

Motion

Council Member Gipson stated that he anticipated that furlough days would start at the top and go to the bottom and moved to lift the cap, which was seconded by Davis-Holmes.

During discussion of the motion, Council Member Gipson commented that he liked the suggestion of the City Manager to lift the cap as long as there were furloughs.

Motion Restated

Council Member Gipson clarified and restated that his motion as originally offered to remove the cap, which Davis-Holmes concurring.

Substitute Motion (Not Considered)

Council Member Santarina offered a substitute motion to not remove the cap, which was not considered due to lack of a second.

During discussion of the motion, Council Member Ruiz-Raber referred to the UUT and stated that she wanted to retract her exemption and would be paying her 2% UUT; Mayor Dear felt that if the economy were to improve, it would be a simple process to reinstate the cap; and Council Member Davis-Holmes stated that she could not support saving money for a company, as compared to employee furloughs or layoffs.

Substitute Motion

Council Member Ruiz-Raber offered a substitute motion to remove the \$1M UUT cap during difficult times for the City.

Upon inquiry, Council Member Ruiz-Raber defined "difficult times" as a budget deficit and considering reductions in staff by furlough or layoff and clarified that her substitute motion covered all the years that Carson was having problems; whereupon, Mayor Dear seconded the substitute motion.

During discussion of the substitute motion, Council Member Gipson felt that \$600 could restore special events and Council Member Davis-Holmes inquired whether difficult times included if the City had to dip into the reserves to balance the budget. Whereupon, Mayor Dear clarified that it was not included in the substitute motion.

Council Member Gipson expressed concern about having to dip into the reserves and a discussion ensued.