one additional year, you can increase funding for street reconstruction and repairs from \$3 million to \$6.1 million and also increase sewer rehab by \$1 million, and increase meter replacement by \$600,000. He said just by that one year, you really get to add to some of these projects that are desperately needed.

Ewing-Holmstrom said going back to what Patton said, 5 years, and then another 5 years. She said it's not like we're going to stop doing it. That made perfect sense.

Bass said on the meter replacement program, once you start it for 5 years, it takes you 15 years to finish the project and to him, that's a long time. He said if you go to the 7 year, we can do 3/4 of them. When you ask for the next CIP, it may be 8, 9, or 10 years before you can finish it, which is still a long time. Powell asked if Bass was in favor of the 7 year plan. Bass said he is more in favor of the 7 year, if Council can come to an agreement of the projects needed on the list and this is what the City needs. He said a lot of them, we don't have any choices on, there are only a few we will get to pick and choose from anyway.

Shanklin said we don't have a spreadsheet as to when these funds will be needed for the different projects over the life of the 5 years and the \$65 million. He said like the SE Water Treatment Plant, \$24 million. Which one of these projects are we going to do? Are we just going to jump in there and spend \$3 million on hardware, software, and not being a computer person, that just blows his ears off. He said he counted \$9 million on radios and he just doesn't see how that can be. He would like to see how much money we have spent in the last 10 years on

computers. It would stagger you. He asked when would we do these. The sewer rehab, we know the \$5 million, we've got \$1.5 million, that's in addition to this \$5 million, that's \$6.5 million. How are you going to spread that out? He said we have the landfill and we're not going to do that landfill starting tomorrow or the first of the year. Powell said that's a good point and he thinks what needs to happen is after Council agrees on the term and then the items that should be on the term, then they need to be prioritized by management and staff because there are some more important than others. Shanklin said lake dam improvements is \$2 million. He understands we are going to put out a bid to do something on Ellsworth Gates and didn't know we were doing lake dam improvements. He said he doesn't know what has to be done and when it has to be done. Have we ever discussed this before?

Ihler said the very first meeting we discussed it, over at the Library. One of the major functions we were wanting to do with this project was to replace the seals themselves. Shanklin said he thought that's what we were doing with that. Ihler said no, in fact we took bids on those today and the apparent low bid was about \$228,000, so we did receive some very favorable bids. We will be bringing that to Council next Tuesday. Shanklin said that is the point he wants to make, right here. He said you thought it was only going to cost you \$300,000. He said we run about 60-70% of what Ihler puts down. He leaves himself lots of leeway. Ihler said we said approximately \$300,000 is what we needed to budget for that. Ihler said by the time we do testing, etc. for this, we will ask you to budget \$250,000. Our Engineer's estimate was \$277,000, low bid was \$228,000 and high bid was about \$301,000. He said there were two above our estimate and two below, so we were right in the middle at \$277,000. Shanklin said you said \$228,000. Ihler said \$228,000 was the low bid, yes. Shanklin asked if Ihler threw that bid out. Ihler said no, no, we're recommending awarding. Shanklin said his point is, that's \$80,000, roughly, lower than the Engineer's Estimate. Ihler said we will spend another \$15,000 or so on testing and so forth, for the project. There will be about \$60,000 that we will not spend. We try to provide conservative estimates so we don't have to go through the process we went through on the Medicine Park Plant. He said we don't want to have to come back to Council and ask for more money than what we have. Shanklin said that's what he's saying, we are going to have extra money. Ihler said the other \$1.7 million is dealing with replacing the seals themselves. This project we're bringing to Council next week has nothing to do with replacing the seals at Ellsworth or Lawtonka. Shanklin said we're going to do both of them. Ihler said we want to replace both Ellsworth and Lawtonka and it's a rough guess without doing plans or specifications. He said we know we replaced Ellsworth's seals back in the 80's and the cost was somewhere around a half a million dollars.

Shanklin said the reason why we went way over on the Water Treatment Plant in Medicine Park is we had one bidder. Ihler said no, we had two. Shanklin said when you start bonding \$20 and \$30 million you eliminate so damn many it's unreal. He said he's been here, he's watched it, he knows what he's talking about. He said we did get hung up on that one because we needed to get started, correct? Ihler said yes. Shanklin said we need to get started on that SE Water Treatment Plant. We were going to do that in 85, 90, and 95 and it's still on the list. He said it was very important to have this now, back in '85 and have it by '88. That's his only point, he said he gets worried looking at these as to when they will come up as the monies are generated. You are not going to get all this money at one time, that's why you have a spreadsheet out there as to when do you need some money for this project at a certain time.

Ihler said what we did in the 2000 CIP was once Council established a project list, we brought back a schedule as to when we would need the money.

Ewing-Holmstrom asked Shanklin what he had said about the computers. Shanklin said updating, buying this package and that package, it's hundreds of thousands of dollars. Ewing-Holmstrom said part of that is with computers, every year there's something new.

Powell said on the 5 year plan he hears Haywood, Ewing-Holmstrom, Shanklin, and Devine, and on the 6 year plan he hears Patton, and on the 7 year plan he hears Warren and Bass. He said Hanna has not spoken yet. Hanna said yes I have, the 7 year plan. Powell said he was sorry, 7 year plan, Hanna.

Powell said Council does not have to get through this tonight, we have more opportunities to meet again, but if we could agree on one thing tonight and that be the years and the amount. He said the second thing that has to be done is the list and the amounts.

Bass said his concern is you can do more things with the 7 year plan than you can with the 5. Powell said there is no doubt about that, the downside to that is our people in this community are kind of built into a 5 year plan. Hanna said he would go along with any plan as long as we get it going. Warren said the only thing he would add is everybody he's talked with about this and asked their opinion, he has yet to find a single person who has a problem doing a 7 year plan. He said the people he has run into that have a problem with 7 years has a problem with 5 years also. The only people who have been negative are the ones who will be negative about any of the plans.

Hanna said the main direction is this is not going to raise anybody's money. Warren said that's what everybody cares about. They want to know if it's going to cost them more. Hanna said everything is going to stay status quo. Shanklin said that's why 40% of them are going to vote no.

Ewing-Holmstrom said we have to take into account comments people have made over the years and make sure they understand exactly where the money's going and that it goes for those projects. We put the SE Water Treatment Plant on here for several years and it still hasn't been done. She said if we're going to promote something, whether it be 5 or 7, we have to stick to it because obviously, we haven't stuck to our guns in the past. She said she hears people say to her all the time they didn't vote for the Flower Mound expansion. She said that was part of the CIP, it was road improvements, but because it wasn't itemized, people think they've been hoodwinked.

Powell said he has been advised by legal this evening that we can take a vote on this.

Warren asked if he could touch on something Ewing-Holmstrom said. He said he thinks that's true and he thinks we need to be sure and do that, regardless of time, when we get down to projects. It's very important we have a project the people can identify with. We need at least one because what we do in CIPs, generally, the citizens never see. It's under the ground, it's 15 miles out of town, they never ever see it. We need to find something we can promote that the citizens can see and know where their money went. That's what they want to see. He said other cities he's seen have road projects and the such, but generally, their big projects are a coliseum, a museum, or a library, something the citizens can actually drive by and see. Shanklin said when they turn their water on they see it right then. Warren said that's not true because you have people call you everyday that think the bills are too high and don't understand why it costs that much, because they don't know what they are actually getting for that money. Everybody he has talked with wants to see something. The project he gets the most compliments on is the fire station. Regardless of whether you think we need it or didn't, that's the one the citizens talk to him about. That's because they get to see it.

Powell said Council has set a date and he has been advised by Jensen that we can take a vote on the years.

Ewing-Holmstrom said if we decide on the 7 year plan tonight, does it have to be this list? Powell said no, if it's the 7 year plan, the next thing to happen on this would be homework to be done. He said after the year is set, look at all these projects, including the 34 Mitchell and staff included and have been added since the start of our workshops. He said look at all those and bring that back with an amount. The next meeting, hopefully we can come to the list and how much would be on each project. Next would be up to staff to prioritize the order of those needs to be met with the money coming in.

MOTION by Patton to go with the 6 year package.

SUBSTITUTE MOTION by Hanna, SECOND BY WARREN, to go with the 7 year package.

SECOND SUBSTITUTE MOTION by Devine, SECOND by Ewing-Holmstrom, to go with the 5 year package.

Bass asked Jensen if we can have a 5 year and 7 year at the time people vote and have the people decide on their own, instead of us having to make the decision.

Jensen said absolutely, you can do that. He said it would be an awfully complicated document, there's no question about that, but it can be done.

Ewing-Holmstrom said that's the concern, it's got to be very easy to understand. She said first of all, you are only going to get about 8,000 voters to begin with, if you're lucky.

Powell said we have been told we can take it straight to the people a 5, 6 or 7, but it would be a very complicated document. Jensen said they are hard enough to read as it is. Shanklin said all you're going to do is for an item for 7 years, you're going to put down what's going to be in the 7 that's not in the 5. He said he can't see that it's that complicated. Jensen said he thinks it would end up being a pretty lengthy document.

Patton said he likes the idea about giving the people the opportunity to say if they would rather have a 5, 6, or 7, but, with us trying to be unified, it would be easier if we just had a set deal and all go out and sell it. If we had 5, 6, or 7, some of us might be arguing for 7, some arguing for 5 and that might cloud the issue. He said he thinks it would be a great idea and really, they have kind of missed their opportunity because we publicize these meetings and we really haven't had much of a turn out of the general public. He said he wished folks would have taken advantage of it.

Powell reminded Council there is an original motion on the floor for the 6 year plan and that failed due to a lack of a second. Then we had a substitute motion to go with the 7 year plan and that did receive a second. Then we had another substitute motion to go with the 5 year plan and that has received a second.

Powell said we are going to call roll for the second substitute motion for the 5 year plan, with a dollar amount of \$65 million.

Warren said for clarification, both the 5 and 7 year plan would both be inclusive of a retention of the millage. Powell said yes, that's the only way we can get there.

MOTION ON THE SECOND SUBSTITUTE MOTION WAS HELD AT THIS TIME:

AYE: Devine, Ewing-Holmstrom, Shanklin, Haywood, Patton. NAY: Warren, Bass, Hanna. MOTION CARRIED

Powell said what's important is what do you want under this 5 year plan and the amount of those projects. He said that's up to Council.

Shanklin said he didn't know we were putting in \$2 million in water meters, he said he thought it was \$500,000. He said he would like some explanation on why the meter replacement will cost \$2 million and the other is the landfill for \$8 million. Don't we have about 4 years left?

Ihler said we actually have about 7 years left in the landfill. He said the construction will take approximately two years, so if you wait to try to put it in the next CIP after a 5 year program, that doesn't leave you enough time to get it constructed and ready to go by the time you have to move into it. That's why it's in this CIP.

Devine asked if \$1 million of this wasn't going to be for a building. Ihler said no, that was in the last CIP. Shanklin said we may not build that building, right? Ihler said we plan on building it but don't want to move forward with it until we get our permit from DEQ. He said we don't want to build a maintenance building out there without a permit and then DEQ not approve our permit. Shanklin said that's \$8 million, we're not going to use that \$8 million in this next 5 years, we're going to use some of it, maybe \$2 million of it. Ihler said it would be at the end of the program. Shanklin said he doesn't believe that either.

Shanklin said you have street reconstruction and repairs for \$3 million, now that is where we should be able to say we need some work done in our different wards. Lets put something out there so our people will vote, instead of what staff has programmed. He said the last one we did in Crystal Hills, we spent all our money out there. Ihler said actually the 95 CIP had \$3 million left over at the end of the program and Council appropriated about \$600,000 for roads and that was one of the three streets that was chosen.

Shanklin said he sees \$1 million on roofs. Are we going to replace the roof on the Library and Police Department? Ihler said that's a roof replacement program and the Library and Police Station are two of the main buildings that we're going to do. Whatever \$1 million will do for us, the Parks and Recreation Director will prioritize, and has a priority of which buildings he wants to do, but the Police Station and Library were the two main buildings we wanted to address.

Bass asked if we have to have the ultra violet system. Is there absolutely nothing we can do about that? Ihler said we haven't received the mandate yet from DEQ on the Waste Water Treatment Plant. We have received the notice of violation and in our opinion, at the staff level, it's just a function of time, it's coming, and it'll be here, much like we did with the Water Treatment Plant on the Safe Drinking Water Act. We have been out of violation with the Waste Water Treatment Plant because we use chlorine and this replaces the chlorine system. Bass asked which ones Ihler thought were going to be mandated. Ihler said there are two that are basically mandated and that is the ultra violet system and the landfill. He said we have to have a place to put our trash at the end of that 7 year period. We have had some discussion about utilizing some grant money we received from the Corps. for the ultra violet system.

Shanklin asked if we have trash capped out there, to the height they will let us? Ihler said that is basically the maximum height. Shanklin asked if he was counting in between there in part of that 5 years. Ihler said we can match the height we are at and go all the way over towards the edge of the highway. Of course we will slope to match the current elevation, but that's the 7 years we have left. He said if you remember, we had cells 1, 2, & 3. He said once we fill all of cell 3 to the height that we're at now, that's about 7 years.

Patton asked how much of the \$3 million in the street repairs are for Ward 6. Ihler said he didn't know, basically we have millions of dollars of street repair we could do city-wide and this is just what we choose right now.

Powell said that will be part of Council's assignment when they come back for the next meeting, to bring back what they would like to have and that will have to be pared down.

Hanna introduced Rex Givens, Ward Two Councilman elect.

3. PUBLIC COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS: NONE  
4. MISCELLANEOUS ISSUES

Mitchell said we have tentatively scheduled the next meeting for Tuesday, March 30 and asked if that was ok with Council.

Ewing-Holmstrom said she won't be able to make it.

Powell said there will be a group in Washington D.C. at that time, but he will be here.

Shanklin said no one was is interested in the fact-finding mission as to the \$3 million on accounting hardware and software. Mitchell said he was and will get Shanklin some information. Ewing-Holmstrom said you have to think towards the future. Shanklin said that's what we did 10 years ago when we started spending this \$700-800,000. Ewing-Holmstrom said she knows, but computers have changed so much in the last 5-10 years, it's just like a millennium, when it comes to computers. You've got to think progressive.

Jensen said in addition to getting directions at the next meeting about what projects you want, we are going to have to have direction on what projects you want funded by sales tax and what projects you want funded by ad valorem and how you want us to structure the options. He said we can do a lot of options and we can do them however you want to do them. Powell asked if they didn't feel like that needs to come from staff. Shanklin said that has to come from staff because staff has to know when the money is going to be needed. Jensen said the Council needs to have the opportunity to give us that input if they want to do that.

Powell said that is at our next meeting. Come prepared, with the projects and the amount of the projects to arrive at that \$65 million. Then after that we need to have staff say what they recommend under the sales tax portion and what they recommend under the ad valorem portion.

Mitchell said they had made an initial recommendation in their memo. We suggested as you go down the list, the first \$50 million should be allocated to sales tax and the balance of the projects, the \$15 million remaining, should be funded through ad valorem.

Warren said that was his question, is there any restriction on what can or can't be funded with ad valorem. Jensen said no.

Ewing-Holmstrom said she wouldn't be at that meeting and asked if she could bring a Council pro tem in her place to fight for what we want to leave.

Powell asked if we were locked solid on that meeting date, we have one member not going to be here. Do you want to set another date?

Powell asked about Thursday the 25<sup>th</sup> at 6:00 p.m. for the next meeting date.

Ewing-Holmstrom said at 6:30 the Mayor's Commission on the Status of Women is having a dinner.

Powell asked about April 6<sup>th</sup>, Tuesday at 6:00 p.m. for the next meeting. That date was agreeable with all.

There being no further business to consider, the meeting adjourned at 7:03 p.m. upon motion, second and roll call vote.