City Council of Peachtree City
Minutes of Meeting
March 21, 2002
7 p.m.

The City Council of Peachtree City met Thursday, March 21, 2002, in the City Hall Council Chambers. Mayor Brown called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Other Council Members present were: Annie McMenamin, Steve Rapson, Dan Tennant, and Murray Weed.

Announcements, Awards, Special Recognition

Brown recognized Building Inspector Ursula Todd as the Employee of the Month for February.

Approval of Minutes

McMenamin moved to approve the February 21 minutes with changes. Tennant seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

Rapson moved to approve the March 7 minutes. McMenamin seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

Consent Agenda

1. Adoption of Short Term Work Program/Capital Improvement Element
2. Consider Reclassification of Purchasing Agent Position

Basinger commented that the Finance Director was obviously the senior person, but the only other management person in the department was the Purchasing Agent. If the reclassification were approved, the Purchasing Agent would also serve as the assistant Finance Director. Basinger continued that the Finance Director was the only person with knowledge of City finances and there had been two changes in the position in last few years. A back up was needed if the Finance Director was sick, or left. Someone was needed who could step in and take over if necessary. Basinger said the position was long overdue. Since the Purchasing Agent and Budget Analyst positions were both vacant at this time, Basinger encouraged Council to consider the reclassification and take action. Basinger continued that with the GASB regulations and the increase in the budget, the workload had grown and was not an eight-hour a day job anymore.

Rapson said he agreed with what staff wanted to do. With the Purchasing Agent retiring and the loss of another key person, he said he would like for Salvatore to have more latitude. He wanted to give Salvatore the ability to make either the Budget Analyst or Purchasing Agent an assistant Finance Director, depending on their qualifications.

Weed asked if creating the position would have a detrimental effect on this year's budget. If so, he said the Finance Department would have to fund the position out of its own budget. He asked if there had been any thought given to enhancing the purchasing specialist's job.

Basinger said the department was going through significant changes in the process now and he could not answer Weed's questions. He did not know if there would be an increase or decrease in responsibility. Since the City had gone to centralized purchasing 10-12 years ago, there had been two people in purchasing. Staff would need to look at the purchasing specialist's job, but the process was not finished yet.

Rapson and McMenamin agreed they would like to give Salvatore the latitude to make either the Budget Analyst or the Purchasing Agent the assistant Finance Director, depending up on the qualifications.

Rapson moved to approve the consent agenda with guidance to Finance regarding the Purchasing Agent's position. Weed seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

Old Agenda Items

01-02-05 Discussion on GEM/NEV Vehicles

Brown noted a memo received from Bill Wood, the attorney for General Electric Motorcars (GEM). House Bill 1439 allowed for the tax credit and was looking good. House Bill 1389 was floundering and had not gotten out of committee. Tennant moved to extend the GEM/NEV extension for another 30 days. Brown seconded. Weed commented that HB 1389 had come out of the House favorably according to Smith, Gambrell, and Russell, Wood's law firm. The motion carried unanimously.

03-02-01 Consider Amendments to Parking Ordinance – Commerce Drive

Brown read a letter he had received from J.D. Holmes, the owner of Gold's Gym, regarding the parking situation on Commerce Drive and requesting the item be continued due to his inability to attend the meeting. McMenamin said there were a couple of ways to handle the item. Council could defer to Holmes and move the discussion and the vote to another meeting. She continued that she had driven by the location several times at different times of the day. She found it interesting that people parked in the street when there were spaces available in the parking lot. McMenamin said it was not in the best interests of the City to encourage on-street parking in a commercial district. She asked what the possibility was of Holmes' buying another piece of property and using it for parking. McMenamin said she did not want to encourage day care parking on the gym side of the street. The parking detracted from the professional look of the area. McMenamin said Council should do all it could to encourage no on-street parking in the area.

Steve Samson, owner and builder of the Prudential office building, told Council the building was close to completion and he had been watching the parking situation during the construction phase. He showed Council photos he had taken of the street at various times of during one day. At one point in time, he counted 18 empty spaces in the parking lot at the gym and two empty spaces in the day care center lot. At that time, there were 6 to 8 vehicles parked on both sides of the street. He said it appeared people did not want to park in the gym parking lot because of possible damage to their cars. Samson said he chose the Commerce Drive site for his building because it was perfect for the people he was targeting. He had followed the ordinance for parking, one space for each 300 square feet of the building, and had added four additional spots. He said he had looked at the square footage of the Gold's Gym building and the number of parking spots in the lot was close to what was required by the ordinance. The day care center lot was short a few spaces.

Samson continued that he did not see parking on either side of the street as being in the best interests of the area. He said the parking today was light and he had seen it much worse. Samson said it was expensive to buy additional land for parking, but why park on the street when there were spaces in the lot. He would rather have a clean street. Approving on street parking at that end of Commerce would be approving on street parking for all of Westpark. Samson added he had quite an investment in his building with the parking lot and the landscaping.

Tennant asked Samson if he had any way to ensure his lot was used only by his tenants and their guests. Samson replied no and that leasing parking would depend on who his tenants were. Samson said he just wanted to keep the area nice and clean. He owned buildings in other areas where on street parking was allowed and it was a nuisance.

McMenamin said it was important to Council that small businesses prospered and grew because that showed a healthy economy. However, one business' growth should not impact other businesses. If parking was allowed on one side of the street, it would continue into the cul-de-sac and that would be a mistake.

Rapson said he hated the fact that Holmes was not at the meeting to give his side. Rapson referred to the Fire Chief Lohr's report that stated the area could be accessed with parking restricted to one side. If a fire struck stopped in front of the day care center, there would be no access to the street for other vehicles at all. Rapson stated that was clearly a safety situation and he was not in favor of tabling the ordinance amendment and giving anyone false hope.

McMenamin added that allowing parking on one side of the street would mean that parking would continue into the cul-de-sac, which would cut down on a fire truck's ability to turn in the cul-de-sac.

Tennant said Council had been given false information at the March 7 meeting. He was in favor of restricting parking to one side of the street and probably altogether. Weed said it could be included in the motion that Council considered Holmes' letter and Holmes' comments could be included in the motion.

Rapson pointed out that the ordinance was clear about on street parking. Business owners had to have adequate parking. Rapson instructed staff that if someone at the podium gave incorrect misleading information that staff should raise their hand and let Council know. He said sometimes the members of Council were swayed by emotion and sometimes they were given misleading information.

Brown said the buffer ordinance had been in effect prior to the purchase of the Gold's Gym property. He cautioned business owners to buy the necessary land when building something that would attract a lot of people.

Tennant said he was grateful to have received Holmes' response. He moved to add Section 78-24 to prohibit parking on Commerce Drive North. Rapson seconded.

Weed asked Lohr for his official opinion. Lohr said parking on both sides of the street was not safe, but he was willing to live with parking on one side of the street. The City Code does not allow on street parking. If the builder said he could not get his equipment down the street, Lohr said he did not know how he would get a fire truck down the street with parking on both sides.

Brown said he was not opposed to parallel parking, which was a valid use in some places. However, it was not appropriate in this instance. McMenamin wanted it reflected in the minutes that the parking restriction was borne out of overriding safety concerns. Tennant agreed with McMenamin and said safety was the impetus. The motion carried unanimously.

Rapson encouraged the Police Department and Code Enforcement to go by the businesses on Commerce Drive North and talk to them regarding the parking restriction.

New Agenda Items

03-02-02 Public Hearing – Variance – Jet Limo Tract, Falcon Field

Mike Lorber represented the applicant, V. Michael Rossetti, manager of JetLimo, LLC. The tract was a 4.9-acre parcel in the Airport district at the corner of Falcon Drive, Echo Court, and Victory Road. The project included two 20,000 square-foot warehouses with parking in front, as well as a private hangar and warehouse facilities. Lorber said they wanted to reduce the front setback from 50 feet to 30 feet. The owner bought the property in late 2000 and brought the plan to the City in February 2001. At that time, the owner wanted to rezone the parcel from GC to LUC, which would have settled the setback issue. The rezoning was denied by the Planning Commission and was not taken to Council. The general feeling was if the property was rezoned, it would open a Pandora's box of rezonings, so the rezoning was dropped. The project was pursued with the 50-foot setbacks. The site had been cleared and was ready for construction Lorber said staff and the Planning Commission had basically directed them to come back later during the process to ask for the variance.

Lorber told Council that Plan A was what the company wanted to develop now and Plan B was what the company wanted to develop in the future. He explained that the difference between the two plans was that the 30-foot setback provided more parking in front and a service drive that connected the parking lots of the two buildings. The setback reduction would eliminate the cut on Victory Road through the tree buffer. He said it was a reasonable use of the property. Plan A's impervious surface would be 53% of the site. Lorber added that 56% of the property would be impervious surface with Plan B.

Rapson asked the reason for the connection between the two parking lots. Lorber said if the same tenant had space in both buildings, the connection allowed them to get to the docks without having to get back on the road. Lorber said it was an obvious connection.

Tennant asked Lorber to expound on the tree buffer. Lorber pointed out the tree save areas and the connection they would need without the variance and its location in a tree save area.

McMenamin asked Lorber to respond to the increased intensity of the site if the setback variance were granted. Lorber said they felt 56% of impervious surface was reasonable and was not an intense use of the property. He added that the committees (development committees) were looking at 55%. There was enough land for two warehouses. Lorber continued that the parcel would not be the only one in the Airport Park without a 50-foot buffer. The other parcel was across Falcon Drive. Council would not be setting a precedent by granting the variance; it had already been done. He said they were looking at putting 140 trees back on the property. If the variance were approved, an additional 100 trees would be added to the property.

Mike Rossetti, a principal in Jet Limo, told Council it was an unusual design for the lot, bounded almost ¾ of the way by City streets. He added that the 50-foot buffer took away one and one-quarter acres of the lot, which he said was excessive. Rossetti said his main argument that the 50-foot setback represented a substantial taking of the lot. The use the company proposed was not purely industrial, but a mix of office and industrial. More office space had been leased so more parking was needed so there would be no on-street parking. Tennant asked how many parking spaces would be added if the variance were granted. Rossetti answered 23 spaces.

Developmental Services Director Jim Williams told Council that staff was against the variance for a lot of good reasons. There were not too many exceptions to the 50-foot setback, which provided quality to a development. Williams said a plan with the 50-foot setback had been through the Planning Commission and been approved. Williams said it was a dollars and cents issue. Developers wanted to use as much land as they could and he could sympathize. Williams continued that if they wanted to save the cut from the front warehouse to the street it could be done. There was another cut on Falcon Drive. Williams said there was not enough justification for the variance and thought it would set an unfortunate precedent. Williams said he saw the same situation over and over again.

Tennant asked Williams to clarify a precedent. Rossetti had pointed to the parcel across the street from Jet Limo. Williams said it could be possible, but he needed to check the parcel. He added there could be one or two parcels that did not have a 50-foot setback. Williams said those setbacks were not done by a strict act of Council, but by a mistake of someone doing the plan review. Williams stated that action by Council set precedent.

Rapson said there were not a lot of trees in the area and asked how there could be a tree save. Williams said there were not a lot of trees, but the purpose of the 50-foot setback was to plant trees. Rapson continued that the bottom line was GI required a 50-foot setback with no parking. Rapson asked Williams why the plan did not go back before the Planning Commission, rather than coming before Council, if the approved plan had been changed. Williams said the applicant was correct in the process used. They originally wanted to rezone the property to another category with less of a setback. They wanted the variance for more efficient use of the property.

Weed presented a motion and findings, which addressed the three issues to be considered by Council. The first issue was whether or not special circumstances contributing to the request were peculiar to the parcel. Weed believed Council found no special circumstances and that the internal connection was not necessary in this case. Weed said the curb cut to Victory Road could still be eliminated. The second issue Council looked at was whether or not denial of the variance was a hardship for the applicant. Weed said he had heard no evidence that it would be a hardship and pointed out a plan had been approved by the Planning Commission that did not need a variance. The third issue was whether or not the application intentionally violated the ordinance. Weed said that although the applicant did not intend to violate the requirements of the ordinance, he originally requested a rezoning so he could have a more intensive use of the property. Weed moved to deny the variance request based on the failure to meet the standards required by the ordinance. Rapson seconded.

Tennant referred to the last sentence of the staff position paper and asked Williams to be specific about the intensity of the development. Williams said the only real open space effective for landscaping was the 50-foot strip in front. There were other parts of the property that were not paved, but the only real open space for effective landscaping was the 50-foot strip. The purpose of the variance request was to use a portion of the 50-foot strip for development of the site, which would have to be at the expense of the open space.

The motion carried 4—1 (Tennant).

03-02-03 Consider Clayton State Satellite Center

Brown commented that Council had been approached on this issue at the Retreat and had asked for more specific details from Chris Clark of the Fayette County Development Authority (FCDA). Clark gave the Council Members a letter, not a legal agreement, that addressed the legal issues and went over the legal aspects and the furnishings needed for the satellite center, which would be located in 3,000 square feet of office space in the Tennis Center expansion. Clark told Council the County had tried to get a university program located in the County since 1984. Getting a university center in the County became a priority of the FCDA board. In January, the FCDA board agreed to provide seed money for the facility. Clark and local real estate agents set out to find about 3,000 square feet that could be used. They scoured Peachtree City for free office space, or $2 per square foot space. Clark said he was about at the end of his rope when Virgil Christian, the executive director of the Development Authority of Peachtree City (DAPC), called with an offer of space in the Tennis Center. Clark said Council had wanted the authorities to think out of the box and agreed everything had happened quickly. The Tennis Center expansion was still under construction and the longer it took to make a decision, the more it would cost to go back in and build out the space.

The satellite center would use 3,500 square feet of office space on a year-to-year basis with a five-year expectancy. Any profit after the first year of operation would be split 50/50 with the controlling agency, and whether it would be between the FCDA, DAPC, or the Tennis Center was yet to be determined. Once the satellite center was running, a stand-alone building, such as the one under construction in Rockdale County, would be looked at. Clark said it usually took about five years for a program to get to a stand-alone building, but he felt it would take less time in Fayette County. The FCDA had agreed to put up $50,000 for the build-out at the Tennis Center. The Chamber of Commerce had offered to find corporate funds and sponsors to finish the build-out so it would not be a burden on the taxpayers. Newnan Utilities agreed to donate the necessary wiring, valued at about $40,000, at no cost. The biggest concerns so far were parking and traffic. Clark met with the vice-president of finance and legal issues and the vice-president who would be in charge of the facility at Clayton College and State University and they had discussed the concerns. Clark read a portion of the letter that addressed the legal issues. Classes would be scheduled during slow times at the Tennis Center and no on-site classes would be scheduled during tennis tournaments and special events. In the event of an unplanned event being offered to the Tennis Center, the FCDA would work to find alternate classroom space. Clark said the university had been asked to prioritize the class scheduling so classes could be worked around peak traffic times.

Clark continued that the university planned to offer two credit classes four days a week at first. The center would include two small administrative offices, one 35-seat classroom with folding tables, one 12-seat model classroom with data ports so on-line classes could be offered, and a small 6—8 person conference room. Clark added that some Clayton State retirees who lived in Planterra had already volunteered to staff the site. The center would also house a Small Business Development Center (SBDC). Clark said this would be the first time a small business resource center would be located in Fayette County. Currently, Clayton State is the SBDC provider and County business people had to drive to Morrow to take classes. The Clayton SBDC served five counties and a majority of Fayette's participants were from Peachtree City. Thirty percent of the SBDC's consultancy was in Fayette County. The local industries would be approached regarding their needs and non-credit courses would be offered first, then credit courses. Clark said Mayor Brown had also already made in-roads with West Georgia regarding MBA classes. When the needs were demonstrated, Clayton State would try to bring who was needed to meet them. Clark continued that there was a lot of synergy and they had been overwhelmed by the support. The DAPC had really stepped up. An advisory council for the university center would be set up so it would not be left to Clayton State alone to make decisions. The advisory council would be composed of a representative from the Fayette County Board of Commissioners, the Peachtree City City Council, both the FCDA and the DAPC, the Chamber of Commerce, the School Board, Clayton State with an employee of the university that lived here, and two citizen appointees. The group would be tied in with the university and the community and would be working on a plan to move forward.

Tennant told Clark it was an exciting proposal and an appealing idea. He wondered if the urgency was worth it, or if Council should wait and see. He asked Clark if there would be any additional costs if the university center were done five or six months from now, as opposed to the next 30 days. Clark said he did not know what the costs would be, but if they waited to do the build-out another crew would have to be hired and that would cost additional money. Clayton State wanted to be able to offer classes in the fall and felt they could accomplish it on their end if the FCDA could do what needed to be done on its end. Tennant asked what the worst-case scenario was as far as parking was concerned since as many as 60 people could attend classes at one time. Clark said 180 parking spaces would be added at the Tennis Center and only six courts were added. The Tennis Center and the university would work together on scheduling. If the pre-planning was done right, Clark did not see a problem with parking during peak times at the Tennis Center. Tennant asked Christian what the capacity of the Tennis Center restaurant would be. Christian answered 50 people.

Brown asked how much of the parking lot was removed due to the expansion. Christian said during the worst-case scenario the Tennis Center employees could park in the easement. He did not want a situation where parking was a problem and would not have that kind of situation. He added that the covered courts would be used mainly when it was raining, so the other courts probably would not be used. Christian said the DAPC wanted the university center in the Tennis Center. The reason to do this was for the citizens of the community. Brown said everyone was excited about the project and wanted the component. He said the Tennis Center parking lot was usually full on Saturday and asked how that would affect Saturday classes. Clark answered that Saturday classes were not even in the outlook for the first two years.

Rapson stated he would abstain from the vote on the university center due to the lawsuit filed against the DAPC by his wife. Rapson said he liked the small business development center idea. He felt the Chamber did not need Council approval to do anything in that regard with the DAPC. Rapson recalled that Rockdale County's university center started by holding classes in the schools, then got to the point where the center wanted to offer day classes. At that time the center had 300 students, but the Board of Regents did not agree to build the university center until 1,200 students were enrolled. Rapson asked how Fayette County would get from Point A to Point B. His concern was capacity.

Clark answered there would obviously have to be some creative scheduling and there were other opportunities for class space when needed, such as the Nazarene Church in Peachtree City and the top floor of the Chamber of Commerce building. Clark continued that the School Board was supportive. There was a shortage of trained healthcare professionals and there was some synergy with Fayette Community Hospital. Clayton State was already talking to the hospital about space for classes as well. Clark reiterated that Clayton State wanted this university center to work.

Rapson noted that he was a bean counter and said the center had to be self-supporting. Thirty percent of the funding for the center came from tuition, according to Clayton State. He asked Clark where the remaining seventy percent (70%) would come from. Clark said the remaining funding came from contract classes with industry, business, and government for continuing education.

Tennant told Clark he understood various people had been working on getting a university center for 20 years. He asked why the public schools were not considered for a location. Tennant said he understood there were some psychological barriers to holding the classes in schools, but asked Clark if there was any history on why there had been no success in using the public schools as a location. Clark said Clayton State had made an endeavor in the school system in the late 1980s and early 1990s. Randy Hayes explained that the classes had been held at the LaFayette Education Center, then Fayette County High School, with the County's Alternative School. It was not a good mix and there was not a lot of support from the Board of Education. Hayes said Gordon College and Griffin Tech held classes at LaFayette, but they were for the high school students.

McMenamin commented that the intent had always been to put the university center in the industrial park area. She remarked that for so many years they had come very close without anything coming to fruition. The City would be remiss in not grabbing the opportunity this time. McMenamin added getting the university center would be an opportunity for the County to shine.

Clark said that one of the areas the County needed to look at for economic development was how far people had to drive for training. The university center might not be the University of North Carolina, but it got the County closer. Clark continued that it was hard to put a number on having the university center and it was also hard to put a value on the impact the university center would have on quality of life. Clark agreed it had happened quickly, but said the County needed to grab the opportunity. Clark asked Council for support and to allow the DAPC to draw up an agreement. He said $14,960 was still needed for furnishings.

Lindsey said there would need to be a lease between the DAPC and Clayton State. Christian said the DAPC wanted Council to be a partner.

Margie Swart told Council she loved the idea of a university center, but she had hoped there would be a lot more discussion before deciding on the location. She read a list of course offered by Clayton State at other university centers and asked why one of the public schools could not be used. She said that would leave the Tennis Center space for City recreation programs and that it was more suitable for use by the Recreation Department. The Tennis Center space seemed awfully small for what was being proposed. Swart added she was a little suspect of the idea since there was a possibility the Tennis Center might be separated from the DAPC.

McMenamin said the timing was perfect and a delay in making a decision would delay the university center for a semester or a quarter. Tennant said that it appeared the DAPC did not need the blessing of Council. Christian said the DAPC desired Council's blessing. Tennant continued that for a $15,000 investment he would rather Council be part of the university center. Big ideas started from little ideas. Tennant said he would rather Council got on board than be in an antagonistic relationship. Rapson asked Lindsey how it would affect the City if the DAPC entered into an agreement, and then the university went broke. Lindsey said he had talked to Mark Oldenburg, the DAPC attorney, and understood the lease could only be on a year-to-year basis. Lindsey said he did not believe there were any financial entanglements, but the City should retain ownership of the furnishings. Lindsey said all of this could be done through legal documentation. Lindsey added everyone agreed with the core concepts, but there were no contracts before them.

Christian pointed out that FCDA was putting in $50,000 and there would be $40,000 in smart wiring put in for free. If the university center did not work out, then the space could possibly go to the Recreation Department. Weed asked Christian what the original plans for space included. Christian said the Georgia Tennis Association had originally been approached to rent the space and its board split 3-2 on the vote and did not take the space. He then approached several other tennis organizations that did not choose to not take the space. Christian said he thought the space would be tennis-related.

Weed said he had faith the university center would be a very successful program, but he thought everyone was selling the program short. He felt it would be like putting a very large foot into a small shoe.

Clark said it might make sense to put the university center in the schools, but the classrooms could not be used during the day. Clark said he was the link between the business community and the government. Clark continued that he had spoken with the Clayton State vice-president that morning and the vice-president said the County needed to own the furnishings. Clark explained that Clayton State would like a larger space, but the Tennis Center was offering all the space the university could handle at this time. The university center had to support itself. Clark added that two real estate brokers had been looking for a location since January. The Tennis Center was not ideal, but it might be the best deal.

Brown said he was excited about the concept and was willing to take a shot. He added that he would have liked to talk to the school board, but there was not enough time. Tennant pointed out the County was kicking in $50,000 and suggested that Starr's Mill High School might be used in conjunction with the Tennis Center space. Rapson said the university center was good out of the box thinking and he was not opposed to going out from the City perspective and leasing enough space to get the university center from Point A to Point B. His concern was getting there.

McMenamin moved to approve the university center concept and to take $15,000 out of Council Contingency to be used to assist with furnishings and let the Development Authority and Tennis Center move forward with Clayton State. Tennant seconded.

Marsha Cole, owner of a small business and a member of the Fayette County Chamber of Commerce, addressed Council concerning the university center. She explained that the Chamber of Commerce had taken a serious look at small businesses in the County and had made great strides in supporting the businesses. Her company was the first Small Business Company of the Year for Fayette County. Her company sponsored the last Small Business Council luncheon meeting. They planned for 60 people and 120 showed up. She continued that her employees needed a SMART building for training. She had 10 people who needed computer training and did not want to go to a high school to get it. That was a negative concept. Cole hoped the university center outgrew the Tennis Center space in a year. A university center was a community need and the Chamber and the small businesses were behind it.

Clark stated that if Clayton State had wanted to go into the County's schools, the college would have done that. He continued that the schools were not Clayton State's preference for the demographics in Fayette County. During the day, the university center could not offer computer classes or contract classes if it were located in the schools.

Rapson said he would abstain from the vote due to his wife's lawsuit against the DAPC.

Brown said he had pushed for a university center for a long time and he thought it was well worth taking the shot. The trouble that Brown foresaw was that the facility would be outgrown quickly. Tennant said the benefit of that situation would be one of strength in getting a building for the university center.

Weed clarified the motion. Since there was no written agreement, Weed said he took it that the motion in no way made a commitment to an agreement that did not exist. Weed thought the university center was a wonderful idea. Weed continued that the DAPC was doing what Council had wanted them to do and he would not criticize them for that. Weed said he also believed the university center would outgrow its space in the first two years. Weed noted that Council was elected to ask questions and as long as he was on Council they would ask questions no matter how long it took.

Lindsey asked McMenamin to specify what the $15,000 in her motion would be for. McMenamin said the money would be for university furnishings owned by the City and referred to the list provided by the FCDA. Lindsey suggested McMenamin include the furnishings per the attached list. McMenamin amended her motion. Tennant seconded. The motion carried 4-0-1 (Rapson abstaining). McMenamin and Tennant thanked Clark and Christian for their leadership.

Council/Staff Topics

The Mayor extended condolences to City Manager Basinger and his family on the death of Basinger's father-in-law. Tennant expressed sympathy to *The Citizen* on the death of Editor Dave Hamrick.

Basinger announced that the Golf Cart Committee would meet Thursday, April 18, 6 p.m., at City Hall.

The Council meeting on Thursday, April 4, was cancelled.

Brown said there were two real estate items and one legal item for executive session. Tennant moved to recess from the regular meeting and reconvene in executive session. McMenamn seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

Brown moved to recess out of executive session and reconvene the regular meeting. Tennant seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

There being no further business to discuss, Brown moved to adjourn the meeting. Tennant seconded. The motion carried unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 11:20 p.m.

Pamela Dufresne, Recording Secretary

Stephen D. Brown, Mayor

Jane Miller, City Clerk