

KETCHIKAN CHARTER COMMISSION

E-1

REGULAR MEETING & PUBLIC HEARING

September 17, 2004

The regular meeting of the Ketchikan Charter Commission commenced at 6:00 p.m., Friday, September 17, 2004, in the City Council Chambers.

Roll Call

PRESENT: OTTE, HARRINGTON, MCCARTY, FINNEY, PAINTER, KIFFER,
THOMPSON

ABSENT:

A: PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

B: CEREMONIAL MATTERS/INTRODUCTIONS

NONE

C: PUBLIC COMMENTS

NONE

D. INFORMATIONAL REPORTS AND/OR COMMISSION PRESENTATIONS

THOMPSON indicated he'd sent the additional verbiage to Exhibit J discussing the transparency of the financial statements. He said he hoped everyone had looked at that and it would be discussed in the work session. That item was only set up for one reading.

OTTE said that the errata pages to the Petition had been distributed not only to the Commissioners, but were distributed to 38 others in the community. She thanked THOMPSON for assisting in putting the pages together. THOMPSON indicated there were about $\frac{3}{4}$ " of changes since the initial draft Petition had been distributed. The sections that need replacing (or inserting) are separated by Ms. Hill's lovely green paper. OTTE continued that she only had two sections left to do. These are the sections with the newspaper clippings to be mounted

and copied. The School District budget will be copied and scanned into electronic format by the Borough Clerk and the Petition should be good to go to Juneau.

PAINTER said he'd like to comment on the excellent Daily News editorial in the day's paper. He said he hoped there would be some input at the 7 pm Public Hearing.

THOMPSON said that he had been scheduled to speak to the morning Rotary Club the next week, and since he was going to be out of town, he spoke to them the day before and there had been some good questions from the audience and he said he was able to impart some information to the attendees.

OTTE said that she'd had the top of the TBC ad copy changed to indicate that even though this part was over, the Commission was still available by email and the information would still be on the web page for people to review.

MCCARTY inquired as to whether the LBC had indicated what the typical response time would be after the Petition was submitted. OTTE found Mr. Bockhorst's email on the time-line of the process and a discussion was held. THOMPSON said that even though the law says 45 days, after speaking with the Governor at an open house, he felt there might be some pressure on the LBC to move the Petition along. THOMPSON said he mentioned to the Governor that any efforts that he could get behind on the part of the Administration to move it along and make it a priority and his (the Governor's) comments were, "What's been taking you so long? At the State government level, we're tired of hearing two voices from Ketchikan and this needs to get done." THOMPSON went on to say that the Governor is very supportive of the effort and when the guy at the top, there might be some trimming of that 45 days that are allowed by law for the LBC to respond.

PAINTER talked about the process and there was further detailed discussion. It's a very complicated process. The LBC will more than likely be expecting some comments during the public comment period from the City, the Borough and from Saxman and from anyone in the community and then, based on those comments and the Petition, they will make recommendations to the Commission or to the LBC to accept the Petition as is or suggest some changes. If there are substantive changes, the Commission will probably need to meet to discuss those changes and determine how, if necessary, the document should be modified.

HARRINGTON wanted to know if the substantive changes that would need to be made were based on the staff initial review? He said he felt that within the 45 days there should be something from the LBC staff. The Commission would sit again, review the document as to the suggested changes, and change or not

change to meet their suggestions and get the document back to them. THOMPSON said at that point would be when it would go to the full LBC and they also review the Petition and once that is complete and it's accepted, then there's an open comment period.

OTTE went through Mr. Bockhorst's email and the time line was also discussed. The best-case scenario would seem to point to a July 1, 2006 start of a new government. FINNEY indicated that the time line should be checked from time to time to make sure everything is being done when required and maybe a nudge to the Governor's office wouldn't hurt if things seemed to be getting bogged down.

THOMPSON said that one of the comments made to him by Mr. Bockhorst was the fact that their office is very small with a large workload. He said he'd been following the Commission's progress and hadn't seen anything that was causing him the necessity to jump in and give direction, but Mr. Bockhorst had indicated that as far as the details of this Commission's actions, he'd been reading the emails and the fact that he hadn't responded meant that he hadn't seen anything particularly wrong in the direction the Commission was taking and he would address the effort when the entire Petition gets to his office.

KIFFER talked about how long it's taken the community to get to this stage again. THOMPSON pointed out that in 1979 there had been an effort to consolidate and this effort will be attempt number 5.

E. CONSENT CALENDAR

M/S MCCARTY/HARRINGTON for approval of the minutes for the meetings of 9/3/04 and 9/10/04.

The minutes were approved by a unanimous voice vote.

F. VOUCHERS

M/S PAINTER/MCCARTY to authorize the payment of a voucher, as submitted, for a total of \$ 1,197.77.

A roll-call vote was taken on the motion.

FOR: FINNEY, KIFFER, HARRINGTON, PAINTER, MCCARTY, THOMPSON

AGAINST:

ABSTENTION: OTTE

The motion to approve payment of vouchers passed with a vote of 6-0-1.

THOMPSON pointed out that the expense tracking sheet distributed at the meeting was expenses to-date, exclusive of the grant monies returned to the State. OTTE indicated that a new sheet would be distributed showing the correct amount still available to the Commission for expenses.

G-1 RECESS THE MEETING INTO WORKSESSION TO CONSIDER THE 2004 DRAFT CONSOLIDATION PETITION, AS WELL AS THE 2004 DRAFT CHARTER, AS WELL AS CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED ADDRESSING ISSUES WITHIN THE PETITION AND EXHIBITS.

Note: Work sessions are informal discussion sessions held for the purpose of exchanging and gathering information. No action may be taken, formal rules of order are relaxed, and there is no requirement that minutes be kept.

M/S PAINTER/MCCARTY to recess in work session to consider the 2004 Draft Consolidation Petition.

A unanimous voice vote approved the recess into work session.

A discussion was held regarding the added verbiage to the Transition Plan and the simplified format of the first year's budget to be used as an example of the format being requested to be included in the consolidated Municipality's budget process. THOMPSON said that the figures in the suggested format were not perfect because in the numbers being worked with there were a lot of summarized numbers rather than a more detailed break-down of expenses. He said the intent was to show the direct revenues and expenses were and the net, to show what support is coming from taxes and other revenues in the various departments. He said the Non-departmental lines at the bottom were things that were not directly identified to anything. He said in the KPU budget, taking the numbers down as he had, the Water Department actually shows a positive figure, so when subsidies are being discussed, direct costs/direct expenses show that department doesn't need a subsidy or support, however, the Non-Departmental, in direct expense, is all of the administration expenses for all three utilities. The question would be as to whether those are allocated on a revenue basis or a cost basis. When that step is included in the Water Department there is a subsidy of approximately \$200-300,000. Other examples were pointed out, such as Parks & Rec, which in this spreadsheet appears to need a support level of approximately \$800,000. THOMPSON said that in looking at the budget in this way, it's clear which departments need general taxation support and perhaps fees should be raised, or a lowering of support might be

necessary. Or, is that an appropriate amount for the community to contribute to a local parks and recreation facility and programs.

THOMPSON said that it was difficult to break-down all the expenses from the information given, however, once the format is established in the new budget process, the break-down of more detailed expenditures would be easier.

MCCARTY said that these numbers were a reasonable estimate, a working document, that a person could look at and get a picture of what the costs/revenues of a particular area are and if further detail is needed, that could be easily obtained. He said it was a good, conceptual document.

FINNEY said that because it's supposed to be a simplified version, in looking at the General Fund there are \$20 million in revenues and \$21.5 million in expenses, so there is a deficit of \$1.5 million. He inquired as to whether having that deficit would allow the concept to fly. THOMPSON said that the deficit would be made up in transfers and one of the things that are there is transfers from the Hospital Sales Tax Fund to support the General Fund and from the Land Trust Fund to balance that out. That shows that there is a deficit and it's being covered by some other revenues from other funds. He wanted to know if that tells the taxpayers and administrators there is still a little problem within the new government's financial picture because the direct expenses are not being covered. The question would be whether to lower the direct expenses or are the revenues increased so that subsidies from other funds are not required? Those are the questions the new Assembly will have to answer.

KIFFER said that in the Gateway Service Area, J-2 second page, wanted to know why the direct revenue and expenses were balancing out in the Public Streets, Garage and Buildings. THOMPSON said that was editorial license on his part. The revenues were not broken down the way the expenses were and he had a total amount of revenue and so he'd broken the revenues out and showed that all those sub-funds broke even, it left \$415,000 at the top. THOMPSON said that in the future when this budget is done, with this simplified format in mind, a lot of the missing specific information could be pulled out at that time.

KIFFER said he'd struggled throughout the process with the budget in trying to understand. He said he hadn't gone to accountant school for a reason. He asked THOMPSON how comfortable he was with the budget? He asked if it were something that THOMPSON thought was workable? THOMPSON replied, yes. He said that the new J-2 would tie back to the budget year above the transfers. He said it is somewhat illuminative that it shows that are deficits that are being funding and there are funds being moved around before the bottom line balances. When this action is recognized, that gives an idea of the direction of the document. If the deficit \$1.5 million were closer to 0, the funds that are in

the Hospital Sales Tax Fund and the Land Trust Fund and leave them to grow. That luxury is not available right now because the tax revenues based on this cost structure aren't getting close enough to 0. OTTE said that there is a potential of tax relief should economies be realized and some of the suggestions that this Commission have made would lead to those economies. For example, the combining of the garages and the other suggestions indicated in J-1. With consolidation, these things could be realized. THOMPSON said that hopefully once consolidation occurs some of the cost side will be reduced, the direct expense side.

THOMPSON went on to say that the other thing to point out in the worksheet is that this includes capital expenditures, as well as operational expenditures and he didn't pull them out because in some cases they were combined and sometimes they were identified separately. He wanted to get everything on the same page, so he said he'd stuck it all in there. He said he hoped that in a J-2 in the future, the operating expenditures would be separated out from the new growth and stuff, buildings, trucks & equipment. Capital expenditures can throw the budget way off. Of that \$1.5 million, \$630,000 is being spent on capital expenditures. This figure kind of rotates from year to year, which is why it's included in the expenditures in this budget. THOMPSON said that's part of it; if the General Fund is being supported by funds from the Land Trust Fund, how much of those monies from the Land Trust Fund go to pay for capital expenditures and how much is operational. He said he thought that in the base budget there was \$800,000 coming out of the Land Trust Fund earnings to support the General Fund budget. \$630,000 is going right to buying new stuff, capital expenditures.

KIFFER asked, after hearing FINNEY's comment, would it be worth the time to bring that detail into the transparent budget (J-2) and bring that negative figure a little closer just for submitting purposes. THOMPSON said no, he didn't think so, because the capital expenditures are listed out there, but that was a line that was pulled. There are other capital expenditures in there and it would take a considerable amount of time to go back through the budget and pull each line item out and re-do just for this new sheet. This was intended to be illustrative of what the Commission is looking for in the future. It could certainly be more refined and be more in-depth, but it would take 40 to 50 man-hours just to do that. He also said if the concept got more complicated, it wouldn't fit on two pages and that was one of the nice things that it was two pages and it showed everything. FINNEY said that he liked what THOMPSON had put together. OTTE said it was a good example for the new government to follow.

FINNEY said that it definitely brings up some questions and THOMPSON agreed that it was pretty illuminating.

G-2 RECONVENE INTO REGULAR SESSION

M/S HARRINGTON/OTTE to reconvene the meeting into regular session.

A unanimous voice vote passed the motion to reconvene into regular session.

H: UNFINISHED/OLD BUSINESS

M/S HARRINGTON/PAINTER to adopt the clerical, and any other changes deemed appropriate to modify in this format, as set forth in work session to the 2004 Draft Consolidation Petition and Exhibits. (As a point of clarification, the changes suggested to the Transition Plan, as well as the new Exhibit J-2 are to be included in this vote.

A roll-call vote was taken on the motion.

FOR: OTTE, PAINTER, KIFFER, HARRINGTON, MCCARTY, FINNEY, THOMPSON
AGAINST:

The motion passed by a vote of 7-0.

I-4 Adoption of Resolution No. 7

M/S HARRINGTON/OTTE to adopt Resolution No. 7.

THOMPSON clarified that Resolution No. 7 is a Resolution of the Ketchikan Charter Commission, Alaska, authorizing submittal of the 2004 Draft Petition for Consolidation and accompanying documents to the Local Boundary Commission through the Ketchikan Gateway Borough.

MCCARTY said that having been in Ketchikan throughout the processes to unify and consolidate the community, he said that he thinks he hopes the reason why there hasn't been the notoriety and a lot of angry people coming in or letters to the editor means that the time is right to consider this process and he hoped the Commission had done it in a manner that people feel confident that what is being sent is at least worthy of consideration, if not necessarily support at a later date. This is the type of business where when people speak; you know they're upset. If they're not worried about it, it flows along as it has. He said we've done our job.

THOMPSON said that it was interesting to him that everything that's been done that's been contentious amongst the Commissioners, we've reconsidered and

gotten to the point where the votes have been 5-2, 6-1, or 7-0. The good thing about that is when the Commission was formed, there was a cross-section and representation from the Borough and the City and the one at-large seat, and for the citizens to come forward and elect people from a broad spectrum of the community and that elected group could sit down at a table and agree that it's not perfect; there are things each Commissioner doesn't like, but overall, we like it. That goes a long way.

PAINTER wanted to remind the Commissioners to be present at the Borough Assembly meeting on 9/27 when the document is passed over. OTTE indicated that the presentation would be scheduled at the beginning of the meeting in their "Presentations" section right near the beginning. It won't be an agenda item that the Commissioners would have to wait for. PAINTER pointed out some slight wording errors in the Resolution recitals that OTTE indicated she'd corrected as she printed out the document for the Commissioners signatures.

THOMPSON said he had a point of clarification that throughout the Resolution and recitals, the Petition is referred to as the Draft Petition. He wanted to know at what point it becomes just the Petition and loses the word Draft? OTTE explained that after the LBC accepts the Petition, it becomes the Petition for Consolidation. She said that on page 3 of the Resolution there's a place for everyone to sign should it pass.

HARRINGTON said the reason he'd said it was appropriate for the Commission to vote on this item at this time, even though it may get changed after the Public Hearing, we would be formally adopting any changes, so it wouldn't change the intent of the Resolution.

A roll-call vote was taken on adoption of Resolution No. 7.

FOR: FINNEY, KIFFER, MCCARTY, HARRINGTON, PAINTER, THOMPSON, OTTE
AGAINST:

The Resolution passed by a vote of 7-0.

I-5 Authorization for Email voting for Approval of Minutes and Vouchers

M/S HARRINGTON/PAINTER to allow email voting on the minutes of the 9/17/04 Meeting and Public Hearing as well as any vouchers submitted for payment for advertising, contractual services, postage or goods required for submittal of the Petition documents in a timely manner.

PAINTER wanted to know if this motion had been run by the Borough Attorney for an opinion and OTTE indicated no, but she had talked with Danielle at the Chamber of Commerce and they routinely conduct votes via email, with a non-response being counted as a yes vote. The Chamber is a non-profit with rules of procedure, etc. THOMPSON said that the Chamber is the grantee and the Commission is the beneficiary and the Commission is bound by their rules on how the grant would be spent. What they said was that they were going to require approved minutes of the meetings when there are vouchers, so if we, as a group, say that the approval of the minutes would be allowed electronically, they would accept that.

OTTE said that any subsequent vouchers after the ones approved at the present meeting, she said she could wait until they were all in and then send it out as an email for a vote of approval. Those response emails can then be compiled and sent to Danielle for payment of the bills.

HARRINGTON said that if the Commission were to run afoul of the Open Meetings Act regarding these minutes and the subsequent vouchers, just call another meeting. OTTE said she would also post the information on Sitnews and will be distributed electronically to all who receive the packets in that manner.

THOMPSON suggested an amendment to the motion that this procedure will be done with the concurrence of the Borough Attorney to make certain it doesn't get the Commission in trouble with the Open Meetings Act, and if it does, we can just meet again. HARRINGTON said in that amendment the Chair could be empowered to approve any vouchers submitted in the event that the voting process is inappropriate by email.

KIFFER said he was comfortable with the way this has been presented. FINNEY wanted to know how a body would ever catch up if something like email voting wasn't allowed? He said you'd constantly have to keep coming back just to approve the minutes of the meeting you'd had to approve the minutes.

MCCARTY said there isn't a lot of discretion in voting to pay the Daily News or the document shipping charges. If it were something that was discretionary, it might be a problem. FINNEY said that at some point you've got to quit having meetings. It would be a constant conundrum or the Twilight Zone.

MCCARTY said he wouldn't even bother making the amendment say with the concurrence of the Borough Attorney as part of the motion. That's part of what the Chair is empowered to do. THOMPSON said that the part about the concurrence of the Borough Attorney would be dropped, but HARRINGTON's suggestion about the Chair being empowered to authorize payment of vouchers and he said he or OTTE would check with the Attorney just to make certain that

the email voting would not run afoul with the Open Meetings Act. OTTE said she'd send out the minutes for approval.

THOMPSON said the Daily News, the shipping/postage charges, the contractual salary obligations would probably be the only expenses submitted for approval. HARRINGTON said the money that is left should be retained because there will be additional expenses throughout the coming year for advertising and mailing and probably meetings.

KIFFER wanted to know if the office space was going to be available throughout the process and OTTE indicated she didn't know. She said that Mr. Amylon wasn't due back until the 28th and she said she was sure he would run it by the Council. Everything in there other than the computer and the files belong to the City. THOMPSON said they would probably say that they don't have anyone that needs that space and for the Commission to just stay there until they need the space. The Commission's belongings can easily be boxed up and stored there until such time as the City requests the space back.

A roll-call vote on the amended motion was taken.

FOR: THOMPSON, FINNEY, MCCARTY, KIFFER, HARRINGTON, PAINTER, OTTE
AGAINST:

The amended motion passed by a vote of 7-0.

A break was taken until 7 pm.

I: NEW BUSINESS – PUBLIC HEARING 7 PM.

I-1 Recess the meeting into Public Hearing. Note: During the time set aside for the Public Hearing, the Commissioners may discuss items concerning the Draft Petition and Exhibits, assign specific tasks or work on individual assigned tasks when there is no one testifying. As with a work session, no action may be taken and formal rules of order are relaxed.

M/S MCCARTY/FINNEY to recess into Public Hearing in order for the citizens of the community to bring their comments and concerns regarding the Commission's draft Petition to the Commission.

A unanimous voice vote was taken on the motion and the Commission went into Public Hearing.

MCCARTY suggested that the citizens and the press would probably like to have the time-line information on the consolidation process. OTTE inquired if Mr. Miller from the Daily News remembers having received the information from Mr. Bockhorst. He said he probably had read it, but didn't quite know where it was. OTTE said she'd make sure he got it again.

OTTE then did a synopsis of the time-line for the members of the audience.

THOMPSON asked the individuals in the audience if they wanted to come up and comment on anything.

Dave Coates, PO Box 9452, said he hadn't come to comment, but to listen to the comments. He said he'd expected the room to be full and he had wanted to hear what others had to say. In absence of no one coming up to speak, he said he'd feel bad if the Commission had the Public Hearing and no one spoke. He wanted to again thank the Commissioners who cared enough for the two communities to try to put a document together to put us all together into one community. He said that there weren't people up throwing rocks at the Commission, and the document has been presented to the community. He said he's heard from people that it's not such a bad idea after all. The document, he said, obviously, is a good enough document, that the Commission is getting both Borough and City people who aren't throwing rocks at them. He said that was a wonderful job.

Mr. Coates continued by saying that he's excited about the prospect. He said his son had come because he'll probably be running for the new Assembly when he's old enough and there will be a unified community instead of two segments that always have differences. He thanked the Commission again. He said he'd been watching on TV and listening to the feedback and it's a wonderful thing. He said the community just had its first hundred years and moving into the next hundred years and now there's a chance to put the community as one. He said he lives in the Borough, but has businesses in the City and he said he takes great exception when the City has the elections and he's not able to vote on things that affect him and affect his family and businesses. He said he's been told that he's not a taxpayer or not a voter. He said he takes exception to those statements, because the City means a lot to him. Not to be able to have a voice now and this would make it where everyone can have an equal voice in the community.

Dave Valentine, 11976 North Tongass, spoke to the Commissioners after they had completed their comments. He said he was having trouble hearing the Commissioners speak and he was wondering if the sound system was working.

Mr. Valentine said he wished he'd come to a lot more of the meetings. He said he didn't know what all had been said, but he said he was underwhelmed at the

turnout at this meeting. He really thought it would be full. He said one of his concerns about consolidation is that a whole lot of the City laws will be spread out onto the Borough, too. He said he has a small rock quarry out at Mile 12 and he's been selling rock out there for 25 years. He said he'd never had any permits to fill out, any laws or anything and he said he felt real fortunate to be able to level his property with no hassles whatsoever. He said he'd never had any problems. He's had about 6 different drillers drill and blast out there and he said he knew how tough it is within the City to do any blasting. A person needs a million dollars worth of coverage. He said that he'd hate to see all this heavy layer of City regulations spread out to the Borough. He said that was his main concern. There may be a lot of other things, too, that the Borough residents would rather not see laid on them. Those, he said, are his kind of concerns.

Mr. Valentine said he'd been in Alaska for 48 years and it used to be pretty wide open; do whatever you want, but it's sure changing. Too fast to suit him, he said. As people get closer and closer together, he said he knew that it would take more rules and regulations to keep things in balance, but he said he had no idea what kind of regulations they intend to move out into the Borough. Even places like Loring, some of the Borough regulations are pretty stiff like height of fences and decks and things, in remote places they're even having a heavy hand about it. Aerial surveillance to tell you how many cars you've got in your yard. He said he'd spoken with a guy who'd bought a lot out North and all he'd ever done was store things on it. The Borough is telling him he's got to move it all. He came to Mr. Valentine to see if he could store it on Mr. Valentine's light industrial lot. It's old, ugly junk and it's not even worth the price of moving it and storing it, but the guy's facing \$500 per day penalty hanging over his head. Where'd all this stuff come from, Mr. Valentine wanted to know. He said he'd like to see less of it, not more.

HARRINGTON spoke to Mr. Valentine and let him know that all the rules and regulations of both the Borough and City will have to be re-enacted within the two or three years after consolidation. So there will be a period of time in which those different rules will remain in force until such time as the new Assembly can review those laws. He continued that this would be the critical time to get involved in the process as the new Assembly starts the review of the rules. He said the second item voiced by Mr. Valentine was on the Code Enforcement Division. In the Charter, the Commission has said that the power for Building Code Enforcement is limited to within the former City, the Gateway Service Area and other service areas only. The Building Code enforcement will not be in effect in the former "Borough" until those individual service areas choose to have that power. He said to Mr. Valentine that he didn't know if that gave him any breathing room, but those two items at least give him the option for addressing those concerns as consolidation takes place.

Mr. Valentine continued that he sure wished more people had shown up. MCCARTY indicated to Mr. Valentine that this isn't the final go-around. The Petition will go up to Juneau and then there will be a public comment period and some more Public Hearings before the issue comes to a vote. He said it's still a work in progress and that the Petition is basically done except for some tinkering with some of the parts at the behest of the Local Boundary Commission. He continued to Mr. Valentine that if he felt like looking at the document, the Commission could make certain he got a copy.

The Commission thanked Mr. Valentine for his comments. He then thanked the Commission for serving and putting in so many hours at the task.

Another citizen had come into the Chambers, but he declined to comment.

I-2 Reconvene to regular session

M/S THOMPSON/PAINTER that seeing no further citizens desiring to testify at the Public Hearing to reconvene into regular session to consider the suggestions and comments received from the community during the Public Hearing.

The motion passed by a unanimous voice vote.

I-3- Commission Discussion of Public Hearing Comments (if necessary)

This item was not necessary.

J: COMMISSION COMMENTS

MCCARTY said that it was worth noting that it seems to be a part of the personality of Ketchikan. People pay a lot of attention to what is going on. It may be a little quiet or below the surface; watching the TV and talking with each other. If there were something that really bothered them, they would let the Commission know. He said that he thinks it's a strong sign...it's not that people aren't watching. He said he knows they are watching and listening and this Commission seems to have done nothing at this point to cause any great upset and he said he thinks that the document arrived at by the Commission is not so bland and so little content, that's not the reason for it. It's because everyone tried to work together. He gave his congratulations to the Commissioners who have been working very hard on this.

KIFFER said this has been a process for him and he said he'd learned a lot. He said he appreciated the Commissioners putting up with someone that's a little

thicker-headed than most and he said it's been a haul, but he's enjoyed being there.

FINNEY said he'd enjoyed working with all the Commissioners.

HARRINGTON wanted to know if the Public Hearing would be opened up again as soon as the Commission's comments were through, since there were more people coming in? The Commission indicated in the affirmative. He said in that case, he'd not speak any more.

PAINTER said that it had been a pleasure to serve with the six other Commissioners. He said that at first he'd had second thoughts about the Commission's ability to complete this project within the time frame, but we have. Each and every one of us has provided input to this hefty document. We debated the issues to consensus. He thanked the other Commissioners.

OTTE said that she didn't want to get "verclempt".

THOMPSON said he wanted to thank all the Commissioners for working together so diligently. He said he was impressed when the flyer went out in the newspaper this week because it was like eight months of work and it all could be put on two pieces of paper. It made sense when he read through it, he said, after it was all said and done. He thanked the Commissioners.

THOMPSON then invited Mr. Valentine to speak to the Commission. He said the Public Hearing would be opened up. (See Mr. Valentine's comments under the Public Hearing section).

M/S MCCARTY/PAINTER to recess subject to the call of the Chair.

THOMPSON said that when the Commission hears back from the LBC, there might be a need to re-convene to address the concerns and suggestions voiced by the LBC.

A roll-call vote was taken on the motion.

FOR: PAINTER, KIFFER, FINNEY, HARRINGTON, MCCARTY, THOMPSON, OTTE
AGAINST:

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 7:25 p.m.