CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
February 23, 2021

The scheduled meeting of the Ontario City Council was called to order by Mayor Riley Hill at 6:00 p.m. on Tuesday, February 23, 2021, in the Council Chambers of City Hall. Council members present in person or by call-in were Riley Hill, Freddy Rodriguez, Michael Braden, Sam Baker, Ken Hart, Eddie Melendrez, and John Kirby.

Members of staff present in person or by call-in were Adam Brown, Tori Barnett, Peter Hall, Dan Cummings, Terry Leighton, Steven Romero, Kari Ott, Larry Sullivan, and Al Cablay.

The meeting was recorded, and copies are available at City Hall.

Mayor Hill led everyone in the Pledge of Allegiance.

AGENDA

This Agenda was posted on February 12, 2021. Copies of the Agenda are available from the City Hall Customer Service Counter and on the city's website www.ontariooregon.org.

KIRBY moved, BRADEN seconded, **TO ADOPT THE AGENDA AS PRESENTED.** Roll call vote: Rodriguez-yes; Baker-yes; Kirby-yes; Braden-yes; Hart-yes; Melendrez-yes; Hill-yes. Motion carried 7/0/0.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

Appoint Three City Councilors to Ad-Hoc City Charter Review Committee

Mayor Hill recommended Sam Baker, Ken Hart, and John Kirby to serve on the Ad-Hoc City Charter Review Committee.

BRADEN moved, RODRIGUEZ seconded, **THAT THE COUNCIL AFIRM THE MAYORAL APPOINTMENTS OF THREE CITY COUNCILORS.** Roll call vote: Rodriguez-yes; Baker-yes; Kirby-yes; Hart-yes; Braden-yes; Melendrez-yes; Hill-yes. Motion carried 7/0/0.

Preliminary Meeting Schedule for Ad-Hoc City Charter Review Committee

Councilor Hart stated Friday was the deadline for citizens to submit an application to serve on the Charter Review Committee and asked if any applications had been received.

Tori Barnett, City Recorder, stated three had been received so far.

Councilor Hart stated the resolution the Council had adopted to set up the Committee had that group meeting fairly quickly. At the next meeting, the Council would appoint the citizens to sit on the Committee, so it would be March 8th they could meet.

Ms. Barnett informed Councilor Hart that the 8th was a Planning Commission meeting.

Councilor Hart he wanted to layout an organizing calendar for staff and the other members.

Ms. Barnett stated once the appointments were made, she would work with him to get a calendar set up that wouldn't conflict with any other scheduled city meetings.

Councilor Hart stated if everything was due on Friday, the appointments would be made by the Mayor at the meeting on March 4th. He wanted to give staff a heads up on when they would hold their first meeting. It would be the week of the 8th to hold an organization meeting.

Ingeborg Dickerson Letter (Dated 02/03/21) re: Homeless Shelters

Mayor Hill began by reading Ms. Dickerson's letter into the record: *I am the widow of Ray Dickerson. In 1992 Ray and I bought the Huey Apartments at NW 3rd Avenue and 1st Street in Ontario. After my husband died in 2017, I have been managing the apartments myself. At the moment I have a good onsite manager, Cody Demaris. The City of Ontario saw fit to locate the tiny homeless shelters directly across the street from my apartment. I was not notified of this. It is possible I missed a blip in the Argus newspaper, but I was in the hospital with cancer surgery. When I spoke to the lady who owns the Townhouse apartments where the shelters are located, she assured me that someone would be available 24/7 to supervise the tenants. She also told me there would be a six-foot fence to enclose the entire project. None of that is true. I have attached my second letter to Barbara Higinbotham of Community in Action, and to Riley Hill. I fear for the safety of my tenants, some of whom are children, and for the obvious reduction in their quality of life in living at my apartments. I am urging you for better police presence, a real fence, possibly chain link that deters jumping across, and someone in charge to supervise the shelter patrons. Ingeborg Dickerson.* There was also an attachment to the letter signed by the tenants.

Mayor Hill stated he responded to Ms. Dickerson's letter stating it was unfortunate that she missed the meetings, but it had been published in the paper that it would occur, it was on Facebook, and other social media outlets.

Priscilla Garcia, Community in Action, asked if there were any questions or concerns regarding the shelter.

Mayor Hill asked if a fence was promised to surround the area.

Ms. Garcie stated the believed the chain link fence that was promised was for the pilot project that was next to the Nichols Accounting area. However, when this new fence was installed, they ensured it met all city guidelines and protocol.

Mayor Hill stated Ms. Dickerson mentioned a manger on site 24/7.

Ms. Garcia stated there was 24/7 onsite management. There was some confusion when the shelters were placed, the office was originally placed in the far corner, so everyone was going to the first one, which no one answered. The office had now been moved to the first unit to the right when entering the property. There were split breaks between morning and evening shift, as well as an all-night shift.

Mayor Hill asked what problems had been encountered, and how were they resolved.

Ms. Garcia stated they had been partnering with Origins. Her office required the tenants to follow a strict case plan, as these were only temporary homes. Residents were aware of the rules at the time of move in. Portable restrooms had also been provided, which were open 6am-10pm, which was when the shelter closed. Also, onsite staff had kept an open log of events or activities that occurred. If there were any issues, dispatch was contacted. There were a few medical emergencies, which were all taken care of through the EMTs. For drug and alcohol issues, that was not allowed at any time in the units; however, if there were issues, referrals were made to Lifeways. Origins also had their own counselors on site multiple days of the week to assist with abuse problems. Community in Action provided a warning system, so if the case plan was not followed, or refused to follow the rules, the tenant had to vacate the home. There were only 16 units, but there were over 300 homeless in the area.

Councilor Kirby stated he was acquainted with the night security employee at the shelter site, so he was able to confirm that there was someone on site. He had spoken with Ms. Dickerson about that but recognized that her concerns were deep and probably warranted, but she appeared willing to work with them.

Councilor Hart asked if there had been any evictions?

Ms. Garcia stated not evictions, but they had clients who had been approved for housing or found more stable housing. There was a wait list, and their priority was senior, disabled, and households with children. It was understood that there were issues and were aware that there was a lot of running around through that neighborhood, but they were doing their best to provide assistance for those who wanted help.

Councilor Rodriguez stated there was running around in that neighborhood, but it was fair to say that the project being in the current location was definitely a focal point. In reading the letter written by Ms. Dickerson where she indicated the noise issues, mainly between 2-6am, fighting, taking tenant parking spots, etc., he believed that was truly taking place. He also believed that Community in Action had done a good job implementing their own restrictions and guidelines for the project. It appeared that the complaints were taking place during the nightwatchman's hours of coverage. Maybe it was time to review the rules and guidelines.

Ms. Garcia agreed, but they were only able to control what happened within their units. The night watchman was good at enforcing the rules and was more than able to calm any issues that occurred at night. Regarding the fence, they didn't want them to feel they were in a cage or trapped in a cell. Many struggled with PTSD. She understood the concerns, but couldn't speak to those, she just knew there was a great partnership between Community in Action and Origins in logging what has occurred.

Dan Cummings, Community Development Director, stated regarding the fence, the pilot program was in an industrial zone and they wanted to keep that area secure, so a temporary 6-foot chain link fence was erected around the area. Where this new program was running was in a residential area and the committee agreed that if they put a 6-foot fence in a residential area, it would take a variance to the front yard height restriction, barb wire along the top was not allowed in a residential area so that would take a variance, and that would make it appear as a compound which would not blend into the neighborhood. They wanted to have it blend in, so a wood fence was constructed. If the Council wanted to tell them to erect a compound fence, then variances would have to be applied for and granted before that would be allowed.

Councilor Hart verified this was just a temporary winter shelter, so when was that over?

Ms. Garcia stated it was done April 30th.

Councilor Kirby asked if the night watchman had special training or a written job description? Had it been reviewed by the Chief?

Ms. Garcia stated yes; it had been provided by Origins. Regarding the Chief's review, she did not believe that had been done.

Councilor Kirby suggested having the Chief review it.

Councilor Rodriguez asked if there were any cameras or surveillance of the area.

Ms. Garcia stated no, not yet, but it had been discussed, along with additional lighting.

Councilor Melendrez stated he wanted them to take the concerns brought forward by Ms. Dickenson to heart, because he would feel the same way if that was taking place around his home and family. Were there some success stories that Ms. Garcia could share?

Ms. Garcia stated she could not reveal a lot of details due to privacy reasons, but there was a gentleman who qualified as a youth who had no where to go, and he was now housed, found employment, and was not renting an apartment on his own for the first time. There was a woman who suffered from homelessness for years and was not in a low-income housing unit. There were success stories, and while those should be advertised and highlighted more, they had to respect the privacy issues.

Update on PERS

Adam Brown, City Manager, stated he hoped to have a presentation for them on the PERS, but when reviewing the draft, he noted some errors. While making corrections, it became larger than he could fix in time to make the current meeting. He would bring it to them at the Thursday meeting. They would also turn it into a video that could be posted online. It would explain why the Council might want to pay down the obligation the city had for PERS.

Councilor Rodriguez asked if this debt was normal for a municipality.

Mr. Brown stated yes. In his reviewing of assets across city governments, it was not uncommon for any of them to be behind. Most were in the 70% range.

Cost Analysis of Justice Court

Larry Sullivan, City Attorney, stated he discussed the possibility of getting more use of the Ontario Justice Court with Judge Mahoney, the Justice of the Peace, about the work she was currently doing for the City of Ontario. OPD was using the Justice Court to handle their traffic offenses and perhaps other offenses. Neither recalled any efforts by the city to use the Justice Court for any other purpose. She expressed a willingness to do that if the city wanted to move in that direction. The city had a contract with the Justice Court that was handled through the administration office in Vale. There was no set fee that was referred to in the contract that the city had to pay for the use of the Justice Court. It was an agreement that the city would reimburse the county for any out-of-pocket expenses that were incurred by the county as a result of the use of the Justice Court by the city. He had not found out if the city had been paying any money to reimburse the county for the use of the Justice Court. If there had been any payments, there should be some record through the Finance Department. Judge Mahoney was not aware of any charges that were being incurred through that use. The proceeds from the tickets that were paid through the Justice Court, portions went to the city and a portion to other places. He had not been able to pin down how that allocation worked. He was now aware of what other information could be obtained to determine if the city wanted to establish a municipal court. The City of Vale paid approximately $800 per month to a Municipal Judge, a currently practicing attorney, to act as Municipal judge. That included using that Judge for four hours every Friday, and office space was also provided for that purpose. They also paid a hefty fee for using a program that was designed to be used by municipal courts for keeping track of fees and for sending the proceeds to various entities that were legally required under Oregon law to receive fees from those fines and court costs.

This would require a lot more discussion to decide what ultimately would be the benefit from the city in having its own municipal court. His own view was that the main benefit to the city in having its own municipal court was to use it as a profit center but wasn't necessarily the case. The Ontario Police Department might prefer to have a municipal court that would be doing nothing but handling its own fines and citations.

Mayor Hill stated that was not the analysis he had in mind. He had wanted staff to review the dollars and cents of how much money the city put out towards the Justice Court. He was also told the city provided police protection. He was not sure, and wanted to know, what the tickets that OPD were issuing, how much money the city received. He believed that type of analysis was what he and the Council were looking for.

Councilor Melendrez asked if they were basing this off how much money was being received versus how much was being put out.

Mayor Hill stated that was one issue. OPD was issuing citations, working for the city, but where did the citations and fines go? How was the pot divided? They needed to revisit that issue and see what the financial impact might be.

Councilor Kirby stated he spoke with Mr. Sullivan about this, and Mr. Sullivna understood it was a cost benefit analysis overall. That was the only way to make this type of decision.

Mayor Hill agreed but did not understand why the city had to hire an attorney to do that analysis when it could be done in-house.

Councilor Kirby stated that perhaps it was because Judge Mahoney's husband was a partner of Mr. Sullivan.

Councilor Hart stated maybe in the next month or two, to tell the Council when they could have a good analysis of what were the financial benefits of the arrangement that the city had with the Justice Court. He also looked to Chief Romero to see if there would be a benefit if that court were more geared towards the city and helping the city with things versus how it was currently structured. There was policy and policing involved, fi they were taking police time to provide services. He heard the city needed more police officers, but if they were currently covering the court, maybe they could be out patrolling instead. He was seeking a more business analysis, policy, and dollars and cents of that court and how it might be utilized differently. How long might that take?

Mr. Brown stated that was a more reasonable request. He believed it could be completed in two months. The start would need to be figuring out the legal framework. That was the legwork that Mr. Sullivan had done. Staff could take that forward to do the analysis for the dollars and cents part.

Resolution #2021-106: Proposed Use of Marijuana Funds

Mayor Hill stated he had an email that was sent to the City Manager and a proposed resolution which was contributed by Councilor Hart.

Councilor Hart read what he had emailed to the Council: *I move that the Ontario City Council direct staff and the Budget Committee to submit and pass a budget that assumes all locally taxed marijuana revenue will be used for the following purposes only: Payments to reduce the unfunded liability of the City of Ontario's PERS retirement debt which is currently in excess of $13 million (interest payments on this unfunded liability negatively impact the general fund resources by taking funds from operations and puts them towards PERS interest payments), and; Engineering, design and federal matching requirements for infrastructure improvement projects that benefit the citizens of Ontario, and; Capital projects that benefit the citizens of Ontario.*

Councilor Hart stated he had drafted the resolution that if it was the sense of the Council that was the way they wanted to spend the marijuana funds, it was important to get that information to staff so they didn't go down a rabbit hole and make an assumption to spend it in other ways, and then get told by Council that was not what they were comfortable with. Same thing with the Budget Committee. The Budget Committee could do whatever they wanted, but it was important, if that was the sense of the Council, of what they wanted to do. When he was previous Budget Chair, he had attempted to have this same discussion, and it had been voted down. They needed to have a framework on how they wanted to see funds spent in general. Once that was agreed on, it was easier to see the size of the pie they were working with. That was the intent of the resolution – to be as transparent as possible up front in the budget process if that's what the Council wanted to do.

Councilor Hart continued with the other piece that he wanted to put towards staff was understanding what the marijuana money was. He knew there was a line item currently for $3M; however, he believed that was not all of it from the standpoint of there was a lot of carryover marijuana money from the prior year. So how much money were they really talking about. He guessed $5.5M, which could be high or low. But they all needed to kino that amount before they committed to setting aside this number. They also needed to be able to be very clear that in the budget document itself, was to be able to see a list that said that $5.5M of marijuana money had been spent, and then have an itemized list of where that money went.

Mayor Hill stated the budget resolution that could be changed at any time. He liked the resolution except that he wanted to see, before a motion was made, where the second caveat read "...federal matching...", Council needed to include federal, *state, county* to cover all the bases. He understood the PERS analysis. He had received four different numbers. He had contacted the State Representative, the State Senator for numbers, and the numbers from the city, and every different was different and varied greatly. He understood the headache in reaching a number and the number arrived at was not going to be 100% correct because they did not know how the investments were going to turn out during the year, by increasing or decreasing, or if someone died, so they were removed from the system and the city would no longer be contributing to the system on their behalf, etc., But, he believed they could arrive at some number that they were comfortable with. He would support the motion if it were amended.

Mr. Brown stated Councilor Hart was close with his estimated number. In terms of the carryover money and the current year of funds, thought it was closer to the $5M. Staff prepared the budget based on the direction from the Council during the Strategic Planning Retreat.

Councilor Hart asked, as submitted, did it meet the criteria that was in the proposed resolution, or would it cause staff to state they were not in compliance as of now?

Mr. Brown stated staff was working with the budget calendar as approved by Council, but as the Leadership Team worked on it, and the smaller team that put it all together, that was the end goal, to use those monies for non-reoccurring things, particularly not for salaries, programs, and positions. In speaking with the budget team, they intended to bring a list forward of the items that were specified here - PERS paydown, engineering design, federal preference, capital projects, beautification projects, they were going to bring a list of all those things. The expectation was that it would wind up within that $5M. It was easy to see the big jump of $10M to $5M, and that was almost all attributable to the underestimation of the marijuana revenues and the more accurate estimation going forward.

KIRBY moved, HART seconded, **TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #2021-106, A RESOLUTION PROPOSING USE OF MARIJUANA FUNDS, WHEREAS THE CITY IS EXPERIENCING SUBSTANTIAL GROWTH IN REVENUE ATTRIBUTABLE TO THE SALE OF MARIJUANA; AND WHEREAS, MARIJUANA LEGALIZATION HAS INCREASED ACROSS THE UNITED STATES AND IT IS BELIEVED THAT STATES WILL CONTINUE TO SOFTEN THEIR STANCE TOWARD ACCEPTANCE; AND WHEREAS, A SIGNIFICANT AMOUNT, FAR MORE THAN A MAJORITY, OF THE REVENUE COMES FROM SALES TO RESIDENTS IN IDAHO; AND WHEREAS, IF MARIJUANA SALES ARE LEGALIZED IN THE STATE OF IDAHO, ONTARIO WILL LOSE THE MAJORITY OF THIS SOURCE OF REVENUE; AND WHEREAS, INVESTMENTS IN OUR COMMUNITY AND EFFORTS TO MAKE OUR PRIMARY SERVICES MORE SUSTAINABLE FOR THE FUTURE IS THE MOST RESPONSIBLE USE OF THIS REVENUE STREAM. NOW THEREFORE, BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED BY THE ONTARIO CITY COUNCIL, TO DIRECT STAFF AND THE BUDGET COMMITTEE TO SUBMIT AND PASS A BUDGET THAT ASSUMES ALL LOCALLY TAXED MARIJUANA REVENUE WILL BE USED FOR THE FOLLOWING PURPOSES ONLY: PAYMENTS TO REDUCE THE UNFUNDED LIABILITY OF THE CITY OF ONTARIO'S PERS RETIREMENT DEBT WHICH IS CURRENTLY AT ALMOST $11 MILLION (INTEREST PAYMENTS ON THIS UNFUNDED LIABILITY NEGATIVELY IMPACT THE GENERAL FUND RESOURCES BY TAKING FUNDS FROM OPERATIONS AND PUTS THEM TOWARDS PERS INTEREST PAYMENTS); AND ENGINEERING, DESIGN, AND FEDERAL, LOCAL, COUNTY, PRIVATE, AND STATE MATCHING REQUIREMENTS FOR INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS THAT BENEFIT THE CITIZENS OF ONTARIO; AND CAPITAL PROJECTS THAT BENEFIT THE CITIZENS OF ONTARIO.** NO VOTE.

Councilor Braden asked about a timeline for this resolution. Secondly, for clarification, where it read *NOW THEREFORE, BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED by the Ontario City Council, to direct staff and the Budget Committee to submit and pass a budget that assumes all locally taxed marijuana revenue will be used for the following purposes only,* the statement "all locally taxed marijuana revenue". There has been some accrued, some being paid in arrears, some carry-over from last year, and they were also looking at this year's projected budget. Those were all different pieces of this tax, and he was not clear which ones of those this proposed resolution was being marked and what the Council was locking in.

Mayor Hill stated when it read all marijuana money collected, it would be all the money received for whatever timeline they put in for this fiscal year.

Councilor Braden verified the Mayor was speaking of the funds for the budget year that were earned during that budget year and nothing that was earned prior?

Mayor Hill stated no, it was for everything that had been collected.

Councilor Braden stated they had spent some of that through previous budget cycles.

Councilor Hart asked if they need to amend the resolution to clarify both of those points? He could amend it to read it was for this budget year and it was for any marijuana local tax funds from this year and/or prior years that were unspent, and to be spent in this budget year.

BRADEN moved, **TO AMEND THE RESOLUTION TO HAVE A FINITE TIMELINE OF THE NEXT BUDGET YEAR, WHICH WOULD BE 2021-2022 AND ALSO TO INCLUDE THAT YEAR'S REVENUES FROM MARIJUANA LOCAL TAX REVENUE AND ANY FUNDS SPENT, CARRIED-OVER, OR PREVIOUS YEAR'S MARIJUANA TAX REVENUE.**

Mayor Hill stated collected vs. earned could be two different things, so he believed it should be the money the city "earned".

BRADEN moved, HART seconded, **TO AMEND THE RESOLUTION TO HAVE A FINITE TIMELINE OF THE NEXT BUDGET YEAR, WHICH WOULD BE 2021-2022 AND ALSO TO INCLUDE THAT YEAR'S REVENUES FROM MARIJUANA LOCAL TAX REVENUE AND ANY FUNDS SPENT, CARRIED-OVER, PREVIOUS YEAR'S MARIJUANA TAX REVENUE.** Roll call vote: Rodriguez-yes; Baker-yes; Kirby-yes; Hart-yes; Braden-yes; Melendrez-yes; Hill-yes. Motion carried 7/0/0.

Councilor Braden stated he believed they could all see the value in Councilor Hart's proposed motion, but the difficult spot for him was based on six years on the Budget Committee, hearing discussion there, how money was allocated from funds, how contingency balances worked, he thought that locking themselves into restricted use of general use funds, even though from a specific source, could lead to headache down the road from budgeting and financial perspectives. He had a lot of trepidation on locking them into this.

Mayor Hill appreciated Councilor Braden's concerns, but in speaking with the City Manager, there was going to be $900K carry0over from the operating budget from last year, which did not include the three-month required operating money on hand for emergencies, so he was not concerned at this point. Also, it was only proposed to last one year.

RETYPED MOTION WITH AMENDMENTS INCLUDED:
KIRBY moved, HART seconded, **TO APPROVE RESOLUTION #2021-106, A RESOLUTION PURPOSING USE OF MARIJUANA FUNDS, WHEREAS THE CITY IS EXPERIENCING SUBSTANTIAL GROWTH IN REVENUE ATTRIBUTABLE TO THE SALE OF MARIJUANA; AND WHEREAS, MARIJUANA LEGALIZATION HAS INCREASED ACROSS THE UNITED STATES AND IT IS BELIEVED THAT STATES WILL CONTINUE TO SOFTEN THEIR STANCE TOWARD ACCEPTANCE; AND WHEREAS, A SIGNIFICANT AMOUNT, FAR MORE THAN A MAJORITY, OF THE REVENUE COMES FROM SALES TO RESIDENTS IN IDAHO; AND WHEREAS, IF MARIJUANA SALES ARE LEGALIZED IN THE STATE OF IDAHO, ONTARIO WILL LOSE THE MAJORITY OF THIS SOURCE OF REVENUE; AND WHEREAS, INVESTMENTS IN OUR COMMUNITY AND EFFORTS TO MAKE OUR PRIMARY SERVICES MORE SUSTAINABLE FOR THE FUTURE IS THE MOST RESPONSIBLE USE OF THIS REVENUE STREAM. NOW THEREFORE, BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED BY THE ONTARIO CITY**

COUNCIL, TO DIRECT STAFF AND THE BUDGET COMMITTEE TO SUBMIT AND PASS A BUDGET THAT ASSUMES ALL LOCALLY TAXED MARIJUANA REVENUE WILL BE USED FOR THE FOLLOWING PURPOSES ONLY: PAYMENTS TO REDUCE THE UNFUNDED LIABILITY OF THE CITY OF ONTARIO'S PERS RETIREMENT DEBT WHICH IS CURRENTLY AT ALMOST $11 MILLION (INTEREST PAYMENTS ON THIS UNFUNDED LIABILITY NEGATIVELY IMPACT THE GENERAL FUND RESOURCES BY TAKING FUNDS FROM OPERATIONS AND PUTS THEM TOWARDS PERS INTEREST PAYMENTS); AND ENGINEERING, DESIGN, AND FEDERAL, LOCAL, COUNTY, PRIVATE, AND STATE MATCHING REQUIREMENTS FOR INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS THAT BENEFIT THE CITIZENS OF ONTARIO; AND CAPITAL PROJECTS THAT BENEFIT THE CITIZENS OF ONTARIO; TO HAVE A FINITE TIMELINE OF THE NEXT BUDGET YEAR, WHICH WOULD BE 2021-2022 AND ALSO TO INCLUDE THAT YEAR'S REVENUES FROM MARIJUANA LOCAL TAX REVENUE AND ANY FUNDS SPENT, CARRIED-OVER, PREVIOUS YEAR'S MARIJUANA TAX REVENUE. Roll call vote: Rodriguez-yes; Baker-yes; Kirby-yes; Hart-yes; Braden-yes; Melendrez-yes; Hill-yes. Motion carried 7/0/0.

CORRESPONDENCE, COMMENTS, AND EX-OFFICIO REPORTS

- Councilor Braden stated he had a hand-out item they all received. The Small Business Development Center at Treasure Valley Community College was funded in multiple ways. It was funded by the federal dollars, by Business Oregon, and by Treasure Valley Community College. Each paid approximately 1/3 of the SBDC's operating budget in Ontario. The Governor's proposed budget cut their 1/3 from $72K down to $42K for next year, a 41% decrease. A letter of support had been drafted by the City Manager to the Ways & Means Subcommittee on Transportation and Economic Development requesting that it be reinstated to its previous levels and not be cut for the current biennium.

  Councilor Kirby stated he spoke with Andrea Testi, and she informed him that redirecting services that SBDC already did for the community, plus adding some. He wondered, during their communication with their representatives and the Oregon Legislature, that it was possible that the funding that was there be redirected to make SBDC ahead of the entire thing. There was already management and crew in place, so why recreate another one. The money would be better spent and administered throughout the state.

  BRADEN move, HART seconded, THAT THE COUNCIL APPROVE THE LETTER OF SUPPORT FOR THE SBDCs. Roll call vote: Rodriguez-yes; Baker-yes; Kirby-yes; Hart-yes; Braden-yes; Melendrez-yes; Hill-yes. Motion carried 7/0/0.

- Mayor Hill stated he received a letter from Ian Neill questioning why Ontario didn't have a Wendy's and what could the Mayor do about getting one here. He replied to Mr. Neill that it had been investigated a few years ago. He also invited Mr. Neill to attend a Council meeting to do the Pledge of Allegiance and to open the meeting. Mr. Neill responded with *"I got your letter today. I would like to say I would be honored to lead the Pledge of Allegiance at a City Council meeting. I also think we could become partners to convince the Wendy's franchise to get us a Wendy's. P.S. When you write me back, please give me a date and time to be at the City Council meeting."* They had a 10-year-old aspiring developer here and he would invite him to a meeting.

- Councilor Hart suggested having a white board in the Council Chambers that would list those items they would eventually get at. For example, it could read Magistrate Court Update, so then the Council wouldn't forget things.

- Councilor Hart stated at the end of the previous Council meeting, they had adjourned, and he was thinking about a resolution about the budget knowing there was a meeting that night, so he held back on brining up the resolution until currently, but then he asked the City Manager about the next week's meeting, and was told no, there was nothing on the Agenda. What he'd like to ask is that at the end of every meeting there be a brief, 10-second discussion on if they were going to have the next meeting or cancel it.

- Mayor Hill stated he had been approached about the need for City Business Registrations, and if it was needed.

- Councilor Kirby stated he had been talked to about the added items on the utility bill, so the Council needed to keep that issue in mind.

  Councilor Rodriguez stated what they discussed earlier about limiting the spending of the cannabis money, would the fees that are currently on the water bill, that did not fit that scope, correct?

  Mayor Hill stated because they were paying down PERS, it could free up other money in the budget.

  Mr. Brown stated when the Council made comments or suggestions at the end of the meeting, staff had to work off the Council as a whole, so if they wanted staff to go in that direction, it was best to request a consensus on those items. Staff then knew if it was a lone Councilor's idea, or the entire Council was on board.

  Councilor Hart asked for a consensus that at the end of every meeting, the Council acknowledged that the next scheduled meeting would occur or would not, maybe a discussion item at the next meeting.

  Council consensus to have it stated at the end of a current meeting that the next scheduled meeting would or would not occur.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE SESSION: ORS 192.660(2)(e)
An executive session was called at 7:29 p.m. under provisions of ORS 192.660(2)(e) to discuss real property. The Council reconvened into regular session at 7:47 p.m.

ADJOURN

KIRBY moved, HART seconded, **THAT THE MEETING BE ADJOURNED**. Roll call vote: Rodriguez-yes; Baker-yes; Kirby-yes; Hart-yes; Braden-yes; Melendrez-yes; Hill-yes. Motion carried 7/0/0.

ACCEPTED:

Riley J. Hill, Mayor

ATTEST

Tori Barnett, MMC, City Recorder