

**CITY OF WIXOM
49045 PONTIAC TRAIL
SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 21, 2023**

Deputy Mayor Rzeznik called the meeting to order at 6:32 p.m.

Present:

Mayor: P. Beagle (Excused)
Deputy Mayor: T. Rzeznik
Councilmembers: P. Behrmann
K. Gottschall
T. Gronlund-Fox
P. Sharpe
R. Smiley

AGENDA CHANGES: (None)

CALL TO THE PUBLIC:

There were no comments by the public.

NEW BUSINESS:

1.) **Discussion of Major and Local Roads**

Mr. Brown said the purpose of this meeting was to discuss the conditions of local and major roads in the City of Wixom, as well as the current funding status of the millages that support that. He thought this would be an open discussion to take a look at what we are doing and if we want to do something different.

Deputy Mayor Rzeznik said that there was some discrepancy regarding the current millage expiration. He confirmed the current local road millage expired at the end of the 2025 fiscal year. Mr. Brown said it will expire at the end of fiscal year 2026. He added that the newly voted in safety path millage will expire in 2038.

Mr. Brown said that we currently have 3.5 additional operating mills that we can levy and we have only been levying 3 mills. If we were to levy that additional .5 mills, we would raise approximately \$432,000 with no need for a new vote. We could also supplement that with the year-end operating surpluses. Another option would be dedicated road millages. He said that there used to be two roads millages that were levied in the past. One was local roads (originally at 1.15 mills but with the rollback it was down to 1.1357 mills) and the major roads had been at 0.87 mills before it expired in fiscal year 2014. There was the possibility to do a dedicated road millage for local as well as major. He thought we may be able to tie them together as a roads millage and allow year-to-year fluctuations between major and local roads. Another thing that had been discussed at prior Council meetings was a Charter amendment to change the general operating millage maximum from its current 8 mills (which was rolled back down to 7.4503 mills). Council could decide to put it back up to its original 8 mills which would add .5497 mills or decide to do an increase over and above that. He explained there were a variety of different funding approaches.

Next, he reviewed some of the expiration and renewal dates for the various millages. The additional operating millage could be renewed at the August or November 2024 elections. The local roads millage could be renewed at the November 2025 election.

We have Act 51 local (\$540,000 per year) and major (\$1.3 million per year) road funding that we utilize. He said that was basic maintenance activities or occasions where we have a rollover to fund balance. He stated that if the Council was looking to make any further

impact on the road situation, they would have to look at whether they wanted to implement any kind of additional millage question to put in front of the voters.

Councilmember Behrmann was curious about the millage rate over the years and when we levied the major road millage. He asked what the major road debt was from. Mr. Benson thought that was the realignment of Wixom Road.

Councilmember Smiley asked for an explanation of the prior rollback of the general operating millage. He wondered if it would have to be placed on a ballot to get it back to 8 mills. Mr. Brown indicated that was due to the Headlee override and to get it back to the 8 mills would require a ballot question.

Councilmember Gottschall knew there were a number of communities that tried to do Headlee overrides on the ballot and he didn't believe a lot were successful. Recently, the City of Berkley's failed. That was a concern to him. He thought when the Council discussed this earlier this year, the plan was to have something for the February ballot. That would have allowed us to start collecting those new funds at the start of the next fiscal year to get a jump on things. Mr. Brown stated that the timing was such that we can't get this on the February ballot. Councilmember Gottschall said that now we won't start collecting money until July 2025. He thought it would've been great if we wouldn't keep kicking this down the road as he has been asking for so long. He thought the Council was all on the same page that this would be on the February ballot. In looking at the combined top scenario for local and major roads, he thought it said .33 mills. He confirmed it would take about 1.1643 mills to get to the 6 range on the PASER rating over the next decade. Mr. Brown said no. For the major roads, the additional expenditures to get it to a 6 on the PASER rating would be .33 mills. For the local roads, one scenario would take us to 5.3 mills, which was the 1.13 mills. Councilmember Gottschall said that the upper level of both cases when we have them together was the 1.1643 mills. Mr. Benson said it would be 1.97 mills plus the 1.13 mills. Councilmember Gottschall was talking in addition to what they were doing now. Mr. Brown said that was correct. Councilmember Gottschall asked Mr. Sikma if he thought the trend would be that the expenses would keep growing like they have or if he thought they had peaked and would sit where they are now with a more minimal increase each year. Mr. Sikma said he was estimating a continual increase, whether it follows the Consumer Price Index or something else was still unknown. Over the last two or three months, it did seem to have plateaued. His personal opinion was that it had gone up at a big jump and it will continue to rise systematically as 3-5% over the next 4-5 years. Councilmember Gottschall asked if that was what HRC was seeing. Nancy Faught didn't think we would see the increase like we did from three years ago until this summer, but she was projecting 5-7%. She said a lot of the contractors have big jobs for the next several years and we haven't had a big growth in contractors in the State over the last ten years. We are still dealing with limited labor. We will see a decrease from the feds and the state because they don't have the money that they did because of COVID. We are still expecting pretty large jumps above inflation. Councilmember Gottschall indicated that previous Councils never made adjustments when they put these on a ballot. He wasn't sure if they had considered Headlee rollbacks and inflation, especially inflation the way we have seen it. If we are at 1.16 mills in current numbers, he thought we would be better off to be aware of Headlee rollbacks and inflation. He wanted to make sure that we wouldn't be leaving a future Council shortchanged. He wouldn't know why we would let a major road millage completely fall off.

Deputy Mayor Rzeznik agreed that the Council should make sure if it was a ten-year program, we should have adequate funding for inflationary and other increases. It was interesting to note the average from the ten or twelve communities that were surveyed for road only was 1.996 mills and the medium was 2 with ten years.

Mr. Brown stated that we talked about a combination of things. If we have the .5 mill opportunity now, we could use some portion of that for major roads, or all of that for major roads. We could then seek what we want for an increase for the local roads. That would keep it simpler.

Deputy Mayor Rzeknik confirmed that the \$432,000 was adequate. Mr. Brown replied that if we look at what was projected on the major road needs (4.8 up to 6.0) the amount we put in there was 0.33 mills. A half mill would cover that. Major roads were in better shape in comparison to the local roads. Even if we continue to just spend Act 51 monies, we were actually trending slightly upward with the projects we have planned over the next few years. If we add that additional 0.33 mills, we could get it up to the 6.0 PASER rating that we were providing as an arbitrary goal on both the major and the local roads. The local road millage that we talked about was a total of 1.97 over the 1.13 that we are currently levying.

Councilmember Behrmann understood how we have the major and local roads classified. In looking at the major roads we have done recently, we have been using the millage from the local roads to do the major roads. We haven't been keeping the money separate. Mr. Sikma said that we get most of our State funding from major roads. Occasionally, the major road funding rolls over to local roads depending on the projects. Councilmember Behrmann asked if the funding for West Maple and Loon Lake Road was not coming from the local road fund. Mr. Sikma replied that it was coming through the local road fund because we have accumulated more in the local road fund. As a general rule, we are getting \$1.2 million a year in the major roads and only half a million in the local roads. We will do a major road every other year and the little bit left gets rolled over into the local roads. Councilmember Behrmann asked if there would be a benefit in keeping this separate, or if we would be better off having a road fund and a road millage. Mr. Sikma said it would be up to the Council to move local road funding over to major roads. We could change those on occasion if needed. Right now, we are receiving the funds from Act 51 for the major road program. That was why we don't have a millage for it. Councilmember Behrmann commented that over the last couple of years, we have done West Maple and now coming up on Loon Lake. They are on the category of major roads but he thought the money for that was coming from the millage. It wasn't like we were banking all the local road money and not spending it. We are spending it on the major roads. Mr. Sikma said that was not correct. We are trying to leverage both, depending on the ten-year capital. Over the last five to seven years, we have been trying to follow the PASER ratings and getting the worse ones done first. We have been leveraging the funding to accomplish that. The major roads just happened to be over the last few years.

Mr. Brown clarified that he has been taking the monies for the major roads from the Act 51 surplus that we built up in local roads. Mr. Sikma said yes. The millage funds continue to go to local roads primarily. Councilmember Behrmann assumed that the 12 Mile Road extension was going from 12 Mile Road to Alpha Drive and Mr. Sikma said that was correct.

Councilmember Gottschall asked if one of Councilmember Behrmann's questions was if we put something on ballot if it would just be for roads in general. Councilmember Behrmann replied that it confused him if we have major and local roads, so he thought it would confuse residents. He thought a roads millage would make more sense and leave it up to us to determine what roads need it most. Councilmember Gottschall thought that if we could do something like that, he would be of the same mind. What people consider major roads around here would not be what they are categorized as. If a single ballot question was allowed, that would be helpful. He said that with the survey of communities and their levies, we would be about 2.3 if we went to the upper limits for the 6 PASER rating. That would put us in the upper end of that list of communities. South Lyon has a debt, so they bonded out. He couldn't imagine that being on the table now with interest rates what they are. Mr. Brown said he would not recommend that.

Deputy Mayor Rzeznik agreed with combining it into a roads millage. He wondered if that had any impact on Act 51 funds from the State. Mr. Benson commented that they do have to be segregated funds. Mr. Brown said we would check with the attorney. Mr. Sikma stated that the Act 51 funding is designated to specific types of road (major and local). We end up getting more for the major roads than the local roads. The State keeps that separated but we can move a certain percentage each year into one or the other. Mr. Brown said we may be able to adjust that year-to-year if we have a bigger project that needs to get done. We would have to do some research to see if it was permissible to do it that way.

Councilmember Gronlund-Fox asked if Mr. Brown was recommending we needed 1.2 mills to get all of our roads to the 6 PASER rating. Mr. Brown said based on the projections that we have, it was actually 1.17 on top of the additional millage that we have. She confirmed that didn't have anything to do with Beck Road and Mr. Brown said that was correct. It was totally separate. On a budget front, we talk about putting that out there year to year, but it was always assuming other funding sources were coming in and we weren't reflecting the cost in our ten-year project list. If the Council was interested in those kinds of things, it should be considered. If you were looking to do a project like that with a reduced amount of borrowing or bonding, it would be an alternative that could be considered and projected. Councilmember Gronlund-Fox said her concern was if we were going to do this now, and she understood there was uncertainty about the whole Beck Road project anyway, if we are going to go to the voters and say we need a certain amount of money and then a year or two we go back for Beck Road, she wasn't sure that would pass. She asked if he had any idea what was going on with Beck Road. Mr. Brown said there was no better time to get the Beck Road project funded than over the past several years. We have not managed to secure additional funding beyond the initial piece of funding we had for the section in Novi. It was pretty gloomy on our prospects of success for funding in the future. That wasn't to say that we couldn't get awarded something we applied for tomorrow, but we haven't been successful so far. He wondered if the widening of Beck Road fit with the priorities of current federal administration. Councilmember Gronlund-Fox said that with all of the right-of-way we still have to do, she didn't see it happening. Mr. Brown said that we wouldn't find 100% of funding from other funding sources. The best-case scenario was an 80-20% funding split. On the rail side of things, sometimes it was worse than that. Sometimes it was 60-40% and those rail projects, like the overpasses, are more expensive. If you were to do that after a millage push, that would require consideration from everyone.

Councilmember Behrmann liked the idea of us doing it as soon as possible. We could put to the voters that it would replace the existing road millage. Our current millage doesn't expire until 2025, but we would not wait until 2025. If it doesn't pass, we still have time to react before we are losing funding. He agreed that it almost seemed like we were waiting too long to have this conversation. He asked if there was a way where we would have another bite of the apple if we put this forward as soon as possible and it didn't pass.

Mr. Brown said this millage expires in fiscal year 2026. The election we were talking about putting a replacement millage or renewal of local roads was November 2025. We do have time on that front. The other considerations were related to the additional operating millage that was ending in fiscal year 2025. We would be looking at the 2024 election cycle to put that before the voters. That was part of what he thought Council needed to consider. They were talking about continuing with the additional operating, which he would advocated that we do need to do. That was what has allowed us to continue to maintain a good investment in our infrastructure and other capital improvements that we have to accomplish. That was part of the reason why we would not pursue an election prior to 2025. We would allow the additional operating to go and then a separate question on road millage that we could be pursued in 2025. There were a number of ways to do that – a local and a major, a local only or a combination, if that was permissible.

Mr. Benson added that we have three elections that we can still put language on relevant to roads (August 2024, November 2024 and November 2025). It probably would be difficult if it failed in August 2024 to try again in November 2024. There might not be enough turnaround time to get the language approved by the Governor's Office. There would be no issues with November 2024 and then November 2025 to try something else.

Councilmember Behrmann felt our residents had no problem voting for a renewal because they are happy with the services they are getting. When we are asking for an increase, there will be different people at a national election. It will be a lot of people who don't normally vote and he was concerned about that. If we wait until November, we could be doing ourselves a disservice.

Councilmember Gottschall didn't want to wait until 2025 to put this on the ballot. He didn't have an issue putting both the additional operating millage and the road millage on the same ballot. He would love to see us make a commitment to take "up to 3.5" to "up to 3." That would show good faith to voters. We have been operating within that anyway for the last several years. The alternative was to do one in August and one in November, but he didn't think it should float down to the 2025 election cycle. The roads are not getting better any time soon. He was upset to see this wouldn't be on the Presidential Primary in February. He thought that was what the Council had talked about last time. This can't keep getting pushed out.

Councilmember Gronlund-Fox questioned if we would have two separate proposals on the ballot. Mr. Brown said that we have the additional operating millage and then the roads to replace what we currently have. It could be written to say "in the place of that, here is the new." Councilmember Gronlund-Fox said she was not a huge fan of that because it would be confusing to the voters. If they are at all confused, they will vote no. If we were going to do something like that, she thought it would really be on administration to have a lot of communication with the public. We would need people inundating the voters with the educational piece of this. She thought that would be extremely important, especially if we have two different questions on a single ballot.

Deputy Mayor Rzeknik also expressed concern with having two questions on the same ballot. People tend to vote for one and not the other. There would be no chance to recover from that. He agreed that November 2025 was a very late start to get this out in front of the people. He was also disappointed that we couldn't get this on the Presidential Primary in February. There was a bigger danger with listing two of them on the same ballot.

Councilmember Gottschall agreed this was not the most favorable. If it came to them both being on at the same time, we can brainstorm ways to educate our residents. He was not sure an open house was the way to go any more, but everyone knows when they pull out of their driveway and they have to rumble down Charms or Loon Lake Road. We can show videos of our roads. People get it. He thought we could come up with a plan ahead of time to point out the projects we would be getting done. It was not an insignificant amount of money. He thought the average taxpayer would have over \$300 of their tax bill going toward roads. It was not a small amount. If we can prove the benefit of it, it would be helpful. Everyone uses the roads every day and we know the roads are not great around here. He would like to see this on both ballots next year. He thought 2025 was too late because that would mean we would be getting the money in 2026.

Councilmember Smiley said he did not disagree with any of this. It was not a matter of if we do anything, but a matter of how much and when. He knew the language on the ballot, whether it could be major and local, was a question for the lawyer. He hoped it didn't get too convoluted. If it is confusing, people will say no. He thought we were aiming for the 6

PASER rating average so we would need 1.97 total for local and 1.3 was currently being levied. It was an additional .84 that was needed. We need another .33 for major roads, so that would get us to 1.17 additional that we would be asking from residents. If we take the .5 from the operating millage and dedicate that to roads, in the end, we would be asking residents for an additional .67 mills to get us where we want to be. He thought that was how we would explain this to the residents. If we take the .5 mill and use that for the .33 we needed for major roads, then our ballot language can talk about local roads. That was an idea he had to remove the major roads out of it. Finally, having two millage requests on one ballot spooked him, too. It will be tough especially if times get tougher. He thought those should be split up for the two elections in 2024.

Deputy Mayor Rzeknik said that we could put the general operating renewal of up to 3.5 on the August ballot and then go for the road millage in November. If it didn't pass, we would still have one more November to attempt it. That would split them up. One would be considered a renewal of the existing. He recalled there was quite a large majority in favor the last time we did this. We would have one more crack at the road millage in November 2025 if it didn't pass. We would show it as a replacement for one that was expiring at the end of fiscal year 2025.

Councilmember Gottschall said his caution would be against conflating the general operating with the roads. We can tell people that we have the up to 3.5 and we will use a third more than we are now for major roads and we will have a separate local road millage. If the general operating failed, we would be short on road money. He said he would rather cleanly do the road millage and that would take care of everything we need. Then whatever happens with the general operating millage wouldn't impact our ability to take care of the roads. He would like a clean separation of those millages. He would also prefer we come down to 3 mills instead of up to 3.5 mills. He asked how long of a millage we could do for roads. Mr. Sikma said we could do 15 years. Councilmember Gottschall said that the roads could be 15 years and additional operating will be another four years. He didn't want to mix the two together.

Councilmember Smiley thought that could work. However, he would be nervous about reducing the operating millage from 3.5 to 3 because we have a few other projects (at the Water and Wastewater Plant). He questioned if we keep them separate, would the road millage need to be a larger amount. Mr. Benson said that the nice thing with the additional operating and whether you do 3 or 3.5 mills, it allows flexibility to pick where it goes. Right now, we are already on a regular basis to reap about \$1 million from general fund, from additional operating to capital. It is not always roads. Major roads tends to be less frequent, while we are usually doing one local road every year or every other year. It also gives the flexibility to use the money for a different capital project that isn't a road.

Councilmember Sharpe liked the way Councilmember Smiley summarized all of this. He basically came down to .7, which he liked for keeping whatever we asked additionally for under one mill. He wanted to be sure everyone was thinking about our objectives. He thought improving our PASER rating to a 6 was a random number. He liked the chart and the data. He was concerned about industry capacity. The chart was based on can we do it. He felt that with the recent safety path discussions where we are collecting all this money for safety paths but we aren't getting any of them done for one reason or another. In terms of funding, he favored a dedicated millage. He didn't want to go back to the City Charter to try to get it back to 8. He liked being put to task and getting money just for what we need it for. He liked the .7 number and use .5 from the up to 3.5 mills. He thought a taxpayer might call us on that when they see their tax bill go up. He hadn't thought about the importance of the timing. He thought the idea of putting both a renewal and an increase on the same ballot would be a challenge. He thought the way to go would be to put a renewal on one and then focus our time on a new tax.

Councilmember Gottschall said that in looking at which roads are rated 5s and 6s on the Local Road PASER map, he noticed Indian Wells and Indian Springs were 5s to 8s. Those were nice, smooth and good-looking roads. He thought that was a good number to be at. People have faith that we are taking care of the roads because they are not completely covered in crack seal. He thought that was a good number.

Councilmember Smiley thought the construction capacity would be an issue, but there was nothing we could do about that. We have to have funds to lean on that capacity. It was a concern that it would delay things, but we have to have the funds to get it done. He didn't think a PASER rating of 6 was a lofty goal. That was the bare minimum for our roads. It was a scale of 10 so 60% was a modest goal. Mr. Sikma said the average PASER rating was 5, so we are above average. We were shooting for a little more and that was how we came up with a 6 rating. A PASER rating of 10 only stays a 10 for a year and then it drops to a 9 and 8 in 3 to 5 years. Most of the time, the roads are in fair condition, which is a PASER rating of 7-5.

Mr. Brown said if they stayed on the current trend for local roads they would be at a 3.7 PASER rating if they didn't do anything or renew the millage. If they renewed the millage, the PASER rating would become a 5.3, which was just above the fair category. The best way he could summarize all of this would be that a category 6 would give you a little bit of time before things dropped down to category 4. He stated that he would like Wixom to be a category 6 because that would mean they were in the higher end of the fair category.

Mr. Benson commented that if they were to do all the millages at once than they could expire all at once. From a functionality standpoint that was something to consider.

Mr. Sikma said they continued to perform preventative maintenance to extend the life of the roads. He indicated when they extended the life of the roadway, they paid extra detail to drainage so they could correct any situation that didn't sheet the water runoff quickly and/or slow the storm water down so it didn't impact the streams.

Deputy Mayor Rzeznik thought it sounded like the consensus was they didn't want the road money to run out and wanted to have something on the August 2024 ballot. He wasn't sure if they should just have the operating millage renewal alone but at a minimum the operating millage should be on the August ballot. He noted they still had time to decide if they wanted 3 mills, 3.25 mills or 3.5 mills.

Mr. Brown suggested some additional analysis be completed on a couple key alternatives they spoke about and have another meeting in January. He would present Council with a summary of a couple different options.

Councilmember Behrmann asked administration to provide previous millage information over the last fifteen years. Such as what election cycle did the millage go on and what did they pass or fail by. He presumed the operating millage was the most important millage and we needed to make sure that it passes. He agreed the road millage needed to be passed but he would much rather delay fixing roads than laying off staff. He would be in favor of putting one millage on the August 2024 ballot and another on the November 2024 ballot.

Councilmember Gottschall wanted staff to clarify if they could do a single road millage. Mr. Brown said he would look into that and get back to them.

Mr. Benson said realistically the widening of Beck Road and the overpass would not happen without the assistance of outside funding. He said at some point they'd have to mill and overlay Beck Road with a cost estimate of \$4 million. He believed they had to get to a point

to ask themselves how important it was for them to widen Beck Road from 12 Mile to Pontiac Trail if they couldn't get other funding. Also, they needed to consider the previous conversations about Landrow connections and/or Alpha Drive to 12 Mile. He asked Council if they saw relevance to a millage conversation. He said if there was an interest, staff would prepare information that could impact what millage numbers were needed or if they were to bond for these circumstances.

Councilmember Behrmann believed Landrow and 12 Mile/Alpha Drive would need to be tied into development going into those pieces of property. If they were not going to get contribution from a developer, then he saw no rush on our end. He said they really needed to continue to focus on getting outside funding for Beck Road.

Councilmember Smiley said his highest priorities were getting the PASER ratings to 6 and obtaining the operating millage. The Beck Road and Landrow, Alpha Drive and 12 Mile were lower on his priority list.

Councilmember Sharpe said he had nothing to add.

Councilmember Gronlund-Fox said 12 Mile was not on the higher list of her priorities; however, Beck Road was an issue. She knew that a lot of residents wanted something to be done with Beck Road. She wasn't opposed to looking at widening the road but she would need an abundance of information with cost estimates before she made any decision. Mr. Benson said they could provide that information, and added they were making decent progress on obtaining rights-of-way along Beck Road from West Road to 12 Mile. He added that some folks were hesitant to sell their right-of-way without having a detailed plan of exactly what was going to happen.

Councilmember Gottschall agreed that 12 Mile and Landrow were lower on his priority list. As he has mentioned before, they seemed to have missed installing right-hand turn lanes around town so that added to the traffic flow issues. For the next meeting, they should look into an analysis of how they could improve the flow of traffic that included various ideas and cost associations. He thought they needed to look into if and when they could make repairs to Beck Road one side at a time in certain stretches so over time they could get to a full expanded road. He hesitated on asking our residents to solely bare the cost of the widening as it's not only traveled by Wixom residents.

Deputy Mayor Rzeknik agreed with Councilmember Behrmann with Landrow as it needed to be tied to the developer and/or economic development. As for Beck Road, he agreed with Councilmember Gottschall that it should not only be paid for by Wixom taxpayers. He'd like to continue to find ways to look at outside source funding. He suggested they continue using LDFA funding for right-of-way acquisition.

Mr. Brown never even considered that Wixom taxpayers be the only funding source to Beck Road. He said even if they were successful on grant funding, they would still have to ask residents for funding.

Councilmember Gottschall said if they were to obtain a grant with federal and state funding, he would still like to see the additional taxpayer funding split up amongst Wixom and the neighboring communities.

CALL TO THE PUBLIC:

Matt Ruffeno, 2665 Alorington Drive, agreed that Wixom Road was the major road and Beck Road was the secondary road that ran north to south. He thought the most important piece that he's heard from residents was the lack of west to east roads. He heard a lot of opinions from people because he's very big into infrastructure and runs a twitch online stream where

a few thousand followers watch him build roads all day. The east to west roads in Wixom were a lot smaller than the north and south roads so that caused a lot of issue. When trying to go to Novi and a train comes, it pushes Wixom residents north of the train tracks and into Walled Lake. Before when he would travel to Novi and got stuck at a train crossing, it would take ten minutes and now it took 40 minutes. He got stuck at every single train crossing. He knew that MDOT and RCOC were considering expanding 12 Mile. He didn't think that Beck Road was as high priority because Wixom Road was just redone. He did see a need for expanding or installing east to west and/or west to south roads because Wixom Road took care of everything else. You're not expanding Wixom Road north of Pontiac Trail because it could handle the load; however, during rush hour it could be very dangerous taking a right or left turn out of the neighborhoods where they don't have middle turning lanes. Where his neighborhood was, it could take him 15 minutes to make a left turn. He said great job on the improvements to Wixom Road.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 7:56 p.m.

Catherine Buck
City Clerk

Approved 12-12-2023
