

**CITY COUNCIL
EXECUTIVE SESSION MEETING
MINUTES**

November 17, 2009

1) HINGER PROPERTY NEGOTIATIONS

PW: I am going to refer to this white board behind me here.

(inaudible), we have accepted an offer on the Hinger property, which to refresh your memory, the Hinger property is right behind the Miller house. Um, it is at \$288, 000.00, that was the appraised value from their side, we set an earnest money that said we will get our own appraisal and if it is at or above 288, the price will be 288. If it was below then you would re-negotiate from there. Umm, and I'm hoping you can see, is this okay?

Um, it came in at \$300,000.00 and we made a copy of the cover page for you and the full appraisal if you want to look at that. We also have received the physical inspection report, um, there are, uh, all and all it's in good condition.

There are some minor issues that we'll have to look at and ironically it's a wood shingle roofed house so, luckily we're not bringing the Fire Department there. Um, but there is some shingles, there are some shingles that do need repair, all in all it's uh, it's a twenty year life roof it's about ten years of life into it right now. So, you will be looking at roof replacement in a decade roughly but some minor repairs until that time. No dry rot-rot issues, we will probably have to do some re-wiring, there are no GFI circuits in there um, and so, we'll probably have to do some of that sort of thing. The water heater will need to be replaced, *(clears throat)*, because it is well past its life-time. We will also have some modifications for security purposes for the police and certain rooms, depending on how we design that. Uh, the final design the Chief has worked up one option and I worked up another, it depends on what the final layout is as to how much all of these costs will be, uh, but we will also have to do some communications improvements in there for the police and also as the emergency operations center. Uh, then finally we'll have to connect it to the generator for emergency power.

All in all, rough guess, we're probably looking at ten to twenty thousand dollars worth of improvements to get all of those changes made, um, in the building. I think it will serve the purpose functionally very well for police and for the emergency operations center and we'll also get some archives fixed out of it, so those are the benefits the City's going to receive to free up some room in the Miller House. Uh, Sandra and I have been talking about how to re-work the Miller House once this goes in, uh, but all in all, I see police, emergency operations center and archives being the primary functions going on here. We will be probably removing most of the hedges on the internal side to get some diagonal parking in there for police and other employees.

Um, the, um financing is now a question that we have to look at, that's why I've laid out all three of the properties that we're looking at, so we can, we can balance them all off. So, um, before I get into the financing of any one of them, I want to give you the status on all three.

Uh, the uh, City Attorney is still in the process of re-drafting the sales agreement (Galpin) here, that's just for legal fine tuning, all of the conceptual, um, pieces I've already laid out to you and you found them to be acceptable, so we're looking at \$350,000.00 plus we'll probably have some survey work to be done there in order to, *(inaudible)*, so you will have some additional costs there for the Galpin property. I anticipate that somewhere in the next week or so we will get the agreement back from the

attorney, we'll get that from Mr. Galpin, assume another two week turn-around, so we're probably a month out on this one, on the Galpin property.

Uh, then the Romero property we don't have numbers on yet. This is the one behind the Fire Hall. Um, the appraisal has been ordered and conducted, it hasn't been written yet, we anticipate that on Thursday. Um, we're probably, and this is of my guess, \$110,000.00 dollar range, um, but that's not for sure. So, I really can't do too many counts on this one, as you guessed, but obviously the big unknown is going to be your demo and construction afterwards, you won't be able to use much of the existing facility, if anything at all, it's probably going to be a total scrape down and start all over. Um, so this will be a big dollar value here, um, again, that is something we haven't done much with, um, but you let us know what you would like done on getting some ball-park estimates for that.

All three of these properties are in the Urban Renewal tax base and you will be removing them from their tax base. What that means is you'll actually reduce your receipts in Urban Renewal District. I can't say that this is going to be significant, but it will be some dollar amount. So, as you look at this and have discussion, you're probably looking at replacing those by either returning other properties onto the tax base that are currently City owned, or by changing the boundaries and adding more to that.

So, those are a couple of options you'll probably wish to look with, look at with Urban Renewal, because most of, at least if my proposal, most of your payments are going to be coming out of Urban Renewal. So, you will actually pay these down.

Um, so, what I did in terms of how to approach this, because you want to do internal financing, is, that I looked a loan and used generally 3% and I used a 30 year amortization to keep the payments low at the beginning, at the front end, and looked at a five-year balloon, okay? So, you're going to be tapping your own funds and you're going to be drawing them down for awhile at 3%, at this point in time, is a good rate. Whether you wanted to sustain that for a length of time, I'm sorry, (*inaudible*), whether you wanted to sustain that for any length of time is the question and that is why I proposed a balloon, um, so that you can make you're funds, you're other funds whole again, to do whatever it is that they are supposed to do.

Within five years, a couple of things will happen, one, the interest rates will probably be much different, two, um, the real estate market will be much different. So, if you do have to do surplusing or any other types of activities, you will probably be much more inclined to do so than you are right now. That's why I chose the 30 year amortization with a balloon in five, is to keep finance costs down, look at making all of your internal funds full. If you recall, we did talk about going from water reserves, for the Hinger in particular, uh, discussing this with the Public Works Director, there's a number of issues here, um, that led me to recommend that the water reserves be left intact, that is, we are looking at, in 2013, the need to buy about 280 acre feet of additional water rights that's required by our contractor with the Medford Water Commission. We are also looking at additional maintenance costs that we have to pay to the army core of engineers and those will probably double; there are a number of issues here that Jeff felt that you really need to keep those reserves intact for, this was pointed out last time also, in case there are any issues.

Therefore, uh, my current recommendation is looking at the Historic Preservation Fund, which, by the way, just recently received an additional \$75,000.00 roughly, uh, which now puts it over \$700,000.00 in the Historic Preservation Fund. That is the final payment from the Beebe Estate, there will be no more payments. So, that is your full amount to the Historic Preservation Fund, but is a very fat fund, and could handle being used as a base for a loan. Most of our funds are currently earning just under 1%, that's why I'm suggesting a 3% as a medium ground, you're current loan that the Chief received is about 4.75% for a Commercial loan from a bank, this is just basically splitting the difference, we can fine tune that interest rate if you want to do something different, but at least it gave you some ideas. I ran up some amortizations that I think were circulated to you, (*inaudible*), will make our payments very

steep, so that is why I went to a 30 year and just kept pulling back and pulling those payments back as much as I can.

Um, so basically on this one, the Hinger property, we'll be looking at probably \$300,000.00 over-all, after purchase and improvements and I'm proposing that we look to the Historic Preservation fund for \$250,000.00 and Public Safety for \$50,000.00 and you could even use \$50,000.00 down, that same \$50,000.00, put it down and bring the over-all payment down or the over-all loan down and make your payments around \$15,000.00 a year. Just looking at a general trend line of where we've been at with Urban Renewal taxes over the recent five years, you're probably going to look at another \$30,000.00 for conditional tax coming in from Urban Renewal in the next year, that's why I split it 15 and 15. We did have a bump a year ago with Bigham Knoll coming in, because that was a return of a non-taxable property onto the tax base, so Urban Renewal took a spike right there, but, I don't think we will see that again for awhile. So, I'm anticipating about \$30,000.00 additional for us to work with in terms of being able to make payments out of Urban Renewal, which is why I suggested the format that I did. So, again I am recommending \$50,000.00 down, \$15,000.00 a year, over-all loan, \$300,000.00 that will have to get paid back, estimating, roughly, a rough amortization, of that principal loan system, you're probably going to have about \$260,000.00 that you're going to have in terms of a balloon in five years. That will also replenish the Public Safety building reserve of \$50,000.00 that you took out of here, so that would be a reimbursement to bring the Public Safety fund and the Historic Preservation fund whole again.

Similarly, on the Galpin property, utilize the Historic Preservation fund, but not to the same degree. Use it for about \$100,000.00 and utilize the Cemetery Trust for \$250,000.00. Right now your Cemetery Trust has \$50,000.00 set aside as a building reserve. You also have the Trust Corpus itself which is about \$268,000.00. You must keep \$207,000.00 in that Trust, but you can borrow against it, so I'm recommending that you use the Cemetery Trust itself and use \$50,000.000 of the building reserve for a down payment, but to pay back the balance of the Cemetery...of the Corpus itself. This again would then be...the payments on this would be paid from Urban Renewal, \$15,000.00 a year, and this one will take an amendment to our Urban Renewal Plan, I mentioned that before, it is in the boundaries of Urban Renewal, but it isn't called out specifically in the Plan to purchase Cemetery property. So, you can spend money on the Cemetery and enhancements to it, but it doesn't call for property acquisition, so that will take an amendment to the Urban Renewal Plan. And then again, probably just estimating the payout here, it's probably going to be, in five years, about \$285,000.00 to replenish those funds. So, here's with the unknown, the Romero property, again, you had dedicated \$100,000.00 for the building reserve, there's 50 here, there would be another 50 there to go towards that property, but we can't really run any more of the calc's on this one until you get your number into place at the top so, there's a little bit more work to be done here. All of these are going to look at balloons, and so what you are going to be looking at is additional property surpluses to make those balloons and/or you can have a mix, bonds that you will have to put to the voters.

LM: So, if a bond doesn't pass, then uh, we should have a back-up plan of what we would sell, um in order to meet those, *(inaudible)*, payments.

PW: It will be a contractual obligation to yourself.

LM: And the Public Safety coming out of the reserve or out of the unappropriated, um, the Public Safety...*(inaudible)*.

PW: It would be coming out of the reserves and the balance...well that is...*(inaudible)*, we have \$50,000.00 already budgeted.

LM: Out of the reserves?

PW: Correct.

LM: So, that leaves the reserves at about \$9,000.00?

PW: Roughly, yeah.

LM: And we also know that there are some people that are trying to get our surcharge down to \$15.00, so how long does that give us, about two months, right, the same reserves, so that's about two months worth of...?

PW: The reserves, yes. Remember the budget figures that you have are using the \$15.00 dollar amount, *(inaudible)*, so, if you don't change it, you will have more reserves.

(Council discussed Romero property-Fire Department)

PW: From the unappropriated fund balance, its \$268,000.00, we also have \$50,000.00 in a building reserve, so if you just took a look at those two together, you would be looking at about \$310k - \$315k right there or \$318k maybe.

CG: Could we bump the Cemetery Trust to 300, Historical Preservation, drop that one down to 50 and put the 100 over here...make this a 300?

PW: So, you would do a \$50,000.00 down out of Historical?

CG: Right. That part we might be able to still swing, it's 50, it's not 100.

LM: It's at \$59,000.00 now, so, we pay 50...are we talking about unappropriated or...?

PW: Yeah, I'm talking about the amount dedicated as a budget note for the 100. You're right, it's only 58 something, that's actually budgeted, you would have to do a supplemental budget to spend the...

DW: ...to spend that.

LM: Here's the thing, is that we had Public Works get up there, Public Works said, and I agree with them, *(inaudible)*, that we've got our funds, our reserves at a very low level. Okay, and if there is an emergency, I know people said you can shift from fund to fund, nevertheless, if you had an earthquake, you could have water, fire at the same time. It's not that they know about things, but we get these ideas, honestly, do we have the money to do them? Are we going to borrow from this fund and that...the only fund I can see that we don't have as an emergency fund is the Historic Preservation Fund, but that's the fund that you could, if you had an emergency, shift here and shift there. We almost have to envision this as if its one big fund and what do we need to have for emergencies. What is the thing, the 3 million or 5 million in our budget? I could look it up right now, but...

PW: It's 5.8

LM: So, our reserves should be what did people say, about 10% or something like that, or...ideally.

PW: No, you're thinking of the unappropriated in fund balancing...a percentage to it. But, reserves really are based on the assets that you want to replace and I don't have those figures yet, I've asked the Departments heads to work that up for you and give you targets from their perspective so, they can say they need X amount for fire equipment, Y for water, that sort of thing. I'm sorry I don't have the number right now; it's not a magic percentage.

LM: And can I ask what we would be willing to sell of our assets? In other words, if the fire location or the police locations are viable, if that's what we decide on, then are we willing to sell any other assets in order to make those happen.

PW: Those are definitely tough questions. Yes...and yet you'll have to make them. Because, if you don't; you're going to be looking strictly at bonds.

LM: People are not going to vote for those, I think it's a dream that they might.

JD: Yeah...the other thing to think about, you don't want to be thinking negatively, but here again we're still in a fairly tenuous economic state, we don't know, I mean you can see how many for rent signs and all that stuff that's out there, potentially you can get into a situation where the tax revenues goes down, you try to sell the property, the property isn't going to sell, so, you know, I mean, you want to...it would be great being on an up-swing in looking at this kind of stuff, you're saying, okay, we've

got some forward momentum, right now, at best, we're at stasis, you know, it's just hard to...

PW: The good part is; it's a good time to buy.

JD: I agree. That's if the economy is going to up-swing and it may, you know, it may be this year, it may be five years from now so, you don't know how long you're going to be able...and since we are so vulnerable with the tax receipts, I mean, that's the big...you know, because the commercial real estate is probably the only that hasn't really hit with this whole debacle.

DS: Commercial real estate has hit.

JD: Well, it's starting to now but, we haven't felt the full weight of it, I don't think.

DS: No, I don't think so either.

DW: There will be lags.

JD: Yeah so, it's going to lag so, that could potentially happen, then your Urban Renewal goes down, your tax funds go down and then you get into this impasse so, I mean, to have the reserves is probably the most responsible thing to do, I mean, at least for the City.

LM: What happens if you do nothing now, you try for the levy or the bond and it does pass and then you...you're going to say that these guys will be gone then, they want their money now because they have their emergency stuff that they are trying to cover, or whatever, right...

PW: You mean, back out on the deal? Gamble and let's put it on the market?

JD: That one, I think we should go for, personally, I think that that's the most viable thing we need, I would say that one would be the one that would be the first priority, that's my personal feeling on it.

DS: Well, I would say, Hinger and Romero. Because, in both cases, it adds to the value of adjacent properties big time and so, if anything, uh, and I don't know what we can do about that Cemetery thing right now, but, uh....

PW: His also, he would basically, uh, what do you call it? He would surplus it to his partners so; it would come off of Galpin's inventory bill or somebody else.

JD: So, it would still be in the tax rolls.

PW: It would still be in the tax rolls so; it would be in a residential zone.

JD: Yeah...yeah, I think we should prioritize these and that would, at least give us some...I mean, I'd go along with that too, I...you know, that's a real...it's a luxury almost at this point in some respects...the Galpin.

DS: To have that size of additional Cemetery property?

JD: As great as it would be and I think we could make it into a money maker, uh...

PW: Yes, you could get cemetery plot sales from it.

JD: Yeah, and I think there's even bigger things you could probably do there, but can you afford to gamble it at this point?

PW: Sandra, can you let Larry know that we are at Exec?

LM: It's a good price on that; I believe it's a good price on it, but you bring up a good point; if he gives back a part of it, because you know, (*inaudible*)....all of a sudden it becomes, uh...

PW: It would be a PUD of some sort.

JD: It isn't the end of the world, but...

BG: I think they are going to run out of plots in about five years or less and this is the only property around the Cemetery that's been made available, (*inaudible*), so, if we walk away from it now, we probably won't be getting anything down the road.

JD: Well, but then again, I mean I'm not saying that we should ignore that, but I mean, is the Cemetery, I don't know maybe, is it a big money maker for the City?

BG: If you just look at the current prices of cemetery lots and expect the number of lots you could put on that property, you're looking at getting about 1.6 million from an investment of about \$350,000.00.

JD: But, you've still got your maintenance costs that are going to go up to maintain a bigger...and I'm just wondering if the investment there, I mean, maybe that's another discussion we should have, is what is the cemetery? Is it a Historic Cemetery that we want to maintain its historic integrity and use it as that showplace or is it someplace that we want to provide gravesites for people in town? They're both viable options, but that maybe a discussion we should have before we...

LM: That's a good point because, when I was back in New England, there were cemeteries...they were done, they were like parks and people would walk through the park and have their moments in the cemetery, but they weren't adding to them, I mean that is a legitimate discussion.

PW: Yes, and if you do that...you can do that, and it can become a park and then you are stuck with just living off the interest of the Trust. Currently we don't do that, we actually supplement this with sales and opening and closing and other types of billings and just for your background, all of those are well over our budget this year, I don't know what that says about the economy, but there's 70%, 185%, 47% on those line items, cemetery lot sales, open and close, weekend burials so, if you no longer have it as an active cemetery, basically, you are going to have to rely entirely off of the interest or from subsidizing it in some other manner.

JD: So, basically now are we supporting it with the money that's coming in, is it a positive cash flow or negative or neutral?

PW: It's positive at this point.

JD: Like, how much?

PW: Let's see, uh, well, just looking at revenues to expenses so far this year, and this doesn't mean this is how the deal will end up, we're getting in about three times revenue as we are expenses. Now, that could change, you know, and if lot sales drop down and expenses are going faster than revenue, who knows? You can't always predict how it will turn out cash flow wise. We balance it in terms of revenues to expenses, we don't, well it's not quite balanced, we have lesser expenses than budgeted revenues, because we're building the reserves. So, we actually make more revenue and stash it away in the reserves.

JD: I guess again, it would be good to understand what the ramifications...rather than looking at it from one end and saying we can buy this and do this, trying to understand, what are we really trying to accomplish and what are our goals? I mean, I just hate to see us do things because they seem like a good opportunity and make decisions that we don't realize we're making.

LM: Well that we can't afford.

JD: Well potentially too and maybe...

LM: There are a lot of those things up in the air and a lot of those issues, not just things that cost money. They're not bad ideas; it's that, can we afford them? The timing with these people, they need their money now, just like it's a good opportunity for us to do it now, but can we afford it? It really comes down to that and uh, the balloon payment; I like the idea of trying to get the payment down each month, but the balloon payment is five years, dependant on a bond or surplus property. We've always talked about trying to sell something and everybody gets in a giant battle so, I don't know if we'll even be able to sell anything and the second thing is I don't know if we can pass a bond. Will we lose them all? Will we lose all those properties that's, *(inaudible)*, when we have invested our, you know, to go to this stage, and the new police thing and then find out that...five years we, *(inaudible)*.

PW: Now, five years is my recommendation, it is not set in stone. You can set it at whatever time you want and you are going to be negotiating with yourself if you fail to make that below so, the properties won't revert to the old owners, but you will have to negotiate them. The bottom line is you will have to pay them off, but in five years, if you are in dire straits, you can re-negotiate your own terms, which is the benefit of internal financing. The thing you can't do is absolve the loan.

JD: If you need that money from where it came from, that's the real issue.

PW: If that is needed, for whatever reason, it must be paid back according with the contract.

DS: Paul, where will the City be in five years as far as paying off the bonds that we've got right now?

PW: Water bonds are 30 year bonds; I think they are 20 to 30, somewhere in there. Sandra, do you remember?

SM: *(Inaudible)*.

PW: Water bonds are 30 year bonds, 30 year loans instituted in the mid 90's so, you're out there quite a ways.

JD: We kill all that with Public Safety.

CG: What do you mean?

JD: Well, as far as funding it. It's still up in the air as how we are going to...

CG: We have some numbers that will be coming to the next City Council meeting that will show the amount of staff, resources and the amount of money that will be needed to survive.

JD: It's just where it's going to come from.

CG: Yeah, that's the thing. You know, I think that we can still levy passed.

LM: We've can't spend the money ahead of time. You know in 62 years, and this is personal philosophy, that's how people approach money, my husband and I would not have bought something without having the money here to pay for it, even if we bought it on time, we always know if it's something we could have paid for it and I don't think the City should spend money until it has the money in its hand to spend it. I don't know if we should count a bond or a levy, I don't think we should obligate ourselves to a debt until we know if a bond or a levy gets passed. It's too risky.

JD: Yeah, you've got probably less than a 50% chance that it's going to pass.

LM: *(Inaudible)*.

DS: I do appreciate Devin's attitude towards this that he can make do and I think the community will appreciate that and I also think that community picking up that property right next door would be good. To me that's good sense from a couple of different ways of looking at it, if we do anything with that property or sometime in the future, uh, we surplus it, we've got more.

CG: I agree with that, um, I think of the three, that is one that I think would benefit the police, it would benefit the fire, um, and the community so, I am all up for buying that one. The other two, I mean, I would...we...did Romero say how much he wanted for it?

PW: He agreed to operate off of an appraisal and he's paying half the appraisal cost billing and he was thinking it was going to be somewhere around \$128,000.00 range, is that right? I can't remember...he thought it would be around 120 something. But, he doesn't have a firm price, he said to tell him if we are interested and then let's get an appraisal and he's splitting the cost of the appraisal with us.

LM: *(Inaudible)*.

PW: Only if it's a revenue producing property, he doesn't want something that still didn't float the church past it.

JD: He's a minister in the universal order.

PW: Maybe he'd jump at the chance. So, if you had something that would produce a revenue source, he could go with, *(Inaudible)*.

JD: You know the other is just talking about what people will think, just the optics of this, three...you know, three fairly hefty purchases, you know, what, you know, I don't usually worry about that, but I mean, if I was a citizen and seeing this happening at a time like this, you'd have to turn your head and say, you know, what's going on here? It would seem excessive on some level, I mean, since there's three of them. I've never been involved with anything that's been this, you know, a purchase this large that the City has made, that I can remember.

DS: Well, two of them, the Romero and Hinger, to me, are just good sense.

JD: They can be justified.

DS: I think that's how the community would take it too, that far range planning, way, way, way down in the future, to acquire all of that block. We've got an opportunity, at this point, to pick it up and we need to do that.

JD: I agree with that. The Hinger is definitely a no-brainer to me.

DW: I agree with you there.

BG: Are we looking at Hinger as number one, Romero as number two and Galpin as number three? (JD,

DS, & DW: All agreeing.) That's what I'm hearing.

PW: Do you want to proceed with this first outline here...with Hinger this way? And then, I can bring these two back to you at your next meeting? Because, I'll have the dollars here.

DW: Good idea, yeah.

LM: Can we revisit this again? Does it have to be decided tonight, I mean, I know...

DW: We can't bring it back.

PW: You mean the whole thing? No...

JD: We've got to move on that thing.

DW: We've got to move on that.

BG: Our appraisal's come in at 300, ballparkish, we're going to be paying 288 so, right there, will make it \$12,000.00

DW: That's a no-brainer right there.

JD: And again, just the optics of the thing would be better, just getting this one in the past and if we do whatever we do next, will be a whole other thing.

CG: That's actually a good idea...that makes it, maybe we even do all three, sort of...but, let's do one and get the other two...let people digest that, (JD: And us too.), I mean, are they in that big of a hurry?

PW: Who's "they?"

CG: Galpin and Romero.

PW: Yes, Galpin has to streamline his inventories for his own financing reasons and Romero is offering us first right of refusal if we don't wish to proceed, then he'll put that on the market. He didn't say you have to do this by December 10th, no, but, (CG: Within a couple of months), right. So, I think they both expect a reasonable answer; are you playing or not?

BG: So, I'm hearing that we are going to move on Hinger and we still want to play with Galpin and Romero?

CG: Yes.

PW: Okay, I will bring it back to your next meeting with more details as it comes.

LM: Okay, I would like us to think about, I mean, if we go ahead with Hinger, and we borrow the Historic Preservation Funds, they are not going to want a 30 year thing, I doubt.

PW: That's just an amortization; it's a five year balloon so, they will get their money back in five years. You're amortizing for 30 years from the first, (*Inaudible*). So, it will be made whole at the end of five years.

LM: I think we should decide what piece of property we would sell if we have to meet that in five years.

PW: Do you want to start that tonight?

LM: Well, I think if we are being reasonable and no bond passes, what are we going to do in five years if we have to meet that obligation. That's \$250,000.00 for amount of money we would be taking out each month; I just think we should think about that.

CG: Do we still have a list of our properties that we could...

PW: Offer?

DW: Just in case.

PW: Yes, we do. The most common recommended one from staff has been Scheffel Park; it's a vacant parcel, 100 by 100, zoned Historic Core, it has a path through it, and a bench. So, it's not a high-use park and very marketable. The other one is the church (referring to the Anglican church).

CG: How much is the church?

PW: We haven't done an appraisal on that.

CG: I've always wanted to own a church.

JD: Oh, the 'Alice's Restaurant' thing.

CG: I'd love to own a church. That would be a kick.

PW: The church can be retrofitted to other uses; it's zoned Historic Core. The City would probably want to put an historic easement on it to make sure the building retains its integrity and an historic easement on the rose garden to retain its integrity. It probably would have to have several easements on it.

CG: Now, I'm not interested at all.

PW: Several easements on it would bring the value down, but there would still be a market for it.

LM: If you had to choose between the Brunner Building and the Romero extra land for the fire department, what would be the choice? You said that Romero was willing to do a trade for the Brunner Building, so if that were the choice between the Brunner Building and Romero property, what would be the choice. I know it brings up an argument we had a couple months ago, but this is about priorities and decisions, so

BG: It would place it back on the tax roll.

JD: It would be commercial.

LM: Sometimes we have to make choices. If everyone feels the land next to the fire station is important, then

DS: I don't think that's one I'd want to throw out to the community. That would be a real tough one. The City is stuck with the Brunner Building. We need to hang onto that one and preserve it. The idea of picking up the Romero land is a good one and the community would support it, but not at the expense of letting the Brunner Building go.

CG: I agree with that. If we

JD: I think there's a vocal minority. If the general population were privy to the same information we're privy to, I have no doubt that if it were put to a vote in this town, it would be overwhelming support that public safety is more important and that we need to do that, that we need to get a commercial building back on the tax rolls. It just makes more economic sense to do that, just purely numbers.

BG: I hate to end this, but we need to start the City Council meeting.

JD: I think it's a discussion we should have. . .