I. DECLARATION OF QUORUM.
With quorum present, Ald. Jean Baptiste called the meeting to order at 7:08 p.m.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING of April 12, 2005
They could not be approved because there was no quorum present.

III. ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION ON COUNCIL AGENDA
(A1) City of Evanston Payroll through 04/21/05 $2,309,840.32
(A2) City of Evanston Bills through 04/26/05 $3,309,069.05
(A3.2) A request that we approve the sole source contracts with Hasting Air Energy Control in the amount of $17,561.00 for vehicle exhaust vent equipment for fire stations #1 and #2. This is funded in the fire department’s fiscal year 2005-2006 operating budget.

(A3.3) Is a request that we approve on contract removal of Steve’s Equipment Service for the amount of $18,462.00 for annual rental of a loader and excavator for sand removal. This is funded in the Parks Forestry Recreation Department Budget for fiscal year of 2005-2006.

(A3.4) Is a request that we approve the lowest responsive and responsible bid from George W. Kennedy Construction Company for the 2005 cured in place pipe lining contract at a cost of $185,795.00. This is funded in the Water fund.

(A3.5) Is a request that we approve the lowest responsive and responsible bid from Crescent Printing, Inc. for printing quarterly Highlights in the amount not to exceed $17,910.00. This is funded in the fiscal year 2005-2006 operating budget for Community Information Coordinator in the City Manager’s office.

(A3.6) Is a request that we approve a contract extension with for Hammerschlag and Company for an amount not to exceed $45,000.00 for parking garage consulting services. This is funded by the TIF fund.

(A4) Resolution 23-R-05 – Fence License - A request that we approve Ordinance 23R-05 granting a fence license to 3428 Park Place.

(A6) Resolution 22-R-05 – Authorizing a Lease Agreement - Is a request that we approve Resolution 22-R-05, authorizing City Manager to enter into a Lease Removal Agreement with the League of Women Voters for office space in the Evanston City Civic Center. Located at 2100 Ridge Avenue.

(A9) Ordinance 50-O-05 Increasing Class B – Liquor Licenses - Request that we approve Ordinance 50-O-05, amending Section 3 5-6(b) of the City Code of Evanston, increasing the number of Class B liquor licenses by one from 1 to 12 for Golden Olympic, located at 1608 Chicago Avenue.

Items: (A1), (A2), (A3.1), (A3.2), (A3.3), (A3.4), (A3.5), (A3.6), (A4), (A6), (A9), (A10) were considered on a consent agenda. Aforementioned items were motioned and passed unanimously.
(A7) Ordinance 51-O-05 Amending Title 3 of the City Code
Request that we approve Ordinance 51-O-05 Amending Title 3 of the City Code - increasing the parking tax.

(A11) Ordinance 46-O-05 Elm Tree Injection Program
Consideration of proposed Ordinance 46-O-05 establishing an Elm Tree Injection.

Ald. Rainey: Some of my best friends love Elm trees, however, when I read through this, I thought, I think I made a terrible mistake in supporting this, but secondly, I though, this is a nightmare and if anybody has a way to fix the way we are going to administer it, I could change my mind. But reading through this, people who refuse to pay for elm injections and/or people who refuse to have their own Elm tree injected that are close to one of the parkway owned trees, then we will not inject the Elm. But then to think that the billing is going to be on the water bill because our universal form of billing in Evanston, that if you can't pay to have your Elm injected, or you resist it – you're an injection resister, then you could have your water shut off. If we don't shut off your water, then we will have no way to force you to pay to have your Elm tree injected. Those are the things that really concern me. I just worry. I think I had a knee jerk reaction to finding a way to support the community that wanted Elm trees, but I can tell you that many, many letters were received by me after this saying, "How dare you." You never told me about this. You told me that we were supporting this form of the program, the staff recommendation. I don't care if you support everybody’s trees, all parkway trees being injected. But nobody told me that I had to pay and several people I know I have written to the Mayor demanding a public hearing, because this is a very unique situation, where we are making people pay for stuff going on the parkway. Having said that, I would really like, I don’t know if we can have a public hearing in our next counsel meeting or what, but people should be entitled to know this. If we want to raise the liquor tax one penny a drink, we mail stuff to every single person who sells liquor and the tax and if we want to raise the restaurant tax one penny, the chamber of commerce, everybody in the world is notified personally. If we want to just speak the landlord/tenant ordinance. Every single human being in the City of Evanston, who owns rental property, gets a notice. Whether it’s going to cost them anything or not, but we have people that have three or four trees in their parkway. There not poor, but they really can’t afford or don’t have the inclination to contribute. In a nut shell, those are some of the problems. I feel badly for people that voted to make them do something that I didn’t warn them about. You’re hearing a lot of guilt here, but I still think the community would have reacted differently if a month before we passed this, we’ve said, "Oh, here’s
what we are looking at. We are looking at a 50/50 split on the parkways. I think we would have had a different kind of interaction with the public had we said that. I apologize for it.

Ald. Moran: I’m opposed to this on a number of fronts. The first summary for its face value, says that this particular ordinance gives the City the authority to implement an injection program to collect the residents share of the cost and to invoke penalties for non-payment. So this ordinance requires an approval of three separate items. First of all based on our staff’s report in relation to this issue, before the injection program was approved. I find the injection program based on the experts opinions, virtually universal expert opinions to be risky and unsafe. To the Elm tree population of Evanston. So I object to that instance. The second reason I objected to it was that without any warning at all, this program was approved, predicated upon the contingency that none of the citizenry had obtained any notice that would require citizens to pay half of the injection cost. No one ever said that that was part of the proposal and if someone had said that it was part of the proposal months and months before this vote was taken. It would have been an interesting exercise in democracy, which this particular approval of this program was not in my opinion. But it would have been an interesting exercise in democracy because when you reach down into someone’s pocket book, they have a tendency to start paying attention. Which they were not given the opportunity to do at least to that extent and I received a lot of those emails suggesting that this was done under the radar without notice without any effort to reach out to the citizenry to see whether there was a consensus to go along with this, we’re not. Thirdly, there is a peculiarity to the premise of this 50/50 program. And the peculiarity has been adverted to me by Ann, which is that there are blocks in Evanston, where people have two or three Elm trees on one parkway and none on the next parkway and maybe several on the next lot. None on the next lot and prior to the vote of this program, there had been blocks in Evanston that had decided that they would inject the parkway Elms and the decision was made on the basis that the people who lived on that block would share the costs of those injections. This is on a private sector basis, not a public sector basis. And the decision that was made on that basis was made on the notion that an Elm tree on one persons land was probably a benefit to the person who lived next door to the lot that the Elm tree was based on. There was an accumulative decision to share in the costs of that injection and it was recognized that the benefit of the person whose property was adjacent to the parkway. It’s all the people on that block. That was an exercise of democratic progress, this is not. The next objection that I have to is that I was stunned that the suggestion in this program was that those non-consented unnoticed Evanstonians could be told at some point that they could no longer
get water because they won’t pay their demanded 50/50 share of the cost of the injection, which frightened me. You know, after this vote was taken some time ago, there were discussions about tree liens, that people who might not want to make this payment might have a lien placed on their property, which is an interesting concept but, it would have at least allowed that person who when they sold their house ten years (10) later could have their Elm tree payments made as I suppose disbursed out of their closing proceeds on the sale of their house. In this instance, the people who didn’t want to pay for this apparently can’t shower or get a drink of water anymore. I find that startling, so I’m opposed to this.

**Ald Jean-Baptiste:** I think we have to separate the issues. One the counsel voted 7 to 1 a month and a half ago.

**Ald. Rainey:** 6 to 2.

**Ald. Jean-Baptiste:** You and Liz, 6 to 2, to implement an injection program for all public Elms. We had some work to do. One of the tasks was to do the survey, to determine where we are and how many Elms we have to deal with. I don’t know where the survey is now. Is it done?

**Doug Gaynor:** 90% is done.

**Ald. Jean-Baptiste:** We’ll get a report maybe in about 30 days.

**Doug Gaynor:** Less than that, by the end of the month.

**Ald. Jean-Baptiste:** That’s one. The second thing was that we ask our staff, the Legal Department, to come back with a process of implementation. They made some suggestions. This is not, the process that they suggested, the trying to building potential home owner’s through their water bills, etc., these are the suggestions at this particular point and time. That the counsel can accept or reject or use different processes. I don’t think that we need to raise the gloom and doom of people who will thirst to death, they run around dirty and unable to take a bath. In fact, spread disease throughout the masses. But what I’m saying is the ordinance is a proposal as to how we implement our collective decision. I know that you voted “No”, but we have to put it in prospective and not raise the ultimate fear as we address how we go forward. I think the sentiments of the public that participated in the process was that we needed to do something and inject the Elms. The next thing is, Yes, people now have to face the costs. The counsel did vote to implement a share costs policy and if this is revolting in terms of the method is being proposed, we need to take a close look at that. I think that the sentiment of the counsel and the public was that we inject the Elms. I would not be opposed to some kind of public discussions as to how we pay for it and let the people respond to this proposal to share the costs 50/50. But I think that we need to see it from the prospective that this is only a proposal estimate, right now and not reflective of the counsels positions as to what the trade offs need to be. Okay, I think there is still something we are debating with discussing and we have to put it in prospective. I would separate
the three (3) items myself. We don’t need an ordinance to do this. We have already decided to inject the public Elms. We need an ordinance to carry out that process but not necessarily one to put it to cement our decision. I think the process is what’s still outstanding. I would be open to public discussions because I too heard from people who said we would have liked to have had notice. Although, people did have notice of the decision around the Elm trees injection program, but by the time we came to a decision as to how to get that done. You are right, there was no more time left and we had to pass the budget and people didn’t get wind of the thought of possibly having to share the costs. I wouldn’t be closed to some public discussion but I do think we have to try to find a way to separate those issues.

**Ald. Rainey:** The key issue here is the concept of injecting all the public Elms that is the key issue. I think this is every bit as big as three crowns, Kendal College and I think we should have had a special meeting. I think we should definitely post notices of a public hearing. I absolutely think so. I want to see the results of the survey. What public Elms do we really have? Here’s an issue in the staff presentation that is very upsetting. That is, if the resident declines to inject their private elm, the threatened public elm will not be injected. Now, having said that, or having included that in the whole concept, I don’t think how that might end of being more abusive to our elms then simply doing the signature elms on the public parkway. What if that elm that is near a private property elm is a specimen elm? An historic tree...goodbye. That resident can make a decision and I think we would be hard pressed to force them to inject their own elm trees on private property. If that decision is made, then we are not injecting that public elm. Let’s say that there are two (2) elms down the street, what’s the point of injecting them. I don’t know, maybe we should do those, but it’s a nightmare. I think that any policy that results in this much chaos is something that should be relooked at. I just feel very perplexed about it.

**Ald. Jean-Baptiste:** I understand the sense of your saying that you would want it separate. It make sense okay, between the notion of injecting all the elms vs. the signature elms and then the implementation of process. The reality is this, you can’t separate them, because the plain facts of the matter that the schedule here demands that we have a commitment of financial resources to do that. If you want to take time to figure out how we’ll do that in both hearings and so forth. I suppose that’s okay, but the fact is that we haven’t done that yet and if we would do that in an open fashion to literally give people an opportunity to speak to it, what specter is raised by that is that we don’t have the money to pay for a program that we’re approving tonight. We haven’t made that commitment. Because what you’re saying is that the judgment “budget” for this program is
predicated upon the 50% of infusion of capital that we haven’t
decided yet. It’s not covered, if we are going to continue to explore
the 50/50 aspect.

**Ald. Rainey:** We are not approving this tonight.

**Ald. Jean-Baptiste:** I think that the discussion tonight is whether or not there is
room for us to make modification in the proposed ordinance. The
suggestion that we not inject an elm if a resident objects so we need to
look at that, we need to consider different options. We also need to have
a clear sense of costs based on the survey and to how many trees we
need to inject. What would be the cost of the homeowners and how would
that money be and/or can that money be collected over time that then
perhaps reduces the amount the individual have to pay for something that
is not significant. I don’t know what I would be faced with if there was an
elm in front of my house that I needed to inject or in my yard. I don’t know
what my share would be. Suppose it $3.00 per month for the next three
years. I may see that this is something I am able to manage, but if it’s
$75.00 a month for the next three years, I may not be able to manage.
We’re back again to a position of having to be confronted with some of the
decisions without all the facts and it is essential that we get the survey in
before we even move forward on this issue. I would move to hold this until
we get the survey, we make a real assessment as to what the problem is
and then we can weigh all of the other issues.

**Ald. Rainey:** Excellent suggestion. Second

**Julia Carroll:** Can I just ask a question of Doug? So that means as soon as we
would have information regarding the final survey would be at the first
meeting in May? Or you think the end of April?

**Doug Gaynor:** We would expect no longer than the first meeting in May with that
information.

**Julia Carroll:** Okay. So that is fine. The question I have is do you want to get
that information amended and decide if you want a public hearing or do
you want us…

**Doug Gaynor:** I think we need to get the information really.

**Julia Carroll:** First, and then you may decide to hold a public hearing. I just
need to clarify what we should be preparing for.

**Mimi Peterson:** I’m Mimi Peterson and I have been working with members of
T.R.E.E. for the last three years and I am very glad that you told us. This
is not something that anybody as a member of T.R.E.E. has advocated
for. It was passed at City Council without the opportunity for anybody to
speak to us was terrible. The suggestion to put it on the water bill is
unthinkable and I feel that even dragging along with this survey for far to
long and we can’t make the decision that you’re discussing without the
survey because we don’t know how many trees, we don’t how much
money – to hold, but I do think that you do need to have the public
hearing. I think you need to schedule and have the public hearing because
as Ald. Moran pointed out that it’s something that you’ve already past in
the budget in the 50/50 program, that nobody had any input into it. I
personally and many, many members of T.R.E.E. that we talked to in the
last three days, were outraged by this proposal. It is not one that we have endorsed or supported and we are not in favor of it in its present form and we are very strongly in favor of a public hearing.

**Ald. Baptiste:** The proposal is to hold this and it has been seconded and all in favor say “I”.

**Julia Carroll:** So we would hold this.

**Ald. Baptiste:** Until we hold until we get the survey. I tend to think there needs to be some analysis of the survey. We should not get the survey and then we have to do the addition, subtraction and multiplication.

**Julia Carroll:** Let me just explain the reason we put this on. We thought we were directed to come back with a program and that we wanted to get this adopted with the current counsel, so that was the rationale behind in trying to get this done and we will have the costs.

**Ald. Baptiste:** I don’t think we can go as far as even raising. – I don’t agree with the criticism that this is unconscionable at this point and time because we don’t know. We don’t know what the obligation will be, we only know when we’ll have the survey and the analysis.

**Mimi Peterson:** If I could just add, that the model that we ought to be looking at in St. Louis Park, Minnesota, is a voluntary program. It is not a mandatory program that is being implemented. I think that the idea that in the first paragraph, we are talking about penalties, fines and water being shut off. Is a disincentive to move forward with the program that I think that most people are in favor of. The people were not in favor, nor were they asked if they wanted to participate in the 50/50 sharing program. It is a model that we can look at and try to model something afterward, but to take this as the “be all” and our only opportunity or alternative is wrong headed. I think we need to do and craft something that works for our community and I certainly think that having had no discussion with regards to a 50/50 program and asking people who you said have three and four trees on their properties. They don’t even know that this is being done. Members of T.R.E.E. have always advocated for the injection of all of the parkway elms, which we have continuously stated. Can we afford it by the forestry department budget that we currently have? So to do this in its present form will be double taxing residences asking people to pay that are already paying in terms of paying in terms of the budget that we have for Park and Forestry an additional sums, these people would be paying out of their own pocket, which is more than unreasonable. And without having further discussion in looking at other ways, other models in other communities are more than unreasonable. Without having further discussion and looking at other ways and other models have been pointed to similar to this and that are not mandated including shutting off your water. We don’t need anything else added on to our water. Nothing else.

**Ald. Baptiste:** The discussion will continue to go on. We submit your analysis again for consideration, but I think we have to put it in perspective what is before us. What is before us is not a decision, it is a proposal for a consideration and I or some other people have been given this particular
task maybe we would not have come at it from this prospective to implement because the council did pass this particular decision.

**Mimi Peterson:** With no input though.

**Ald. Baptiste:** I don’t think that’s where the criticism lies in us getting all the information so we understanding what we are really doing at this particular point and time.

**Mimi Peterson:** Let me make one point that has nothing to do with trees. The water bill - that whole process went to an envelope mail in, so that when we mail things we could include other things in that. That was a highly efficient and very smart economic decision and that’s where if we do a 50/50 program that is where you are going to get the bill. I won’t support any other way. We are not going to spend anymore postage. Its right there and all set up to do that. That’s how it’s going to be. I don’t want to foreclose on people if they.

**Ald. Baptiste:** I don’t think we are there.

**Ald. Rainey:** I guarantee that if you cut off their water they pick the ????. It's a full proof method, although I don’t like it at all. I hate it. I don’t like it for special pickup – for anything.

**Ald. Baptiste:** Okay. We will move on to

**Ald. Rainey:** Worst than that, I don’t like the idea that a person can make a decision not to inject their private trees resulting in the death of the park tree. That I don’t like at all.

**Ald. Baptiste:** I hear you. Well, we will consider all these issues and .....

**Ald. Rainey:** I think it was a good report. It’s a make sense report, it’s just when you see it on paper; it’s exactly what I hear.

**Lee McIsaac:** I have a question. Will we still get a chance to speak if we signed up to speak or are we skipping that? I just want to address one thing and its okay to use the chalk board. Ald. Rainey brought a good point about the anarchy of somebody choosing not to inject their own private tree, which could impact a significant. What if this is like a signature elm which is on the parkway. Let’s say this is a private and you could in fact cross. They could in fact cross; they could wick wacky on each other. So what you saying that if this person refuses to vaccinate this tree according to the ordinance as the way it is written, we will choose to vaccinate this public tree. What I’m say is, this is my personal view, is that we could still vaccinate this public tree even though this resident has decided not to vaccinate theirs and our own Forestry Department can protect it because if this tree gets Dutch elm disease, it will start at the top and its going to work its way down on the tree and hopefully our scouts can keep it on their “A list”. Okay, this is a very important tree, we just cut more off than the normal instead of every two weeks, because it is an Elm tree. The scouts are watching this tree a lot and if it gets Dutch Elm’s disease, it gets tagged and has to be cut down within 30 days.

**Mimi Peterson:** You’re forgetting one thing. If a person doesn’t want to inject their private tree they are sure not going to pay half to do their public tree. So that we means that we have to do their public trees injected, which may or may not protect the trees?
Lee McIsaac: I don’t know if this is mandatory or not I don’t know. I’m just saying that this tree can be cut down fast enough that the disease does not move this way all the way down to the roots and can impact this tree.

Ald. Rainey: Or the case where I watched for about six months in administrative adjudication that had a totally stone dead palm tree right next to the tree and …. That’s reality, it’s not a made up story. So if this person is that resistant to participating, they are probably not going to have the commitment to spend a couple a thousand dollars to have their private tree to cut down. That’s all I’m saying.

Lee McIsaac: If it was tagged and it went past three days will the city come to cut it down and wouldn’t they just get a bill.

Ald. Rainey: Well, we got to try and get them to do it. That was eventually happens. I think a lot of people that complain maybe won’t really have that much of a problem with it. I don’t know.

Ald. Baptiste: Well, some of the options that people face is that they don’t inject parkway elms, they don’t participate. The ultimate penalty of the $3,000 to remove that elm tree is something that many citizens would not choose, but it depends on what that bill will be. We don’t know, so that why we will have to come back and go over.

Ald. Rainey: What do we know about the cost of injection and how much is it and do we know the latest information it would costs per elm.

Paul D’Agostino: It could be from $6.00 to $25.00 and we have the bids in but we haven’t analyzed them yet. This was suppose to be on your council agenda on the 25th along with the adoption of the ordinance and I am assuming from the discussion if it continues along these lines, that we will now bring it to you in the first meeting in May. Our estimate all along has been about $150.00 for a 50% share, so $300.00 a tree $150.00 and it actually would come out about $3.00 and change at the most. If that was in fact the case.

Ald. Rainey: And that would be about a 20 inch tree.

(Paul D’Agostino: Our average is 26 – 28 inches.

Ald. Rainey: And that about $10.00 an inch.

Paul D’Agostino: Its about $10.00 or $11.00.

Ald. Baptiste: Let’s cross that bridge later.

(A7) Ordinance 51-O-05 Amending Title 3 of the City Code
Consideration of proposed Ordinance 51-O-05 amending Title 3 of the City Code, increasing the parking tax. For Introduction

(A8) Ordinance 52-O-05 Amending Title 10 of the City Code
Request that we approve Ordinance 50-O-05, amending Section 10-11-12; Schedule XII of the City Code, increasing parking meter rates.

Ald. Rainey: One thing I read through all of this and then I got concerned. If we could go to page 5, people who are responsible for the parking committee. David, on page 5, a parking lot No. 16 – Noyes El Station. Is this the current rate proposed? .25¢ or three hours or is this the existing rate.
**David Jennings:** In some lots, we don’t ultimately control the rates and this may be one of them. The lot on Popular which goes north and south on central; we have an agreement with the owner of about a 1/3 of those spaces. The front 1/3 is actually on Metra land and so there are agreements in some of these lots that control the costs. It’s technically a commuter lot and it serves the neighborhood and I agree may be that it’s a commuter lot.

**Ald. Rainey:** It is important that I understand that before. I just can’t accept that. To me the longer the maximum allowed, the higher the price should be per hour. Because that’s a huge benefit to whoever’s parking there. It serves the neighborhood, but our agreement made be that it’s a commuter lot.

**Ald. Rainey:** What I think that would make sense to reduce rates, not to rates at least on the short term, downtown, I mean we keep it two hours, we are doing our job. It seems to me that the downtown commercial district parking. I mean, we are very unfriendly now with enforcement, which I understand we have to be and it doesn’t bother me a bit that people get tickets. I think to charge them more and then give them tickets. If there was a way you could.

**Dave Jennings:** We are not recommending that in this package. The downtown two hour rates remain the same, but what we are doing is equalizing the outline parking districts.

**Ald. Rainey:** We are going to keep downtown the same.

**Dave Jennings/Bill Stafford:** We are trying to make outlying lots equal.

**Ald. Rainey:** Okay, I take it back.

**Julia Carroll:** For the meters.

**Ald. Baptiste:** The rationale for maintaining the .25¢ for three hours. You are going to give us verification.

**Ald. Rainey:** They are going to give us a memo.

**Dave Jennings:** There are some out lots where we may not have this issue.

**Ald. Rainey:** Well, I’m interested in lots 16, 19, 27, 42 and 53.

**Bill Stafford:** There are lots that are not $.50¢ an hour

**Ald. Rainey:** Lot 54. On Chicago Avenue on the east side of the street from Howard going north are there meters there now.

**Bill Stafford/Dave Jennings:** Yes.

**Ald. Rainey:** When was the last time anybody got a ticket on Howard Street between Ridge and Chicago Avenue.

**Dave Jennings:** I can find out. Ald. Rainey I’m on that street 15 times a week. I have never seen a parking meter unless the city was having a meeting at the outpost that had money in it. Ever, ever, ever. Also, something I wanted to ask about is the business in front of the Surgical Center. I never got a response on my reaction to the suggestion that we do it. I don’t even remember what the suggestion was.

**Ald. Baptiste:** It was suggested that we take away that two hour limit.

**Dave Jennings:** Trying to provide some longer terms spacing.

**Ald. Rainey:** I never got a response.
Dave Jennings: I apologize.
Ald. Baptiste: There was a suggestion that we hold this in committee and its for introduction anyway.
Ald. Rainey: There is also a request I saw by Newman to return it to the parking committee, so it’s not going anywhere soon.
__________ We should introduce it and refer it back to parking.
Julia Carroll: We are not going to refer it back to the committee
Ald. Rainey: We want it to come back here – both place.
Dave Jennings: Then may I make a suggestion to keep those two together. The 51 and 52 ordinances are one package.
Ald. Baptiste: Okay. 51 and 52.
Ald. Rainey: I always heard to be very careful about raising rates because of the county tax.
Dave Jennings: We covered that.
Ald. Rainey: Well you didn’t cover that in the memo.
Dave Jennings: It didn’t say it in the memo, but we covered the rates. We have to stay under 60 a month for our actual fee to not be subjected to the county tax and I think what we’ve given you was the total fee including the packets and then we will back into and restructure our rates so that we are not subjected to that $10.00 a month city/county tax.
Ald. Rainey: Okay.
Ald. Baptiste: Okay, so 7 and 8 will be held in committee. Both of them will be referred to parking. They will come back to us and we can always bend or suspend the rules if we need to.
Dave Jennings: Do you want parking
Ad. Baptiste: You want 7 to go to parking as well.
Julia Carroll: He wants 7 and 8, and your parking committee date is the 29th.
Dave Jennings: The 29th - we have a special meeting.

IV. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

V. COMMUNICATIONS
Emergency purchase for a street sweeper.

VI. ADJOURNMENT
There being no further business before the Committee, it adjourned at 8:18 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Dolores Y. Cortez
City Manager’s Office