

The Mayor and Council of the City of Fairbury met in regular session in the Council Chambers located at 612 D Street, Fairbury, Nebraska, on the 3rd day of March, 2015, at 7:30 p.m. Mayor Ward called the meeting to order.

Notice of meeting was given in advance thereof by publication in the Fairbury Journal News, Fairbury, Nebraska, the designated method of giving notice, as shown by affidavit of publication. The Open Meetings Act was posted in the meeting room and pointed out by Mayor Ward as required by law.

Roll call found the following Council Members present: Doug Brown, Rick Carmichael, Roger Bailey, Tim Polson, Phil Rogge, Ed Friesen, and Brad Kuzelka. Absent: Kelly Davis.

Mayor Ward called for the submittal of forms to request future agenda items. No forms were submitted during the meeting.

Mayor Ward read the Consent Agenda:

1. Approval of the minutes of the regular meeting of February 17, 2015.
2. Approval of the minutes of the special meeting of February 9, 2015.
3. Approval of claims.

Rogge moved to approve the Consent Agenda. Motion seconded by Carmichael. On roll call, Polson, Bailey, Carmichael, Brown, Rogge, Friesen, and Kuzelka all voted "yes". Davis absent. Motion carried.

Mayor Ward opened the public hearing regarding territory to be annexed into the city limits of the City of Fairbury, proposed Area 2 located on a part of the Northwest and Southwest Quarters of Section 2, Township 2 North, Range 2 East of the 6th Principal Meridian, Jefferson County, Nebraska more fully described below.

Referring to the South Quarter Corner of said Section 2, T2N, R2E of the 6th P.M., Jefferson County, Nebraska; said corner being the True Point of Beginning; Thence northerly N 00°04'05" W, on the East line of the Southwest Quarter of said Section 2, 2646.89 feet, to the Center Quarter Corner of said Section 2; Thence Northerly N 00°02'04" W, on the East line of the Northwest Quarter of said Section 2, 940.08 feet to a point of intersection with the easterly extension of the North line of a tract recorded in the Jefferson County Register of Deeds, Deed Book 114, Page 359; Thence westerly S 74°35'40" W, on the easterly extension of and the North line of said tract, 1100.92, to the Northwest corner of said tract; thence southerly S 31°44'08" E, on the West line of said tract, 290.00 feet, to a point of intersection with the easterly extension of the North line of a tract of land recorded in the Jefferson County Register of Deeds, Deed Book 112, Page 95; thence westerly S 58°15'52" W, on the easterly extension of and on the North line of said tract, to a point of intersection on the East line of the State of Nebraska Highway 15 Right of Way as recorded in the Jefferson County Register of Deeds Miscellaneous Book "R", Page 266; Thence southeasterly and southerly on said East Highway

Right of Way line to a point of intersection on the South line of the Southwest Quarter of said Section 2, 33.00 feet west of the South Quarter Corner of said Section 2; thence Easterly N 88°14'27" E on the South line of the Southwest Quarter of said Section 2, 33.00 feet to the South Quarter Corner of said Section 2, said corner also being the True Point of Beginning.

Laura Bedlan Zoning Administrator addressed the Council. Bedlan stated the information regarding the annexation was in the Council packet which was also the same information that was presented to the Planning Commission for their hearing and some of that information was sent to the business owners in this district. Bedlan clarified that at the Planning Commission hearing one business owner, Lloyd Garber from Garber Honda, did object to the annexation. Garber owns a parcel of land north of Airport Road. Bedlan stated a member of the Planning Commission is present and also business owners that may want to address the Council.

Carolyn Scherbarth from Scherbarth Ace Hardware addressed the Council.

Scherbarth asked if the City runs the City sewer up to their business, it would go past the agricultural to the Vet Clinic to Ace Hardware – does that have to happen, is it mandatory, or can they decide between themselves if they want this service. Bedlan stated if they want to pursue a sewer district, any services that the City offers that they currently do not have, they have to request a district. Bedlan stated what would happen is the abutting property owners to the property would form a district, then they would need to vote – essentially you have to have 51% or $\frac{3}{4}$ depending on the frontage, depending which service you're going for – but it's more than 51% would have to agree to the district before the City would build the line or road to the businesses. Bedlan stated those costs for building that service, whatever it may be, would then be assessed back to those property owners. Scherbarth asked with the Fire Department, they have the Rural Fire Department right beside them, if they have a fire do they have to wait for the City Fire Department to come way out to their business or would the Rural Fire Department take care of them – how will this work. Bedlan stated she thought the Rural Fire Department had an agreement with the City Fire Department to respond. Bedlan asked if the City Fire and the Rural Fire have an agreement regarding responses to fires. Barry Schwab with the Rural Fire Department said that agreement only applies to structure fires. Schwab stated the Rural Fire Department would not automatically be called to a grass fire to one of these businesses, the City Fire Department would be dispatched to that call and the City Fire Department would have to request mutual aid from the Rural Fire Department for grass fires.

Dr. Janet Winter from Countryside Veterinary Clinic addressed the Council. Winter wants clarification regarding the Annexation Study as the study states basically, if the Rural Fire Department building would catch fire, the City Fire Department is to respond. Winter stated the study does not state if the business owners have a say of what gas or propane company they use, what particular internet or telephone they use, what garbage service they use, this is not addressed in the study; does the City regulate who the business owners can use or not use for services. Bedlan stated the only service that she knows is regulated in the City would be the garbage pickup; if the proposed area was annexed into the city limits, they would then go on city garbage; but as far as other utilities that are not managed by the City there would be no

restriction over who you use for that service. City Attorney David Barga stated for utilities that are not offered by the City like internet or cable TV or whatever, those would be the property owners option how to proceed with those services. Winter asked if the City provides a service, then they have to use that service whether they want to or not. Barga stated when you must hook on to a City service like sewer, the ordinance states when a sewer line abuts the property, then you are required to hook on to that sewer line. Barga stated if the sewer line gets put up there in the near future is up to either the City or the persons living there; there are two ways that that can be put there – either the residents of the area want to have an improvement put in like a sewer line or water line can create a district like Bedlan explained or the City can also vote to do that and to create a district or the City can vote to assess the costs across the whole City. This would be a future decision to be made by the City or by the people that live there. Winter asked if they have a contract with another company for any of those other things, we have to break those contracts because the City is now making it mandatory to utilize the City's services. Barga stated he was talking strictly about the sewer. Michael Beachler Superintendent of Utilities stated the electrical would be provided by Fairbury Light & Water because they are in our district. Winter stated they're on the City electrical. Beachler stated as far as natural gas, Black Hills Energy has the distribution system used in that area. Beachler stated as far as cable TV, telephone, etc is up to the owner's choice, no restrictions. Winter asked about sanitation. Bedlan stated sanitation, garbage pickup, would fall back to the City in that district. Bedlan stated often times what will happen is she will contact the owners to let them know that they would need to switch over to City sanitation services at that point. Bedlan stated sanitation is the only service that is written in ordinance that the City will provide that service – sanitation is a little different than any of the other City services. Council member Ed Friesen asked if there is a contract in place, will the owner be allowed the opportunity to finish out that contract, before they switch. Barga stated he thought that would be something that the City could allow. Winter stated she didn't see anything in the annexation study specifically about this. Winter stated in the study as far as electrical and utilities it states this annexation area is currently provided electrical services by the City of Fairbury. The services appear adequate to meet the needs of the area. These services include electric utility services and street lights. Winter stated they have no street lights so she doesn't think that is quite adequate; doesn't know how that is going to be addressed. Bedlan asked if she's asking for extension of street lights. Winter stated she is asking, is that part of what is going to be happening; the study says they have adequate street lights, but how can they have adequate, if they are not there. Winter stated the study supposedly has been thorough, but she sees a flaw in the study. Beachler stated street lights would be a very minor part – it wouldn't take much to put street lighting up there. Beachler stated would have to look into how the cost would be handled; it would be minimal. Council member Roger Bailey asked are you talking about a cost to the landowners or a cost to the City. Beachler stated if the City is going to do this and if it is not elaborate street lighting like what is going down 14th Street, but if it would be like intersections on north H Street, then there would probably be no charge to anyone the City would pick up the cost, but if you're looking at different, special lighting, then would maybe have to do some cost-sharing. Bailey stated he thinks

Winter is talking about something like in residential areas or different parts of town that have businesses that have street lights. Beachler stated we do that all the time. Bailey stated that would be provided then. Beachler stated yes it would be. Winter stated she is not necessarily opposed to it or against; it would be convenient for them especially to have a sewer system out there which they can figure out later; but wants to know if they are gaining anything by getting annexed as far as what is being supplied and what is not – right now they don't have lights, they don't have sewer, as far as the protection – police protection, otherwise they already have the electrical – just trying to see what advantages that they are going to be getting out of the City unit itself. Friesen stated one thing about being a part of the City is some things that are available with economic development programs that are available in the city limits possibly for expansion or some new business wanting to build in that area – there would be an allowance in there for some of the programs that we have that are not available out in the county. LB840 would be one if a business expansion would cause a creation of jobs that would be one opportunity that would be available for the businesses that exist as well as those that may want to build in that area. Council member Phil Rogge stated part of that would be TIF. Friesen stated Tax Increment Financing is for blight and substandard areas and that is not designated as one of those areas at this point of time; however LB840 and the reuse program would be available in those areas. Council member Doug Brown stated maybe LB840 would be an opportunity to do something with the road. Council member Rick Carmichael asked Scherbarth who maintains the road. Scherbarth stated the County cleans the blacktop. Carmichael stated that would then come to the City.

Lloyd Garber from Garber Honda addressed the Council. Garber stated he has been in the City for sixty years with a business and has paid a lot of taxes. Garber asked what he is gaining by getting in the city limits. Friesen stated some of the economic development programs would be available. Friesen stated if someone would want to buy his business, there would possibly be some economic development funds available to them to refit it for their use if they would be hiring people, job creation – there would be some things that would be available there that would not be available if you were not in the city limits. Garber stated as long as he is in business, it will not be sold. Garber stated he is using it just for storage. Garber stated the difference in taxes that you pay from what I'm paying now; you could furnish your own economic development to hire people etc. Garber stated he couldn't see anything that he's gaining by it, except the City would be gaining from it. Garber stated he doesn't have a business out there, so the City would not get any gain from the city sales tax from that, would not get anything from Coop. Garber stated when they talked about paving a road – not sure what road they're talking about – the road going to the airport. Garber stated the employees for Coop – Plymouth, Jansen, Fairbury, Daykin – all the employees, all the bosses don't pay one dime towards taxes for that business – so if you get a street paved there – who is going to pay for that – it's not the employees, it's not the owner – what are we gaining by that. That will probably be the end of the city limits for businesses. Why couldn't they stop the annexation area by the road going to the airport; there will be no businesses north of him it's all farm ground. Garber doesn't feel he needs to be involved in the annexation – city will gain no city sales tax, he will not gain – he does not need sewer, he does not need water; the water line was

there when he purchased the building but he doesn't want water. Garber stated his building probably meets the criteria to be in the city limits – but what are we gaining except money for the City.

No one else addressed the Council during the public hearing. Mayor Ward declared the hearing closed.

Mayor Ward read from the agenda “consider recommendation from the Board of Public Works to allow the Water Department to purchase a sanitary sewer camera”. Jeff Sweetser Water Superintendent distributed pictures and information regarding sanitary sewer cameras to the Council. Mike Beachler Superintendent of Utilities addressed the Council. Beachler stated they currently have a sanitary sewer camera which was purchased in 2002 and has worked very well; the camera allows them to remotely view sewer mains to locate the problem without digging. Beachler stated before it was always a shot in the dark, instead of having to dig up ten foot of main to fix what they could find with the camera, sometimes had to dig up a whole block. Beachler stated there is a huge savings having a sanitary sewer camera available. Beachler stated the last two years they've starting having problems with the camera – they've had problems with the cable – had to replace twice in 2013 and twice in 2014 at the price of \$450.00 - \$500.00 for the cable. Beachler stated the camera broke down a couple months ago – they sent the camera in to get it fixed and they say that they don't make parts for that camera anymore; if they were going to do anything it would have to be used parts so they kept the camera and eventually found some used parts but it took a couple months to get done. Beachler stated from June 2013 up to March 2014 the camera was used to view over 12,000 feet of sewer mains – if they would've had Johnson come in (Johnson comes in and cleans and foams the problem areas) they saved approximately \$16,000.00 by using the camera themselves. Beachler stated if they keep using the camera like they are now, the camera they're looking at would be more than paid for in five years. Beachler stated if we dig up the mains that we're having problems with we're talking anywhere from \$45.00 to \$50.00 a foot to fix those mains. Beachler stated if they didn't have the camera and had to dig around 4,000 feet you're looking at \$180,000.00 to \$200,000.00; so you've more than paid for the camera. Beachler stated the insurance company wants to see reports for cleaning these sewers and also pictures that go along with it. Beachler stated this camera will have the ability to do that. Beachler stated the information they gave the Council was for the TrakStar II Camera. Beachler stated they received two bids and had two demonstrations – this one and one from Environmental Products. Beachler stated the pictures they gave the Council are actual photos that were taken of our sewer mains on Maple and West Street. Beachler stated the photos show the clarity that they get with this camera – the top photo shows cracks in the clay tile, the second photo shows the plastic, and the bottom photo shows a residential tap that has been capped off. The camera they're looking at actually has a camera in the back – so not only as it's going, the camera is coming back and in that particular sewer that they were looking at in the top picture, they noticed a crack that the piece was already missing that they wouldn't have seen if they didn't have that camera. Beachler stated with the camera they can concentrate on that problem instead of having to tear up a half block of sewer line. Beachler stated the bid from Nebraska Environmental

Products came in with a similar camera in the amount of \$73,683.18. Beachler stated the used camera they have will not be any good to them because these vendors that they had come down to demonstrate said if we would happen to purchase their camera, if that camera would go down for any reason, they would give us a loaner to use that same day. They are both fairly local distributors so we would have a camera – so there is no use for the used camera so they asked Nebraska Environmental Products if they would have any kind of a trade-in for the old camera – they do not – so the price would be \$73,683.18. Beachler stated the bid from Elliott Supply, which is also the company that has their vac truck so they are very familiar with Elliott, came in with a price at \$64,998.20 and will allow them a \$2,000.00 trade-in for their used camera so the price would be \$62,998.20. Beachler stated they're asking the Council to approve allowing them to purchase the camera from Elliott. Beachler stated the camera purchase has gone before the Board of Public Works which has been fairly extensive as Sweetser has thoroughly checked the information regarding the cameras as they are expensive and wanted to make sure they're getting what they want. Friesen asked if there was any other place in the City that they could use the old camera for whatever reason that would give us more value than \$2,000.00. Beachler stated they could possibly put the camera in the Essent newsletter that perhaps a smaller community could use that type of camera; but we're probably getting the top end at \$2,000.00 for the used camera. Beachler stated if the used camera breaks down again, parts are not available to get the camera fixed. Rogge moved to approve the recommendation from the Board of Public Works to allow the Water Department to approve the bid received for the TrakStar II sanitary sewer camera from Elliott Supply in the amount of \$62,998.20 which includes the \$2,000.00 trade-in for our used camera. Motion seconded by Kuzelka. Rogge stated he has the opportunity that he can attend the Board of Public Works meetings on Tuesday mornings and they started working on this in December and he has been impressed with Jeff and everyone; initially it was \$73,000.00 they did a lot of shopping and did a great job definitely did their due diligence looking for a camera. On roll call, Polson, Bailey, Carmichael, Brown, Rogge, Friesen, and Kuzelka all voted "yes". Davis absent. Motion carried.

Rogge moved to approve the Special Designated Liquor License application for Michael Murman, Glacial Till Vineyard & Winery, LLC for a Wine Sampling/Tasting, on/off sale event to be held at Stagecoach Mall Antiques and Tasting Room located at 508 E Street, Fairbury, Nebraska on April 3, 2015 from 10:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. and on April 4, 2015 from 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Motion seconded by Polson. Rogge asked Julie Katz from Stagecoach Mall what is happening on Saturdays. Katz stated they have an opportunity to do some special events at Stagecoach Mall on Saturdays involving art; they will be having some artists come in and will conduct some classes. Katz stated in larger metropolitan areas these classes have been very popular because they also come with a glass of wine. Katz stated they would like to offer something similar so that people won't have to go to Lincoln or Omaha to experience that; they will be able to do that in Fairbury. Katz stated these will be workshops that will be either held in the morning with maybe a brunch or in the afternoon. On roll call, Polson, Bailey, Carmichael, Brown, Rogge, Friesen, and Kuzelka all voted "yes". Davis absent. Motion carried.

Kuzelka moved to approve the Special Designated Liquor License application for WunderRosa, LLC for a Wine Sampling/Tasting, on/off sale event to be held at Stagecoach Mall Antiques and Tasting Room located at 508 E Street, Fairbury, Nebraska on May 1, 2015 from 10:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. and on May 2, 2015 from 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Motion seconded by Polson. Carmichael asked if the Council has to approve these every time they have a wine tasting event. Bargaen stated for every event that requires a liquor license, has to have approval – maybe there would be a provision where you could have a continuing license he would have to check. On roll call, Polson, Bailey, Carmichael, Brown, Rogge, Friesen, and Kuzelka all voted “yes”. Davis absent. Motion carried.

Mayor Ward read from the agenda “presentation by Blobaum & Busboom, P.C. of the City of Fairbury Enterprise Funds Financial Statements and Schedules for fiscal year 2013-2014 audit.” Brian Blobaum addressed the Council. Blobaum presented the City of Fairbury Enterprise Funds (utility funds) Financial Statements and Schedules for Fiscal Year Ending April 30, 2014. Blobaum stated their firm is issuing a clean audit opinion but he is required to report internal control deficiencies. Blobaum stated they have made some recommendations to the Board of Public Works (BOPW) regarding internal control deficiencies such as the lack of separation of duties, which they report in every governmental entity they audit; as small governmental entities do not have enough people to perform every financial duty separately. Blobaum stated during the last fiscal year the utility went through a consolidation of the billing with the general ledger so they had more to review going through the audit.

Blobaum continued with an overview stating the gross profits with the Water Department and Sewage Disposal Departments their margins, labor costs, and net incomes are as what is expected, no issues. The Light Department, as we’ve discussed in the past, the gross profits are decreasing each year as our costs remain the same or slightly increasing with inflation. The Light Department showed a loss this year of \$1,133,668.00 which includes a settlement in the amount of \$246,961.00 for a MEAN regulatory transmission system operator transmission adjustment which was the City’s share that we’re to pay them – they put all of this in this year since it is a liability. Without the settlement amount, the loss would be \$886,707.00. Blobaum stated nothing unusual about the labor cost summary sheet for the different departments, small increases. The Power Sales and Gross Profit Margin report shows the Power Margin Percent dropped from 42% in 2011 down to 25% in 2014. How much revenue are we creating when we buy power versus when we sell power; back in 2011, we brought in approximately 2.9 million dollars to pay our expenses and now we’re down in 2014 to bringing in 1.9 million dollars – a million dollars difference, as you see, we show a million dollar loss for this year. Blobaum stated obviously the 13% increases that are happening this particular year – what will that 13% placed in May do to this fiscal year – that will probably bring that margin from 25%, MEAN raised the power rates in December so we’re not getting the full 13% - MEAN raised 6.5% in December – so we may pick up somewhere in the neighborhood of \$500,000.00 of that loss. Blobaum stated we have the next 13% coming up in May; however, he’s been informed that there is another possible 10% increase coming in

April or May, so we won't pick up much with the 13%. Just to let you know you probably have more of it coming down the line; he looked at MEAN's rate studies of the different communities in our area; our rates are lower than everyone else's in the area mostly in all categories – they break it down in various categories of how much usage – we are lower in most all categories against all of our local area. Blobaum explained the Cash Balance and Cash Flow Data spreadsheet stating in the Light Department the cash balance at the beginning of the fiscal year was \$4.9 million and at the end of the fiscal year was down to \$4.3 million – that's not \$1.1 million but remember part of this is the MEAN adjustment we're paying on for four or five years - so that is in a new note liability rather than a reduction of cash.

Blobaum went on to present the City of Fairbury Financial Statements for fiscal year 2013-2014 audit, with Fiscal Year Ending September 30, 2014. Blobaum stated the Enterprise Funds (utility department) are included in the City of Fairbury Financial Statements on September 30, but the April 30th numbers are used. Blobaum stated in the actual financial statements we show a change in net position, new words for net income or loss, of a loss of \$298,484.00 for the governmental funds. Blobaum explained the Governmental Funds Cash spreadsheet stating the actual overall totals in 2013 were \$2,564,310.00 and in 2014 down to \$2,216,803.00. Blobaum stated it is a \$300,000.00 loss but looking at what makes up that loss, a lot of it is in LB840 and CDBG funds which brings it down to a net "spendable" cash increase or decrease – rather than having this \$300,000.00 decrease, it is a \$59,165.00 of cash decrease in the funds that are not specifically designated as grants or LB840, the funds that are available to be used by the City in general; in that right we have a fairly even year. Blobaum stated the General Long-Term Debt of the Governmental Funds have gone down from \$1.3 million in 2013 to \$1,073,034.00 in 2014; a drop of \$255,518.00. He cautions not to think that we have \$255,000.00 more because when we are done paying the debt we will be done being able to collect tax to pay off that debt; he doesn't think that when the debt is gone that we will be better off as far as the cash flow. Blobaum stated the expenditures for 2012-2013, without LB840 and CDBG grant funds trying to bring it down to operating expenses for the City, were \$3,590,014.00 and for 2013-2014, \$3,670.868.00 – nothing unusual. Blobaum stated he did the same for revenues taking out the LB840 and grants, for 2012-2013 the revenue was \$3,749,321.00 and in 2013-2014 is down to \$3,603,639.00. The drop is due to several things, the utility funds didn't get deposited until the end of the fiscal year, insurance, etc. Blobaum stated not much to report with the governmental funds, but will still have the enterprise utility rate issues.

Bailey moved to accept the audit reports for both the City of Fairbury Enterprise Funds Financial Statements and Schedules for fiscal year 2013-2014 audit ending April 30, 2014 and the City of Fairbury Financial Statements for fiscal year 2013-2014 audit ending September 30, 2014 as presented. Motion seconded by Carmichael. On roll call, Polson, Bailey, Carmichael, Brown, Rogge, Friesen, and Kuzelka all voted "yes". Davis absent. Motion carried.

Bailey moved to approve transferring \$117,968.24 from the General Fund ~ \$41,613.97 to the Police Fund, \$32,833.41 to the Park Fund, \$17,675.81 to the Swimming Pool Fund and \$25,845.05 to the Library Fund for year-end closing entries. Motion seconded by Brown. On roll call, Polson, Bailey, Carmichael, Brown, Rogge, Friesen, and Kuzelka all voted “yes”. Davis absent. Motion carried.

Friesen moved to adopt Resolution No. 969 to levy and assess costs of nuisance abatement against certain properties. Motion seconded by Rogge. On roll call, Polson, Bailey, Carmichael, Brown, Rogge, Friesen, and Kuzelka all voted “yes”. Davis absent. Motion carried.

Mayor Ward read from the agenda: “Ordinance No. 3050: AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF FAIRBURY, NEBRASKA TO EXTEND THE BOUNDARIES OF THE CITY AND INCLUDE WITHIN THE CORPORATE LIMITS OF, AND TO ANNEX INTO THE CITY OF FAIRBURY, NEBRASKA A TRACT OF LAND THAT IS CONTIGUOUS AND ADJACENT TO THE CURRENT MUNICIPAL LIMITS AS MORE FULLY DESCRIBED HEREIN; DIRECTING THE SAME TO BE RECORDED BY THE JEFFERSON COUNTY REGISTER OF DEEDS; TO PROVIDE FOR THE REPEAL OF CONFLICTING ORDINANCES OR SECTIONS; TO PROVIDE FOR THE EFFECTIVE DATE THEREOF; AND ORDER THE PUBLICATION OF THE ORDINANCE IN PAMPHLET FORM.” Barga stated in order for the City to annex territory, there are some statutory case law requirements that need to be met and some findings that the Council should make as to how this tract meets those requirements. Barga stated as part of the Council packet there was information from the Planning Commission when they looked at this and they made some thorough findings on the record as it relates to those elements that are required to annex territory into the City. Barga stated the first requirement is that the area, which is Area 2, has to be contiguous and adjacent to the City and the Planning Commission’s recommendation report is that Area 2 is contiguous and adjacent primarily because that longest edge touches the city limits. The other considerations of Area 2 that has to be found urban and suburban in character and not agricultural land; that has to do with uses being made currently but also the general character of the surrounding territorial around that piece of property and the Planning Commission’s findings were that given all of the characteristics that it looked at and relying upon the report that was done by the consultant that the City hired – that this territory was also found to meet those requirements of urban and suburban in character. The Planning Commission also made findings regarding the purposes of the annexation – that essentially Area 2 is one of the areas of annexation in the Comprehensive Plan – one of the purposes of the annexation and one of the things the Planning Commission found was the City has a plan to provide City services to Area 2. Barga stated the City hired a consultant to look at the area and looked at it not only as an entire area but also by its component pieces and the study concluded that it met all of the requirements required for annexation. Friesen moved to adopt the Planning Commission recommendations and their findings on the qualifications of this tract, Area 2. Motion seconded by Kuzelka. On roll call, Polson, Carmichael, Brown, Rogge, Friesen, and Kuzelka all voted “yes”. Bailey abstained. Davis absent. Motion carried. Polson moved to introduce and give 1st reading to

Ordinance No. 3050. Motion seconded by Carmichael. On roll call, Polson, Carmichael, Brown, Rogge, Friesen, and Kuzelka all voted “yes”. Bailey abstained. Davis absent. Motion carried.

Within the Committee reports, Ed Friesen stated one of the topics at the League of Municipality meeting in Lincoln was nuisance properties and abandoned properties. Friesen stated an attorney from Neligh, Nebraska gave the presentation. Friesen stated it was very interesting talking to different community representatives. Barga stated Fairbury in relation to other cities, is doing a lot more in those areas than others. Barga stated he had a call from Marysville, Kansas today – they’re looking at our rental inspection ordinance and asking how they can do something similar in Marysville; word is getting around about our rental inspection program. Carmichael stated he had a call from Steele City wanting to know if they could hire Kelly Davis to come to their community for inspections. Doug Brown stated Hebron had also looked at our program at their meeting last night. Bedlan stated DED called her and asked about our demolition program.

Rogge moved to adjourn the meeting. Motion seconded by Carmichael. On roll call, Polson, Bailey, Carmichael, Brown, Rogge, Friesen, and Kuzelka all voted “yes”. Davis absent. Motion carried. Meeting adjourned at 8:38 p.m.

Homer L. Ward, Mayor

ATTEST: Sharyl Preston, City Clerk