

LEGAL AND LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE
October 7, 2008

Councilman Benson, Chairman, called the meeting of the Legal and Legislative Committee to order with Councilmen Rico, Robinson, Berz, Page, Shockley, Pierce, and Gaines present. City Attorneys Randall Nelson and Phil Noblett and Shirley Crownover, Assistant Clerk to the Council, were also present.

Others present included Dan Johnson, Missy Crutchfield, David Johnson, Paul Page, Lee Norris, Chief Parker, Dennis Malone, Adm. Leach, Gary Hilbert, Larry Zehnder, Rick Wood, Daisy Madison, Dardee Long and Jerry Stewart. Officer Collins joined the meeting later.

WRECKER ORDINANCE

Chairman Benson asked Attorney Noblett to come to the table with the Revised Wrecker Ordinance. He noted that Mr. Yates had also asked to be recognized.

Mr. Guy Yates stated that he knew the Council was trying to come up with something on the Recovery Class and there was an ongoing debate, and also there was talk of training—that these items would take time, but he would like to get the “Owner’s Request” changed.

Chairman Benson stated that he thought there was a two-days prior written notice required; that Mr. Yates was interested in getting something in place—that they did not have an “Owner’s Request” in North Georgia.

Mr. Yates noted that this did not present a problem outside the city.

Mr. Noblett noted that **Owner’s Request** was covered on Page 28 of the Ordinance; *that any business within the City of Chattanooga who desires to authorize one wrecker company to do all towing for that business within the City of Chattanooga shall sign a notarized document which shall be filed with the Wrecker Board, Chattanooga Police Department and 911 Board, authorizing such business arrangement. Owners’ requests for A Class, B Class, C Class or Recovery Class wreckers shall be submitted in writing to the Chattanooga Police Dept. and 911 Board with the name of owner and wrecker requested. No changes in owner’s request shall be made unless a written request is filed with the Chattanooga Police Dept. and 911 Board for at least two business days before the request is made.*

Mr. Yates stated that this would help everyone and be “ more fair”.

Chairman Benson stated that he did not think anyone had any problems with this.

A representative of Mostellers asked if it needed to be notarized?

Chairman Benson stated that this took the Police off the spot.

The representative of Mostellers asked what happens if there is not a document on file and a truck wrecks, and it goes to rotation? Doug Yates added “and it is not at Owner’s Request”? Attorney Noblett responded “as long as it is on file”. Mr. Guy Yates stated that they were trying to stop this. The Mostellers representative stated that “on file” only refers to “C” Class and “Recovery”. This was confirmed by Attorney Noblett. Mr. Guy Yates again stated that this was “more fair”.

Chairman Benson stated that this Ordinance would come to the Council next week in its final form.

Attorney Noblett stated that he was not able to be at the meeting on September 23rd, but he had read nine pages of minutes on this; that he had a new draft; that there were some concerns about making a lot of changes about classification, and he had gone back to the earlier version. He referred to Page 2 of the Ordinance, which is made a part of this minute material, **Sec. 35-148 District Wrecker Classifications**. He explained that the purposed and definitions were the same as before; that the requirements for Class A are the same; that a new section “**O**” had been added for Class A tow trucks having specific required equipment, which is listed. He noted that Page 4 contains currently what is in our City Ordinance and that he had added “**M**”, which is medium capacity tow trucks having specific required equipment, which is listed. **Class C** is in the Code for the requirements of size, and he had added “**P**” on Pages 6 and 7, dealing with all heavy duty Class C Tow Trucks having specific required equipment, which is listed.

He noted that we continued to include the *Recovery Class* when needed for public safety as determined by Emergency Service Providers in charge at the scene for life safety purposes. He explained that as it is now, anyone can make the determination, and this is too broad, and we need a Scene Commander making the calls. The specifics for the *Recovery Class* are the same as in 2003 and have been looked at by Mr. McGovern. There is a new section on Page 9, items 28 and 29, which Attorney Noblett felt was helpful. Section 28 reads “*A Recovery Class wrecker shall be required to either own or contract all equipment required in Sections 8.2 through 8.5 of the Georgia Towing and Recovery Incentive Program (TRIP), which equipment is available for response 24/7.*” Section 29 reads, “*All eligible companies for Recovery Class designation shall provide ongoing training to all their employees which satisfy TIME Task Force certifications and endorsements. In addition, each Recovery Class wrecker company shall have towing and recovery professionals employed who have attended at least eight (8) hours of training or continuing education every twelve (12) months. This training may include traffic incident management work shops, MUTCD traffic control flagger training, or advance towing and recovery practices which are approved by the Wrecker Board. All Recovery Class operators shall be familiar with quick clearance, best practices for incident scene management, referenced by the I-95 Corridor Coalition.*”

Councilwoman Robinson had a question for the industry. She wanted to know where the training school would be and would a Certification Diploma have to be displayed in their shop?

Attorney Noblett stated that they would refer to the TIME Task Force certifications and endorsements in Georgia and look at what is available; that there would need to be something on file concerning employees for the City to look at. He noted that this could include workshops, mentioning that he and Councilman Benson attended a Training Session at the Towing Museum—that the bottom line is that heavy equipment operators have to have specific training, and he felt that they would agree because the equipment is so expensive. He reiterated that TIME is what the State of Georgia has.

Chairman Benson stated that Chief Williams was going to put such training into the Police Academy for training for responders—that this would be incorporated in the Police Dept.

Councilman Page asked that Emergency Service Providers be defined? Attorney Noblett stated that it could be Fire and Police or TDOT who is in charge at the scene; that normally it is the first person to show up or the one that is higher in rank; that we need to be sure that the person in charge is making the decisions.

Mr. Guy Yates stated that he knew there was a debate about equipment and training, but he wanted to get the Owner's Request in now.

Chairman Benson stated that Attorney Noblett would bring this back next week.

Mr. Guy Yates again stated “just get the Owner's Request” now—that it would be “more fair”.

Councilwoman Berz asked if rotators were being taken out? Attorney Noblett responded that he has included what is currently in the Code, but it does not specify required equipment—that he has just “beefed” up the current Ordinance.

Attorney Nelson added that this is the Performance Based result—that if a company can't clear a wreck in 90 minutes, they will be removed from the list for a two-year term—that he thought there were only about 18 such wrecks each year and if they just removed them for one year, it would not be enough punishment; that if they failed to clear in 90 minutes, they would lose their right to be on the list for two years.

Chairman Benson noted that this might mean we would end up with nobody!

The man from Mostellers asked Doug Yates if he could clear an accident in 90 minutes? Mr. Yates responded that it depends—that it could be done in 90 minutes and questioned if “cleared up” meant on the shoulder? Would it mean “just open the road”?

Chairman Benson responded that the lanes would need to be clear in 90 minutes—that they clear the lanes in 90 minutes in Illinois.

The representative from Mosteller asked how many lanes had to be open and what if there were just two lanes? It was explained that these time constraints are not for two-lane highways. Attorney Nelson added that there would need to be at least one lane open in each direction.

Chairman Benson mentioned a “grace period” where work would stop and start again.

Attorney Noblett continued with the changes, referring to Page 10, (7) that reads, “*The failure of any operator to clear vehicles from the traffic lanes on controlled access highways within ninety (90) minutes following an order to proceed from the Emergency Service Provider in charge at the scene shall result in citation to the Wrecker Board for consideration on future participation in the rotation list and/or the dispatch of another wrecker service to provide clearance of traffic lanes in the interest of public safety. **Item 8 reads** “Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter to the contrary, any Emergency Service Provider in charge at the scene may call for a recovery class wrecker with a rotator boom at the scene of any accident which, in the discretion of the Emergency Service Provider in charge at the scene will result in potential loss of life or serious injury in the event such equipment is not summoned as quickly as possible to the scene.”*”

Attorney Nelson asked about the two-year suspension? Attorney Noblett stated that the fee numbers are the same and referred to pages 12 and 13 “**Revocation—same**”. This reads that the Wrecker Board shall suspend or revoke the permit of any permittee on the call rotation list maintained by the City on specific grounds that are so noted. He read item (7) *Specific performance times shall be met by all Recovery Class operators or Class C operators who perform clearance work on controlled access highways. The failure of any operator to clear vehicles from the traffic lanes on controlled access highways within ninety (90) minutes following an order to proceed from the Emergency Service Provider in charge at the scene shall result in citation to the Wrecker Board for consideration on suspension or removal from the rotation list in the interest of public safety.*

Attorney Noblett noted that the Wrecker Board has that authority, with Chairman Benson adding that the Wrecker Board has flexibility.

Attorney Noblett referred to Page 12 **Section 35-155—Revocation**, which reads that the Board shall suspend or revoke the permit *“If the permit was procured by fraudulent conduct or false statement of a material fact or a material fact concerning the applicant which was not disclosed at the time of his making application that would have constituted just cause for refusing to issue the license”*.

Provisions for Billing and Charges are outlined on Page 16 **Section 35-160**. Attorney Noblett explained that we went back to what we had before and some amounts were updated, such as the per hour charges. He noted that licenses could be suspended if the business was overcharging.

Section 35-162 on page 21—**Regulations for district wreckers** is much the same as previously.

Section 35-166 on page 24—**Call and notification procedures for emergency towing and storage** is the same as the last draft and comes out of the State of Tennessee manual.

Attorney Noblett noted that we had already gone over **Section 35-169 Owner’s Request** on page 28, noting that something has to be on file for two (2) days.

The last thing was **Section 35-170—Penalties for Violation of the Wrecker Board Ordinance** on Page 28. He went over the penalties involved, giving power to the Wrecker Board and guidance to the Wrecker Board based on the Call Rotation List.

Chairman Benson commended Attorney Noblett on a job well done.

Councilwoman Berz stated that this was totally performance based, covering training and owner’s request, and she, too, thanked Attorney Noblett.

Councilman Page acknowledged that it was a good job.

Councilman Pierce stated that for the benefit of the wrecker companies, he would like to have extra copies of this provided to pass out.

SALE OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES AT TIVOLI/AUDITORIUM

Chairman Benson stated that we are trying to see if we want to handle the sale of alcoholic beverages like other cities are doing.

Attorney Nelson explained that there is legislation from the General Assembly, and we meet some of the criteria.

Councilman Page stated that we sell alcohol at Riverbend and Nightfall on Friday's and at the Zoo; that the only reason he could see for doing this is to raise money, and he thought it would be okay at cultural events as long as we have an Ordinance in place against public drunkenness.

Attorney Nelson explained that the Tennessee Code makes it lawful to sell alcohol and wine in various places. There are some guidelines as it relates to the Auditorium and Tivoli. (1) The facility has to be 50 years old and an Historic Place; (2) The center has to be operated "for profit" or "not for profit" under 501.C and the profits have to be used for operation and maintenance of the center. He noted that the City owns the Tivoli and Auditorium, and they are not 501.C, and we do not meet this second qualification; (3) We meet the third qualification that states that the center provides facilities for programs of cultural, civic and educational interest and (4) We meet the population requirement—less than 300,000 and no more than 400,000. Attorney Nelson noted that we came up short on the second criteria. He explained that the requirement of selling beer 500 ft. from a church does not apply in the central business district, where the Tivoli is located. The auditorium is zoned R-4 and right across the street from a church. In this case, we would either have to change the zoning or change the law. He noted that in going back to the four criteria of State Law, to change, we would have to talk with State legislators.

Councilwoman Robinson mentioned quasi-non-profit authority.

Attorney Nelson stated that this would help "jump the hurdle"; that the Auditorium and Tivoli used to be operated by Chattanooga Downtown Partnership, which is a 501.C organization.

Councilwoman Robinson stated that there are ways we can do this but the question is "Do we want to?" First, she stated, it would be a nice touch—that the Tivoli Theater is an easy one to remedy—that we could get a not-for profit organization to hold the license, and we could vend in the Tivoli. Attorney Nelson clarified that the organization would have to operate the Tivoli and not just hold a license.

Councilwoman Robinson felt that it could still be operated by the City of Chattanooga, and the Tivoli would be where the Board lived, and the Board could operate it together with the support of the Education, Arts & Culture Department to provide staffing, etc.; that they would meet for the purpose of oversight.

Councilman Rico stated that he thought what he heard was that we were asking Attorney Nelson to find a loophole.

Attorney Nelson reiterated that it has to be a 501.C corporation, and they would have to be responsible for maintenance.

Councilwoman Robinson stated that she had a second opinion—that this would open up a stream of revenue, which could be enough to make a difference; however, we could go through a lot of work and contortions, and it could turn out not to make money and turn into a big hassle.

Councilman Pierce stated that for us to be a beneficiary, we would have to turn the whole operation over to a 501.C corporation, and we would not be receiving the benefits.

Attorney Nelson reminded that the proceeds shall be used for the operation and maintenance of the facility or performing arts center; that this would have to be agreed upon with the operator. He stated that another thing to be considered was that anytime you sell alcohol, you are looking at legislation and liability.

Councilman Pierce still felt that the management team would have to receive benefits for their management from us, which means another layer of employees eating up our profits.

Councilwoman Robinson stated that it seemed to her that everything was being portrayed as so difficult, and it should be easy; that we could establish a 501.C—that we would have the structure and staff already in place and on the job; that we could on paper say that we have a Board and this is their Staff, and they would have the oversight; that there would be a liquor license at the Tivoli and the lessee would say to the audience “please enjoy refreshments during intermission”—that they could buy their wine and then enjoy the rest of the performance; that they would be buying a service and paying for it, and it would not hurt these events—that we would not be taking revenue away from them at the end of the day—that she thought it would make a difference and that we should do this.

Councilman Shockley asked if the lessees would have to fit a cultural definition or if it would apply to rock concerts also?

Ms. Crutchfield noted that TAPA is non-profit, with Councilwoman Robinson saying that we already have this in place.

Attorney Nelson stated that this was a different mission—that TAPA does not run the Tivoli or Auditorium.

Councilman Page stated that he thought this could be changed easily.

Attorney Nelson stated that we have an Auditorium Board, and the simplest thing would be to go to the State Legislators.

Councilwoman Robinson stated that she was not ready to say let's do this; that a Business Performance needs to be done, specifying what amount we would be making based on a certain model, and we need to see what we could earn.

Chairman Benson pointed out that the Beer Board approved the selling of beer at the National Guard Armory, and we had shootings. He asked Officer Collins to speak to this.

Officer Collins responded that it would depend on the event; that at the Armory they go until 3:00 a.m. in the morning. Chairman Benson stated that it would be until 3:00 a.m. on Halloween. Officer Collins stated that it went until 2:00 a.m. in the morning and that concerts usually last only until about 11:00 p.m. Chairman Benson stated that on a Friday night (Halloween) it would go until 2:00 a.m. Officer Collins agreed that some of the neighborhood groups were concerned about this; that the Beer Board had added a problem—that with Halloween outfits you would not be able to tell who anyone was.

Councilwoman Robinson stated that she wanted to get this straight—that the Armory was across town, and she thought we were talking about the Tivoli; that we needed to exercise good sense with numbers and see what the bottom line would be—that we could increase revenue with appropriate events; that if it is “sound and fury that signifies nothing”, then we don't need to do it; but it could save taxpayers' money.

Councilman Page stated that he thought Councilwoman Robinson could get this done; that Missy Crutchfield and Councilwoman Robinson need to get the appropriate departments to work with them and come back to the Council with something.

Councilwoman Robinson stated they would come back with some numbers. Ms. Crutchfield stated that they could re-visit this. Councilwoman Robinson felt that we could get a temporary license and capture the revenue stream.

Councilman Pierce stated that we would have to have insurance—that we are in the Bible Belt, and this might work differently in other places. Ms. Crutchfield stated that she understood this.

Attorney Nelson questioned how we would differentiate who can get a license and who cannot? He mentioned rock concerts and country western shows.

Mr. David Johnson stated that if you made money, it would have to be open to all, with Attorney Nelson mentioning the potential damage to the facilities.

Officer Collins stated that they provided security for the Tivoli and Auditorium as opposed to off-venues; that they already had officers there to help with problems; that if people got out of hand, an officer could cut off beer sales.

Councilwoman Robinson added that the seating capacity at the Tivoli is small; that the Auditorium will accommodate around 3800, which she felt was a nice crowd but not a crushing number. Ms. Crutchfield added that we were just talking about intermission sales.

Chairman Benson stated that Councilwoman Robinson would meet with Missy Crutchfield and David Johnson about this.

SIGNAGE AND BRAKE NOISE ON LARGE TRUCKS

Chairman Benson stated that he did not know much about this issue and that Councilwoman Bennett was out of town; that we would have to take this up another time. It was noted at this point that John VanWinkle had been here earlier but had left.

This part of the meeting adjourned at 4:10 P.M.

PARKS AND RECREATION CONCERNS

Adm. Larry Zehnder was present to cover this portion of the meeting. His first item was **Ordinance 6(a)** on tonight's agenda that amends the City Code regarding exceptions to the distance restrictions for the sale of beer or other beverages of like alcoholic content to the area of Warner Park occupied by the Chattanooga Zoo and removing Eastgate Plaza from the exceptions listed in Section 5-75(b).

Councilwoman Berz asked where Eastgate Plaza was? Mr. Zehnder explained that Eastgate Plaza is not there anymore—that it is the area where Starbucks is located, and this is just housekeeping to remove it.

The second aspect is the Chattanooga Zoo property at Warner Park; they need to this to be an exemption because of fundraising events after hours. This is what this change is for.

Councilman Pierce asked if this would not be similar to the Tivoli?

Attorney Nelson explained that this included 5% or less of alcohol.

Councilman Page also saw no difference than beer and wine at the Tivoli and the Auditorium.

Attorney Nelson explained that we would have to amend the Ordinance as it relates to distances from churches for the Auditorium.

Chairman Benson questioned the difference and Councilman Rico stated that it was all alcohol.

Attorney Nelson explained that we regulate the selling of "soft" liquor, and the State regulates "hard" liquor. Councilman Pierce asked how the "body" regulates it? Attorney Nelson explained that there was nothing in the Charter that authorizes us to sell—period; that in the case of the Zoo, it is operated by a third party, which is FOZ.

Adm. Zehnder added that this is different from the Auditorium and the Tivoli; that the law does not permit it in public parks; that this change makes an exemption for the Chattanooga Zoo within Warner Park and has nothing to do with the Tivoli or the Auditorium, and the timing is terrible. This exemption provides a continued opportunity.

Attorney Nelson added that there was a limit of two permits a year.

AGREEMENT AMENDMENT W/BARGE, WAGGONER, SUMNER & CANNON

Adm. Zehnder went over **Resolution 7** on tonight's agenda that authorizes an amendment of the Agreement with Barge, Waggoner, Sumner and Cannon, Inc. relative to the Summit Softball Complex Project to provide additional on-site project representation services, increasing the amount of the contract by \$71,635.00, for a revised contract amount not to exceed \$959,173.00. He stated that he had brought pictures for those who were not able to go on the tour. Councilman Pierce asked if there would be adequate restroom services?

LEASE PURCHASE AGREEMENT WITH THE TRUST FOR PUBLIC LAND

This is **Resolution (e)** on tonight's agenda that authorizes a Lease Purchase Agreement with The Trust for Public Land with respect to the acquisition of the Stringer's Ridge Property, with the City's portion of the purchase price being \$500,000.00, plus closing costs. Adm. Zehnder explained that this would entail \$150,000 this Fiscal Year and the remaining \$350,000 for next year. This is an option to purchase and will be matched by \$2 million dollars in private funds; the \$150,000 will be required from us by the first of November and the remaining part next year.

Councilman Page stated that he was going to vote for this; however he wanted to ask Daisy Madison or Dan Johnson about two bond issues; since the market was bad, he wanted to make sure that this had nothing to do with bonds. He stated that he was concerned with the infrastructure of the City and wanted to make sure we were spending this additional money with "our eyes wide open". He asked if we had the money in this bad market?

Ms. Madison responded that we were facing tough economic times; the \$150,000 is not to come from bond proceeds and the \$350,000 comes from our cash reserve next year as well. She stated that she felt like with this project, the amount referenced would be able to be funded from our Cash Flow or Cash Reserve. She went on to say that we have not issued bonds and are in the process of preparing to issue them; that in talking with our Finance Director, right now is not a good time—that we are just preparing to issue at the latter part of the year after the market crash, the presidential election and the bond market slowing down—that we will go out at the end of the calendar year; that right now we are like the rest of the country "wait and see"—that the situation is expected to "lift" to some degree.

Chairman Benson asked if we had to decide tonight?

Attorney Nelson responded that at the Agenda Session this morning he raised the question of whether there had been a Mandatory Referral and there has not; that the Planning Commission needs to make a recommendation, and their next meeting is next Monday, and the Council meeting would be the following Tuesday.

Councilwoman Robinson stated that she and Councilwoman Bennett would be out of town on that Tuesday. Councilman Shockley stated that he would be out also.

Rick Wood thanked Councilman Page for his support, stating that Attorney Nelson and himself had talked about this—that a Lease Purchase has to have a Mandatory Referral and then come back to the Council; however he stated that there was a different way to do this—that we could make it not a Real Estate item and more of a grant or fee, which would allow for a vote sooner than next week; that The Trust for Public Land will be purchasing it—that Jimmy Hudson owns it now, and the Trust for Public Land needs to acquire the land.

Councilman Pierce stated that because of the state of our economy, he was not supportive of anything of this magnitude; that he did not see continuing to spend with the economy in the state it is in; that Ms. Daisy had said we would be going into our Reserves, and he mentioned the city of Birmingham going bankrupt. He reiterated that he did not see this at this time, and he would not support anything of this nature at this time.

Chairman Benson stated that others agree. He asked if the County had turned them down?

Mr. Wood responded that he had not been to the County, but he would not leave any “rock unturned”.

Chairman Benson noted that this also borders on Red Bank.

Councilman Pierce asked if there would be any upkeep? Chairman Benson noted that Adm. Zehnder would have the money for this! Mr. Wood added that The Trust for Public Land would own it at first.

Councilwoman Robinson asked Ms. Madison if this was something we should not do because our finances are threatened? Ms. Madison responded that we were not at risk at this point; however she could not predict next year; that funds are available now, but she would not predict next year.

Councilman Page stated that there was something he would like to know—that no municipal bonds are being sold; that spending on infrastructure, we would still have costs. He wanted to know when we could go to market?

Ms. Madison reiterated that we are preparing to go to market right now—that it will not be in the next week or two but in November or December, when we expect that the market will have lightened.

Mr. Wood spoke to the maintenance issue. He stated that the Bike Association and Outdoors Chattanooga covered 20 miles in 18 months and are able to maintain this everyday without public maintenance—that they will take the responsibility of maintenance.

Chairman Benson stated that he was not questioning the worth of this, but it would be taking land off the taxrolls in this economy.

Mr. Wood noted that the total City and County taxes are only \$6,500—that he would leave no rock unturned.

Councilman Pierce stated that we turned a developer down, which would have put this on the taxroll; that we were talking about spending money out, and he did not see it with this economy and did not think we would see it at the last of November; that \$750 billion dollars had been allocated, and he did not see any change in the market—except that it kept going down.

Ms. Madison stated that she was not speaking in favor this—that she did not understand that we would be buying it under a Lease Purchase Agreement and that The Trust for Public Land would be buying it first—then the City would be the new owner of the property.

Mr. Wood stated that they would manage their part of it, with Chairman Benson noting that this would be the Park.

Ms. Madison explained that we would be committing \$150,000, and the rest would be subject to approval.

Chairman Benson stated that he would rather wait and see what the economy will do.

Mr. Wood noted that there was a Real Estate Agreement with the land owner, and their deadline was early November.

Councilwoman Berz stated that first, she thought that it should be a Park; that what we were missing was a Cost Benefit Analysis, and we needed to come up with something quickly and Planning needed to do “due diligence” to see what benefit this would be to us. She reiterated that she wanted it to be a Park, but we needed a Cost Benefit Analysis; that we will be spending tax dollars now. She emphasized that we needed a Cost Analysis.

Mr. Wood stated that he was concerned about timing.

Councilwoman Berz questioned when we wanted to deal with this—that three councilmembers would not be in town next week.

Councilwoman Robinson stated that before we leave the topic, she would like to mention that the developer from Greenville left because of the huge amount of Chattanooga shale—that the land is shifting and unstable, and it would have cost them a fortune to construct there and would have ruined the neighborhood below with the run-off; that in order to build a road to get up there, the road would have to be 50 ft. wide—that this was not a great building site!

Councilman Pierce stated that he wished Councilwoman Robinson had told us this before.

Chairman Benson stated that if the land is that bad, they ought to just give it to us!

Mr. Johnson stated that if the City would not be owning the land, it would not have to go to Mandatory Referral.

In that case, Councilwoman Robinson stated that it could be brought before the Council tonight.

For this to happen, Attorney Nelson explained that he would have to re-draft the Resolution as a Grant or Charitable Donation.

Councilman Pierce stated “And I still need restrooms at Warner Park”!

Attorney Nelson stated that he would draft this as a Grant for \$150,000.00.

The meeting was adjourned.

