

CITY OF McMinnville  
MINUTES OF CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION  
of the McMinnville City Council  
Held at the Kent L. Taylor Civic Hall on Gormley Plaza  
McMinnville, Oregon

Tuesday, November 27, 2018 at 5:45 p.m.

Presiding: Scott Hill, Mayor

Recording Secretary: Melissa Bisset

Councilors:

Present

Remy Drabkin

Adam Garvin

Sal Peralta

Alan Ruden

Wendy Stassens

Absent

Kellie Menke, Council President

Also present were Battalion Chief Damon Schulze, Building Official Stuart Ramsing, City Attorney David Koch, City Manager Jeff Towery, Finance Director Marcia Baragary, Fire Chief Rich Leipfert, Planning Director Heather Richards, Parks and Recreation Manager Susan Muir, Program Manager Janet Adams, and members of the News Media – Dave Adams, KLYC Radio, and Jerry Eichten of McMinnville Community Media.

1. CALL TO ORDER: Mayor Hill called the meeting to order at 5:49 p.m. and welcomed all in attendance.

2. PLANNING AND BUILDING FEES

Planning Director Richards explained that leadership asked that a study be conducted related to planning and building fees.

She stated that the City has specialty user programs dedicated to specific users. Usually such programs have some sort of cost recovery associated with them because it is not something that the general tax payer participates in and so most cities do not have them underwritten substantially by the General Fund. In the Planning Department there are two specialty user programs: building permits and current planning permits. She noted that a lot of communities look at those programs as cost recovery programs where the permit fees pay for the programs at different levels which is a policy decision by City Council. She stated that it is State enabled through the Oregon Legislation to collect fees for both programs in a dedicated method. Ms. Richards then shared that long range planning is a little different. She stated that some cities pay for it through current planning fees and that the City of Bend is the only city she is aware of that pays for the long range planning entirely through the fees. She explained that typically cities see long range planning as something that serves the entire population and it is

funded by the general fund. Ms. Richards shared that when she first arrived she was asked to do an assessment of the Planning program and after the assessment she shared that there had been quite a bit of deferred long range planning that had not been done and some of it was critical efforts that the Community needed to see happen such as Buildable Lands Inventory and a Housing Needs Analysis. She stated that she was asked to look at a user fee study.

The City of McMinnville does not have an indirect cost allocation plan meaning that there are departments not collecting fees related to administering the programs but there are costs associated with their work that goes into delivering the programs. Ms. Richards explained that it is important to know what these costs are and build it into a cost recovery model. She stated that Dan Edds, Consultant from Capital Accounting Partners (CAP) LLC, was also asked to perform an Indirect Cost Allocation Plan study for the City.

She explained that there are indirect costs associated with long range planning. Ms. Richards shared that currently 15 % of funds needed to run the current planning program are being collected and 85 % of the program is being underwritten by the General Fund. The building program is collecting 87 %. It was noted the building fee schedule was not compliant with State law.

Ms. Richards stated that the first planning fees were established in 1983. They were amended in 1995 and in 2002. A fee study was conducted in 2000. At that time there was discussion about a 55 % cost recovery for the planning program and it was not memorialized in policy or practice. She shared that the recommendation includes a plan for a six month reserve and discussed the importance of having a reserve built in.

She explained that they have been working on the project since April. In August a meeting was held with representative developers. She explained that the developers were concerned about the amount of the increases and what that meant. She stated that McMinnville has a history of providing a high level of customer service. She stated that there was a suggestion to come up with fees that are equitable.

She stated that they looked at similar cities (Grants Pass, Albany, Redmond).

Proposed fee schedules would be brought before Council on December 11<sup>th</sup> and there will be a public hearing the same evening.

Mr. Edds noted that the Planning Director and her team are smart, dedicated people and he enjoyed working with them.

There were two pieces to the project:

1. Prepare a “full cost” indirect cost allocation plan to accurately calculate

City overhead and build into Development user Fees.

2. Calculate the full cost of Building and Current Planning fees:
  - Conduct a comparison fee study; and
  - Provide recommendations on cost recovery practices and policies.

Mr. Edds explained that a “Full Cost”, Indirect Cost Allocation Plan is designed by the Federal government; and provides a consistent methodology to assign overhead costs based on a measurable benefit for services provided.

He explained the various methods for allocation of a function such as Human Resources.

Finance Director Baragary commented that the model is complex and that this is the first time indirect costs have been estimated in this manner. She stated that Mr. Edds was detailed and meticulous.

Discussion ensued regarding the indirect costs associated with the City Council.

Mr. Edds explained the quality assurance methods which included:

1. Budgeted expenses entering the cost models must equal total expenses accounted for in the costing model. The acceptable margin of error was 0 %.
2. Projected revenue from fees must closely match actual revenue from fees. The acceptable margin of error was + or – 5 to 10 %.
3. Available staff time must be fully accounted for in the costing models. The acceptable margin of error was 0 %.
4. Total revenues from fees and contributions from the general fund or other sources must match total expenses. The acceptable margin of error was 0.

Dan then provided the results on the current Planning and Building fees:

Department or Division	Annual Revenue Impacts			Reserve
	Revenue at Full Cost of Services	Projection of Revenues at Current Fees	Annual Surplus (subsidy)	6 Months Reserve, 5 yr build up
Planning	\$ 280,186	\$ 41,560	(\$238,626)	\$28,011
Building	\$ 823,431	\$ 719,575	(\$103,856)	\$82,343
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$ 1,103,617</b>	<b>\$ 761,135</b>	<b>(\$342,482)</b>	<b>\$110,354</b>

Mr. Edds noted that Cost recovery for the current Planning Program is 15% and for the Building Program is 87%.

Mr. Edds explained that he was not surprised by the results. He recommended that rates should be updated at least every other year. He noted that the following items drive cost recovery:

- Productive hourly rates do not keep up with inflation.
- Changes in regulations, trend is for more regulation (higher cost over time).
- Fees are not regularly updated.
- Building fees based on construction value has an automatic escalator.
- City overhead rates are frequently not assigned to fees.

Mr. Edds then provided challenges with comparisons including:

- Comparing current cost with a price.
- City overhead may or may not be included.
- Fee descriptions and definitions don't always match.
- One city will take an "à la carte" approach to their fees while another may bundle services.
- Comparing different models of cost recovery – flat fees vs deposit based (time & materials).
- Many communities do not routinely update fees with a robust cost analysis.
- Service levels can vary dramatically.
- Building valuation fees have multiple methods off calculating value
  - Given construction value
  - International Code Council (ICC) valuation table, or
  - A combination of both.

The following cities were used in the comparison: Newberg, Woodburn, Tigard, Sherwood, Wilsonville, Albany, Redmond, Grants Pass and Tualatin.

Mr. Edds then provided charts reflecting comparison results and encouraged Council to look at the trend.

The recommendations included the following:

- Set policies or targets for fee generating revenues consistent with community values but also that will maximize cost recovery. This will strengthen ability to maintain current technology; strengthens the General Fund; and strengthens the ability to maintain a high level of customer service.
- Adjust fees annually and perform an update every 3-5 years.
- Consider buildings reserves for development services:
  - Maintains City intellectual capital in the event of an economic downturn;
  - Protects the General fund during an economic downturn; and
  - Source of funding for technology maintenance and improvements.

The importance of having reserves was discussed.

Councilor Ruden stated that there is some liability on the City's part in conducting inspections. He asked how risk to the city on the services is factored in. Mr. Edds responded that it is hard to quantify a value of risk. It was noted that insurance costs are included in the analysis.

Planning Director Richards stated that there are not any fees that go above full cost recovery.

Discussion ensued regarding the reserve. Mr. Edds responded that the proposed policy is a six-month reserve and it is appropriate and traditional.

Mayor Hill shared that in 2002 the City conducted a development services user fee study and at that time the City elected to operate at 100 % full cost recovery for the Building Program and strive for 55 % recovery for the Planning Program. The Mayor reminded Council that the Study found that the Building Program was operating at 87 % cost recovering and the Planning Program was at 15 %.

Councilor Ruden stated that it was not proper to have the Building and Planning programs being subsidized by the General Fund. He stated that he agrees with the proposed cost recovery model and stated that the original intention was to increase the cost recovery to 100 % for Building and 55 % for Planning. Councilor Ruden stated that as a member of the building community, they would like to be in harmony and great partners with the City Building and Planning Departments. He noted that if the developers and City are working towards a common goal then the extra costs that the builders have to bear up front go to a good purpose of sustaining a partner. He stated that it is a win-win and overall the General Fund of the City and the citizens benefit.

Councilor Drabkin agreed that the General Fund should not be subsidizing the Planning and Building Departments. She stated that there is not a clear plan for the reserve such as how it would be used and the maximum amount. She commented on the fees relative to the costs of the items. Ms. Richards responded that in the Building Fee Schedule, appliances were missing before and there will be discussion with builders related to the new fees. She stated that the full cost recovery is the amount of time to perform the inspection of the item. It was noted that the Building Fee Schedule includes many State regulations.

Councilor Peralta asked if there is a plan on what to do with the additional money generated as a result of the increased fees. Ms. Richards responded that she is used to current planning being funded by user fees and long range planning being funded through the General Fund. She stated that this is not how McMinnville has operated. She stated that the Planning Department has been working on getting grants in order to provide for some long range planning opportunities and consultant services. She stated that her hope is that if the decision is for current planning goes into a full cost recovery state

that the savings can then fund the long range planning and the General Fund would not be impacted any more than it is in terms of Planning activities.

Councilor Garvin felt that was the recommended percentages were a good starting point.

Ms. Richards recommendation was an initial 55 % cost recovery with a recommendation that the fee schedule be increased by 10 % plus CPI over the next 5 years to get to full cost recovery.

Ms. Richards stated that she will provide public notice for the public hearing.

3.

ADJOURNMENT: Mayor Hill adjourned the Work Session Meeting of the City Council at 7:07 p.m.

s/s Melissa Bisset  
Melissa Bisset, City Recorder

CITY OF McMinnville  
MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING  
of the McMinnville City Council  
Held at the Kent L. Taylor Civic Hall on Gormley Plaza  
McMinnville, Oregon

Tuesday, November 27, 2018 at 7:00 p.m.

Presiding: Scott Hill, Mayor

Recording Secretary: Melissa Bisset

Councilors:	<u>Present</u>	<u>Excused Absence</u>
	Remy Drabkin	Kellie Menke, Council President
	Adam Garvin	
	Sal Peralta	
	Alan Ruden	
	Wendy Stassens	

Also present were Battalion Chief Damon Schulze, Building Official Stuart Ramsing, City Attorney David Koch, City Manager Jeff Towery, Finance Director Marcia Baragary, Fire Chief Rich Leipfert, Planning Director Heather Richards, Human Resources Manager Kylie Bayer-Fertterer, Parks and Recreation Manager Susan Muir, Program Manager Janet Adams, and members of the News Media – Dave Adams, KLYC Radio, Jerry Eichten of McMinnville Community Media, and Tom Henderson of the *News Register*.

AGENDA ITEM

1. CALL TO ORDER: Mayor Hill called the meeting to order at 7:12 p.m. and welcomed all in attendance.
  
2. PLEDGE  
  
Mayor Hill led the Pledge of Allegiance.
  
3. INVITATION TO CITIZENS FOR PUBLIC COMMENT: Mayor Hill invited the public to comment.

Ramsey McPhillips, 13000 SW McPhillips Road, stated that since the City left the Riverbend landfill there was concern about what the rates for garbage would be. He noted that since the time Recology has switch landfills and the costs have been stable. He stated that there were costs related to building the transfer station. He shared that Metro has signed a final contract for 2020 that no longer includes Riverbend. Mr. McPhillips stated that he spoke with staff from Metro and they noted that the cost of taking the garbage up the Gorge is less than what they were spending sending it to Riverbend. He stated that the argument that Riverbend Landfill is something that the State

needs because of costs has been undermined by a contract twice. He stated that the actual cost of has not gone up in McMinnville. He stated that Newberg has one of the lowest garbage rates in the State. He stated that with Metro moving away from Riverbend 1.2 million people have lowered their garbage rates. He stated that he is very proud of that and he wanted the City to feel good about their decision.

4. PRESENTATION: Emergency Response – Hurricane Michael

Fire Battalion Chief Damon Schulze stated that in October he responded as part of an Incident Management Team to Hurricane Michael in Florida. He thanked the City and Chief Leipfert for the opportunity to go and stated that the training was invaluable as his role as Emergency Management Coordinator. He stated that two Oregon Incident Management Teams were deployed to Florida. He noted that the size and spread of Bay County was similar to Yamhill County. He displayed a picture of the Emergency Operations Center (EOC). He noted that their EOC is set up year-round and it has been operating for 18 years. He displayed an example of the Incident Organization Chart. Mr. Schulze displayed a map of the damaged area explaining the importance of those providing GIS services. He then provided a timeline of events and pointed out that it took four days to get all major roadways and it took ten days for the boil water advisory to be lifted. He stated that you could use that timeline to think about what things would look like if when the Cascadia event happens. Mr. Schulze shared that the Oregon Incident Management Teams are well organized. He emphasized a need for training, GIS and IS. He stated that the City needs to be ready to support its employees: prepared at home and at work, ready for employee emergencies, family, and funerals as well as services need to be made available to employees in the same way as the public. He explained that based on his experience he feels that response to the Cascadia event not be as easy or fast as what happened in Florida. He noted that there will not have a warning to prepare for an earthquake and we are not as prepared as Florida. He stated that Portland and Salem will get priority on resources. Mr. Schulze explained that two weeks worth of supplies will not be enough.

Mayor Hill commented on how fortunate the City is to have Mr. Schulze as the City's Emergency Manager. Mayor Hill stated that families need to be prepared for two weeks. He commented on how McMinnville Water and Light are prepared.

5. CONSENT AGENDA

- a. Consider approval of the minutes from the September 11, 2018 City Council Work Session and Regular Meeting.

Councilor Stassens MOVED to adopt the consent agenda as presented; SECONDED by Councilor Ruden. Motion PASSED unanimously.

6. RESOLUTION

- 6.a. Resolution No. **2018-61**: A Resolution approving an out-of-calendar rate adjustment for Recology Inc., of 5% for solid waste services, and requiring completion of a rate review study.

City Manager Towery stated that at the last City Council Work Session there was a presentation from Recology about the full range of activities of the organization including the change in the recycling market worldwide and the financial impact that has had on Recology. Mr. Towery stated that Recology has requested a 10.47 % rate increase to accommodate the impact of change in the recycling industry as well as additional operating costs that have accrued. He stated that the Resolution acknowledges the increased impact of the recycling market and identifies the opportunity in the Franchise Agreement with Recology to do a rate review study. Staff's proposal was to have a 5 % increase effective January 1, 2019 and conduct a rate review through an agreement with the City's independent auditor. Based on the findings, if necessary, rate changes would be effective July 1, 2019.

Councilor Garvin stated that a good portion of the rate increase is related to recycling going from a profit to a negative value and that unfolded over the past year and asked that if the recycling market were to rebound what would be done with the money. Walter Budzik of Recology stated that there is no indication that would occur but if it did the increase in revenue would work back into the operating ratio.

Finance Director Baragary explained that the auditors have a lot of experience with these types of rate reviews. She stated that they would review operating ratio, visit Recology for half a day, and look at how overhead is allocated out to the various cities and operations. She stated that the City could ask them to compare Recology's rates to industry standards.

Councilor Garvin asked about the residential rates. He stated that it hard to get a direct comparison because of all of the other residential service factors that are provided specifically in McMinnville. He asked how rates compare for commercial or industrial users to other cities. Dave Larmouth, of Recology stated that it depends on what area you are looking at and what services are offered. He stated that Recology's rates are already higher than some and lower than others and the rate adjustment wouldn't flip the tables.

Councilor Drabkin asked about curbside glass pick up. Discussion ensued regarding the history of glass pick up in McMinnville. Councilor Drabkin asked about the stabilization of rates. Ms. Budzik confirmed that it is a stable loss. She asked about what other options are available for recycling without additional increases in rates. Mr. Budzik clarified that the rate increases are for current service levels.

Discussion ensued regarding the various options for recycling programs. It was noted that as long as there is a mixed recycling program in McMinnville, it will look very similar to how it currently looks.

Discussion ensued regarding domestic program possibilities. It could take two to three years before domestic programs could replace the export markets.

Councilor Drabkin asked if there are any other financial tools other than rate increase. Mr. Budzik responded that Recology has endeavored to do as much as they can to keep costs as low as they can.

Councilor Peralta asked that if Council approved a rate increase of 5 % rather than the 10.47 %, would there be an effect the service. Mr. Budzik stated that service would not be reduced.

Mr. Budzik thanked Council for the consideration of the out of cycle rate increase. He thanked City Staff for the 5 % rate increase recommendation and respectfully requested the 10.47 % increase.

Annelly Germaine, Zero Waste Volunteer, stated that styrofoam is pretty evil stuff. She stated that is used in food service and in packing materials. It is 95% air and the rest is #6 plastic. Benzene is used to make Styrofoam and noted that benzene is a known carcinogenic. Styrofoam is a suspected carcinogen. She stated that it styrofoam is an environmental disaster, it makes up to 30 % of any given landfill worldwide and it does incalculable damage to marine life. Ms. Germaine stated that styrofoam is not biodegradable and that it can last nearly forever unless suitable solvents are used to break it down. She stated that many cities and counties have banned styrofoam for food production and food use. It has been banned for food use in Ashland, Eugene, Medford and Portland. Ms. Germaine stated that McMinnville has a piecemeal approach to sustainability. She shared that Zero Waste Volunteers have gathered signatures and there are over 400 signatures that have been gathered and they are asking the City to address the problem.

Mark Davis, 652 SW Washington Street, stated that he has a high level of frustration and that he likes what Recology is trying to do in the community. He likes that they are a recycling company and that they are employee owned. He stated that he is frustrated because the last two times Recology has come before Council for rate increases he asked if there could be more details provided. Mr. Davis said that a citizen cannot look at the information Recology provided and be able to tell what is going on. He stated that in the past, the company had provided enough information for one to tell if the rates were appropriate. Mr. Davis added that he is happy there will be rate study and suggested that everything the Finance Director suggested could be in the study should be in the report. He stated that he would like to see the details so that the citizens can make intelligent comments. He stated that there should be more background information before granting rate increases.

Ramsey McPhillips, stated that styrofoam is multiplying. He shared that it is brought into the community through big box stores in large quantities. He stated that there is often a compactor in the stores and they compact it with other items because it is more economical for the store. Mr. McPhillips stated that he would like there to be an outlet for Styrofoam. He stated that Recology tried to have styrofoam recycling and it was a highly toxic option that Recology briefly used. Zero Waste is in favor of the rate increases but they feel that this is an opportunity to add in something that may create some jobs and may standardize or reduce the garbage rate He noted that 30 % of styrofoam is going to the landfill. Education can help reduce the garbage and there is a local company that has a process to handle the styrofoam.

John Desmarteau, of Agilyx is proud that Zero Waste is educating the public. He stated that Agilyx can take all types of polystyrene. He explained the process for reducing the polystyrene into an oil. He stated that they are reducing the number of plastics going into the landfill. He noted that the product they are creating has 50 to 70 % lower greenhouse gas generation than using virgin products and making a product in the United States to make new products. They are trying to figure out how to get product to them and their facility in Tigard is processing ten tons a day.

Jerry Hunter, local business owner and Zero Waste Board Member, stated that styrofoam and polystyrenes are a significant problem in the waste stream and a significant concern of the citizens of McMinnville. He noted that Mr. Peters had reported that this is already a focal point of Recology. Mr. Hunter stated that Mr. Peters spoke of a growing partnership with McMinnville Zero Waste and Recology has been open to Zero Waste's efforts. Mr. Hunter stated that Recology is a recycling company. He stated that recycling should be treated as an industry and that it is the right thing to do for social and environmental reasons but noted that it should be done in an economically viable way or it can't and won't be done. He stated that he supports the rate increase that Recology is seeking. Mr. Hunter stated that program alternatives are not terribly appealing and that the local options look like continuing to recycle at a higher rate or ask for concurrence from the DEQ and place it in the landfill. He stated that Zero Waste applauds Recology's commitment to recycling and increased levels of service and he is personally happy to increase the frequency of glass collection. Mr. Hunter added that the City has shown leadership in these areas before and noted the positive impact of the Bag-it-Better Ordinance. He stated that Zero Waste hopes that they City will support Recology in their rate increase so that they may have a sustainable model that includes recycling. He asked that the Council consider directing Recology to access the implementation of a polystyrene recycling program to include a collection point at the transfer station and transfer those materials.

Beth Frischmuth, Zero Waste volunteer, stated that she is concerned because she sees what she throws into the garbage with regards to styrofoam. She stated that as a concerned citizen she would like to see something done. She

would like McMinnville citizens to be able to deposit styrofoam and other plastics. She stated that anyone who is concerned about the environment is more than happy to make an effort to drop off these items in order to keep them out of the landfill. She stated that knowing what is happening to the Oceans and sea life is appalling. She stated that it is important for everyone to do their part to keep styrofoam and plastics out of the landfill and to be given an opportunity to recycle them.

Councilor Drabkin stated that there are two great partners represented in the room, the voices of Zero Waste and Recology, both who have helped move the City forward as being a leader when it comes to recycling. She stated that she has seen a lot of positive work between the two organizations. She stated that last time a rate increase was presented there were two different options. Option A was a needed rate increase to keep services as what they were. Option B was a higher rate increase with the expansion of services that included glass recycling and compost bins. She stated that Mr. Fred Stemmler was with Recology at that time and he was somewhat surprised with Option B. She noted that generally the rate increase at that time was well accepted by the community. She stated that she sees the need for styrofoam and believes it is a positive conversation and she hopes the conversation continues with all partners; however, in terms of this request for a rate increase, she doesn't see the rate increase and expansion of service in the same manner. Councilor Drabkin stated that she would like Recology to be able to continue to provide the kind of service and felt that in order to support Recology to maintain their current services, that there is not a choice not to increase rates. She also noted that as Mr. Davis stated, Council has said that they would take a deeper look into the financials and make the reports more available and that hasn't been done. She stated that she is happy to have Recology as a partner.

Councilor Ruden stated that Mr. Davis should be listened to and that the City should get more detail from Recology. He stated that the City should fight the styrofoam in a major way. He stated that he would like to see more detail about the collection of styrofoam and collection of it.

Councilor Garvin stated that he is in favor of finding something to do with styrofoam. He also agreed into a deeper look into Recology's accounting. He stated that if he were to approve, then he would be in favor of staff's 5 % increase with a rate review. He felt there should be a cost analysis of what it would be to add styrofoam.

Councilor Peralta agreed with Councilor Ruden about getting more details from Recology and including the styrofoam as part of the package.

Councilor Stassens stated that she appreciated the testimony. She stated that the really good data from citizens is appreciated. She stated that she likes how staff suggested to split the increase and felt that there should be more details and would like to have additional information about the styrofoam.

She stated that when there is technology that is locally able to handle the material that the responsible thing to do is evaluate the option.

City Manager Towery stated that Staff's recommendation was based on the changes in the recycling market drove roughly half of Recology's requested rate increase. He stated that he is persuaded not only by Recology's presentation of information but by a significant amount of reporting and analysis on recycling worldwide and that it is not a short term fix. He noted that it is probably the new normal for a number of years. Mr. Towery stated that the 5 % would primarily address the unanticipated costs of recycling but would not accommodate an expanded recycling program. He stated that the rest of the rate increase is described as cost of living/ cost of operations. The opportunity to perform a rate review will give clarity on the numbers. Mr. Towery presented options for action.

Discussion ensued on wanting to table the item to receive more information about adding a styrofoam recycling program but also not wanting to create an additional hardship to Recology by delaying the increase.

City Attorney Koch provided the various options to Council for taking action or not taking action on the proposed Resolution.

City Manager Towery explained that the proposal that Recology was that with a full increase they would not bring back another proposal until 2020. It was noted that Staff's suggestion is to conduct the rate analysis in the Spring.

Discussion ensued regarding what other cities are doing with regarding dealing with the increased costs of recycling.

Councilor Stassens stated that allowing them to have sustainable on market knows but giving them the directive that when the next rates and rate review comes up that they would look at including a styrofoam recycling program.

Councilor Stassens made a motion to approve Resolution No. 2018-61. The motion was not seconded.

Councilor Garvin stated that he would like Recology to be able to recover the costs of the changes in the recycling market but he would also like to have the data of what a styrofoam recycling program would cost, and he would consider the cost of the program being included in the rate adjustment. He stated that he would like to hold off on any CPI adjustments until after a rate review.

Discussion ensued regarding the various options.

Councilor Ruden stated that he would like to take more time to make a decision.

City Attorney Koch clarified that Staff understands that the Council is strongly considering a styrofoam recycling program and that there is some interest in considering the 5 % out of cycle rate adjustment based on the increased costs of the current recycling program in the future. He noted that the rate review is still something that Council would like to see prior to any additional rate increases related to operations.

Mayor Hill stated that he would encourage the low cost approach for a styrofoam recycling program.

7. **ADVICE/ INFORMATION ITEMS**

a. Reports from Councilors on Committee and Board Assignments.

Councilor Ruden shared that there have been a couple interviews for the Airport Commission positions.

Councilor Drabkin stated that the next Affordable Housing Task Force will be the follow day.

Councilor Garvin shared that the next YCOM meeting is coming up and there will be more information in January.

Mayor Hill stated that the Bypass Committee met. He noted that U.S. Representative Peter DeFazio will become the Chairman of Transportation Committee in the House of Representatives. Mayor Hill stated that moving quicker than slower in getting “shovel ready” is important for the next Phase of the Bypass.

b. Department Head Reports

Human Resources Manager Kylie Bayer-Fertterer shared that there has been supervisory training and recruiting efforts. She has been building buy-in for an applicant tracking system and working on achieving the requirements of the equal pay act.

City Manager Towery reminded Council that the Holiday Party is coming up on December 14<sup>th</sup>.

8. **ADJOURNMENT: Mayor Hill adjourned the Regular City Council Meeting at 8:51 p.m.**

s/s Melissa Bisset  
Melissa Bisset, City Recorder