ADMINISTRATION & PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

MINUTES

Monday, April 25, 2005
6:58 p.m. – 8:36 p.m.

Evanston Civic Center
Room 2404


Members Absent: none

Staff Present: Chief Berkowsky, Bill Stafford, Bobbie Tolston-Brown, Dave Stoneback, Doug Gaynor, Zeltee Edwards, David Cook, David Jennings, Max Rubin, Donna Stuckert, Vincent Jones, Bob Dornecker, Kathy Brenniman, Elke Purze, Ellen Szymanski, Pat Casey, Division Chief Kelly, Dolores Y. Cortez

Others Present: Unidentified others

Presiding: Ald. Feldman, Chair

I. DECLARATION OF QUORUM.
With quorum present, Ald. Feldman called the meeting to order at 6:58 p.m.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING of April 12, 2005
Ald. Jean-Baptiste: There were some issues, you want to discuss them?
Ald. Rainey: I thought the minutes were way too sparse. I think we need to embellish them a little more, a little more of what we say. I know in my case there was a sentence, I think I spoke with disdain or something, I mean I know I was upset but, I don’t want to read what somebody else thought I was feeling. So if we could just say what we said. I just didn’t think the minutes did it.

Ald. Feldman: Could you, could we look back on some reasonably recent minutes that you would say would be exemplary or the kind of detail that you want. I’m sure whatever you want you’ll get.

Ald. Rainey: Well, I know that Gene. I just wanted to make a point that this was not that. Everything that we’ve always gotten has been fine.

Ald. Feldman: Well I would suggest that staff look back on some previous minutes and try to approximate that, and if there’s any questions you can talk to senior any staff. Is that okay?
Dolores Cortez: Sure, Yes, that’s fine.
Ald. Jean-Baptiste: Just a product of her newness. That’s all.
Ald. Feldman: It’s just getting familiar with this stuff.
Ald. Rainey: And when there’s no discussion, when there’s no discussion when things are on the consent agenda I mean, this is exactly what you would expect to see, so that’s not the issue. But the items that are discussed…okay that’s it.
Ald. Feldman: Well, having said that. Are there any corrections?
Ald. Rainey: No
Ald. Jean-Baptiste: Let me just suggest that…I think it’s in the same light, right, that for example, the tree discussion. There were some intervention by Mimi Peterson I think we had a couple other people who spoke as well, it may have just needed to have added and from their particular organization, their tree organization. And this has been a history of discussion and debate around this issue. So for continuity sake, I think probably need to add that…(Ald. Feldman began speaking)
Ald. Feldman: I think that this deserves an amendment to it. I think that’s a very good point. Find out who the people were that spoke and label the organization because as Ald. Jean-Baptiste said, they’ve been to this committee meeting many times before. Okay. Anything else? Thank you very much. There are no additions other than the ones that have been suggested and we’ve amended those. All those in favor of approval of the minutes as amended indicate by saying “I”.

Unanimous vote of approval by Alderman.

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

(A3.1) Approval of the lowest responsive and responsible bid from Home Towne Electric, Inc. in the amount of $169,782.60 for Traffic Signal Modernization at Dodge Avenue and Church Street Intersection. Funded by Motor Fuel Tax (MFT) and Capital Improvement Program (CIP) funds for FY 2005-06.

(A3.2) Approval of the lowest responsive and responsible bid from Schroeder & Schroeder in the amount of $99,725.00, for FY 2005-06 50/50 Sidewalk and Curb Replacement Program. Funded by General Obligation (GO) Bond Funds.

(A3.6) Approval of contract with Virchow Kraus & Company for Water and Sewer Cost of Services and Fee Study in the amount of $41,000. Funded by Water and Sewer funds.
(A4.1) Approval of Change Order No. 1 for Roof Consulting Services for the repair/replacement of a portion of the roof at the Police/Fire Headquarters with an increased cost of $4,700.00 to the original contract amount of $63,010.99. Funded by Police/Fire Roof CIP account.

(A4.2) Approval of Contract Amendment No. 1 to Agreement with MWH Americas, Inc. for Phase X – Contract B Relief Sewer Program Engineering Services.

(A5) Resolution 27-R-05 – Authorizing a Lease Agreement - Consideration of proposed Resolution 3-R-05 authorizing the City Manager to enter into a Lease Agreement for the apartment at the Civic Center, located at 1223 Simpson Street. For Action

(A7) Resolution 26-R-05 – General Maintenance MFT Resolution - Consideration of proposed Resolution 26-R-05 by which the City Council would appropriate $650,000.00 of MFT funds for FY 2005-06 to finance the general maintenance of streets by City forces. For Action

(A8) 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. This item was held in committee on 4/12/05. For Introduction and Action

Items: (A1), (A2), (A3.1), (A3.2), (A3.6), (A4.1), (A4.2), (A5), (A7), (A8), were considered on a consent agenda. Aforementioned items were motioned and passed unanimously.

(A3.3) Approval of the lowest responsive and responsible bid from Sumit Construction Company in the amount of $225,737.00 for FY 2005-06 Replacement of Sewer Structures, Sewer and Water Main improvement program at various locations. Funded by Sewer and Water funds.

Ald. Feldman: Okay, let’s go to item (A3.3).
Ald. Rainey: Whenever we have these bids where you get too high or too low, you get concerned. And this time, the bid is so much lower than the engineer estimate; I just wonder how that can be explained. The engineer estimated that this project would be a $480k project, and the bid being recommended is $225.7.

Ald. Feldman: Do we have an explanation?
Dave Jennings: We were concerned as well, but we checked their references and they’ve done work for IDOT, City of Chicago, and Cook County, and their references were good.

Ald. Rainey: What did they do? Did they do this kind of job?

Dave Jennings: I don’t know, I actually can’t give you the scope. The second lowest bidders also well under us and they’re the ones … last two years D&B Construction has been our …. I don’t have a good explanation for why….

Ald. Rainey: So let’s say we take this and we don’t have a good explanation. When this happens don’t you think we should look at this and see where are we off? I see this one for $700k the end, the last one. Civil Contractors, their bid was almost $800k. Which is double our estimate.

Dave Jennings: They didn’t want the job.

Ald. Rainey: I don’t think so. From an outsider looking in it doesn’t look right. It looks like either we made mistakes or overestimated or not on top of prices these days, or we’ve got somebody lowballing it hoping to get contract changes. That’s how it looks like to me.

Ald. Feldman: Is there a breakdown in the bid that would give you some information as to where we were wrong rather than a total?

Dave Jennings: Yeah, it’s on the back sheet. There’s a line item analysis on 34 line item numbers.

Ald. Rainey: Okay just look at #10 Gene. Just look at #10. #10 is adjusting sanitary sewers 8” diameter or less. We said it should be $19,800, they say it should be $3,600. Item 2, we say it should $12,000, they say it should be $1,900. Something’s wrong…

Judy Aiello: You know, it could be they have other work they’re doing in the area and the economy of scale, they want the job or they need something to fill a time slot.

Ald. Feldman: I think his point is correct. Not that they’re crazy, but I would feel like I would want to understand what the reason for it.

Ald. Rainey: That’s what I’m saying.

Ald. Feldman: And say look you know, how many hours do you expect. Maybe we’re thinking more hours, more material, more whatever. I don’t know what goes into that. But it might be good for us to understand that.

Dave Jennings: Again a comfort I have is that the contractor has done it for the last two years. It’s not too far they’re under them, but they were under our estimate significantly as well.

Ald. Rainey: My discomfort is on our side. Maybe we could do more jobs if we didn’t estimate so high.

Dave Stoneback: I think there’s a lot of issues, I mean one of them may have to do with the unit price. If you look at the unit price on some of these items, if they’re sitting on a lot of inventory,
we may be pricing at the current prices for what the unit price is. If they've got like a FIFO (first-in-first-out) inventory their unit price may be lower. So a lot of it has to do with materials and their accounting in terms of pricing which their inventory is too.

**Ald. Rainey:** Well Traffic Control and Protection. We say it’s going to cost $30,000, they say it’s going to cost $5,000. What’s the inventory, I mean those orange cones?

**Dave Stoneback:** Well I was just talking about those first items.

**Ald. Rainey:** I know, I know. Okay, okay.

**Dave Jennings:** ...Detour signs, barricades, cones...

**Ald. Jean-Baptiste:** I think there's an issue of credibility that Ald. Rainey was trying to inquire into that's not satisfied by the answer and that is for whom have they worked, what have they done. And you did indicate that County, IDOT, and City of Chicago - that's great. And then the next question is what have they done, you know, what kind of work.

**Dave Jennings:** I don't know...

**Ald. Jean-Baptiste:** I know you don't, but I'm saying that I don't want to give the message that we don't want good deals, you know, we should jump on them. But I think that if the bidding is so much lower than anticipated that maybe we need a little bit of verification as to what they've done to take a look to be able to come back with an answer...

**Judy Aiello:** I think if you look at all of the bids, you know, you do have one that's very high which obviously they are not interested, but you have one that's within $2,000 of what we were, then another was 402. So I mean you've got two that were close and then the other two and it could be those contractors are really hungry and need the work.

**Ald. Jean-Baptiste:** That's true. I mean, there is an explanation and you know one can reasonably conclude that it's a reasonable bid at this particular point and time. But I'm just suggesting that – there's no absolute, I'm just suggesting that there may have been some other ways to try to justify the value of this contract other than dollar. So down the line if we find a bid that's so radically different, maybe we could just confirm what has been done, what comparables. And come back here and say yea, these people have done this and their work is satisfactory.

**Dave Jennings:** Well it is a low bid and the dollars are what we look at. And then what we do is go back and try to detect their references and see if they've done quality work elsewhere and that's what we did. I just don't have answers to your questions.

**Ald. Rainey:** I'm just concerned that if we have inflated estimates all the time, we might be limiting the amount of work we could do.

**Dave Jennings:** This job is primarily spot sewers repairs from the MFT Resurfacing Program. So it's tied to the work we're doing later in the year. There are a few jobs that aren't in that Resurfacing budget, but primarily this is what we do in advance of resurfacing, so if we could do more, would we do more this year, I'm not sure we would.

**Ald. Rainey:** Okay.
Ald. Feldman: Move approval. All those in favor indicate.

Item: (A3.3) was considered, motioned and passed unanimously.

(A3.4) Approval of contract with MWH Americas, Inc. in an amount not-to-exceed $199,608.00 for Engineering Design Services for S82B Contract 1 Relief Sewer Project of the Long Range Sewer Improvement Program. Funded by IEPA loans and Sewer Reserve Funds.

Ald. Feldman: Okay Item (A3.4)

Ald. Rainey: This is one where we’re paying for the job and then applying for the loan. Do we usually - is that what we’re doing?

Dave Stoneback: We always have to design the project and be ready to award it before they will actually give us the loan. We’ve put in a pre-loan application, identified to the IETA that we would like to receive funding for this project next year. Unless you have a bid in hand and the design all done...

Ald. Rainey: The loan will pay for the design right?

Dave Stoneback: Our past experience indicates that 90% of the design cost is incorporated into the loan. We still pay off the loan so it’s not free money, but it gets rolled into the loan.


Ald. Feldman: Second. All those in favor indicate by saying “I”.

Item: (A3.4) was considered, motioned and passed unanimously.

(A3.5) Approval of contract with Government Technology Services Incorporated (GTSI) using the U.S. Community Government Purchasing Alliance Contract in the amount of $41,850.00 for False Alarm tracking software. Funded by Information Systems Capital Account funds.

Ald. Feldman: Item (A3.5)

Ald. Jean-Baptiste: I wanted to get some explanation as to what value this new technology will bring us in terms of dollars. I’m looking at this, not only the $41,850 to purchase this particular technology but also we’re paying $4,500 per year to maintain it, for licensing. So how do we recoup this money?

Bill Stafford: Our best analysis is we think this is about a two-year payback. And by that I mean we will increase both our collections on our annual permits and on the false police and fire alarms. We’re running slightly short now on the budgets and collections that we have and we think in two years we think we’re going to make between $20,000 and $30,000 more a year as a result of this. We’re also doing it because our database is really not secure. We’ve got it on old
technology, an Access database that is not compatible with our 911 system nor is it compatible with our Oracle database. And so we’re basically doing it for three reasons: for the database, for protecting the data, and also we think we’re going to get a return on the investment.

Ald. Jean-Baptiste: How do we detect false alarms now?

Chief Berkowsky: Any alarm that comes into our 911 system is coded based upon us knowing it’s a system alarm. Either it comes in to what we call a Teletron panel which is a direct connect or it comes in via a third party which is a central station. They call us up they say we have an alarm activation at such-n-such address. So what will happen in this case, is when the dispatcher closes that call they are coded to indicate this is a system activation which then fits the criteria of the ordinance…

Ald. Jean-Baptiste: By system activation, what are we talking about? That there’s a fire someplace and the sprinkler system goes off automatically or somebody pulls a fire alarm?

Chief Berkowsky: It’s more dealing with the fire alarm system. Someone pulls a pull station, a heat detector goes off, a malfunction, a system not being maintained, a sprinkler system would cause it once the waterflow alarm activates. On the other hand you got your burglar alarm system, your hold up alarms, doors that swing in the wind that’ll activate a police alarm. Those are the type of activations we see on their side.

Ald. Jean-Baptiste: And once it’s activated, you determine whether it’s false or it’s real. Could you explain that again.

Chief Berkowsky: What we do is every alarm activation is coded the same. We code it as 100 and… over to the alarm system software. What we do then, if there’s a real emergency or they follow the criteria under the ordinance to waive that fee, we then change the code to a 9…

Ald. Jean-Baptiste: There’s a prior step I’m trying to figure out. Somebody pulls a fire alarm, but there’s no fire, how do you determine whether it’s false or not. I mean, you go there? That’s how you determine it? I’m trying to get to how the technology is going to help us detect it other than whatever we’re doing right now.

Chief Berkowsky: Anytime we have a fire alarm activation, we send fire equipment typically two engines and a truck to the fire alarm activation, trouble alarm we send one company, on the police side, it depends on what type of alarm whether it’s a burglar alarm or ….. We go there, we determine whether we have an emergency or not, after that we complete the paperwork which then codes it out properly into the system.

Ald. Jean-Baptiste: Okay, good. With the new technology then, does it prevent us from going out? Do we – we still go out.

Ald. Rainey: It’s billing. It’s just a billing system. It’s a record system.
Judy Aiello: Currently it’s mostly all done by hand and it’s very manual. This will bridge the gap between the 911 and the IRA software and we should be able to do them quicker and more efficient and get better collection rates.

Ald. Rainey: You mentioned when a sprinkler system goes off. You would never bill for a false alarm for something like that would you?

Chief Berkowsky: There are times where we’ve had situations where vehicles strike sprinklers when they’re not being careful...

Ald. Rainey: Oh, oh, okay.

Chief Berkowsky: …they don’t maintain the heat properly in stairwells. So there are times… again any of these activations of course can be appealed and we can waive them based upon the actions that they take. That was the whole intent of the ordinance which I think has been a very successful ordinance.

Ald. Feldman: Move approval.

Item: (A3.5) was considered, motioned and passed unanimously.

Ald. Rainey: And could we get a report maybe in six months? When do you expect this to rolled out or operative?

Chief Berkowsky: That’s probably a good target date...

Ald. Rainey: Could you tell us about it? How it’s working and if it’s everything we hoped it would be.

Chief Berkowsky: We’ll do.

(A3.7) Approval of sole source contract with Current Technologies Corporation in the amount of $133,659.35 for a Security Camera Surveillance System at City buildings. Funded by CIP funds. (Requires a vote of 6 Alderman for passage).

Ald. Feldman: Next Item is (A3.7). Ald. Jean-Baptiste and I felt that way as well. You didn’t get the response that you were looking for.

Ald. Jean-Baptiste: I’m sensing this is the cart before the horse. In this proposal we have this is a significant request – a number of video cameras. I agree that we should have surveillance where money exchange is taking place. However, I see here for example, in the Levy Center we’re surveilling the fitness room, we surveilling some of the hall corridors, and in some of the – I don’t know what all we’ll be surveilling in Fleetwood Jordain and other places other than where money is being exchanged. So I am thinking that there is a policy initiative being taken undertaken here to increase surveillance of our facilities where people are using the facilities. And I understand that you’re not surveilling locker rooms and the rest of those things. I know we’re not doing that. I’m not very comfortable with surveillance outside of issues having to do with money or where there’s been proven kind of problems in terms of perhaps people in a parking area that’s dark. I remember there was an attack against somebody at the library. So I would support
installation of cameras where we are exchanging money but I cannot see the need – and I think it is an invasion of privacy when we are surveilling the fitness room. I’m not sure – and I assume that the front office of the Levy Center is where the money is being exchanged. The police, the remote station, I agree with that. We have an existing security camera in place. And for the new locations, I have to think that these many cameras aren’t just going to surveil our money exchange places. And that in fact we may be very consistent with a pattern that’s already established, for example, at the Levy Center. So I would need some specific clarification as to where we intend to install and I would want to narrow where we would want to install these cameras to specific areas.

Ald. Feldman: I just have a comment on what I saw. You looked at the Levy Center and saw one thing, I looked at it and saw something else. And I’ll tell ya what I saw, I saw a fitness room where in many cases there are some elderly people. And you have a very large building at the Levy Center, very, very large building. We don’t have people standing in the fitness room watching to see some guy, some woman that doesn’t either fall off or have a heart attack. You’re dealing with senior citizens there. It’s very possible – and people will overwork, will do things that they’re not supposed to do or even things they are supposed to do but it can cause some very difficult and unsafe situations if that room isn’t monitored. So if you see something happening, they can be attended to immediately. As far as the corridors are concerned, I assume, and maybe your perspective is different, I assumed that the corridors are only to monitor for the safety of the people that are using the building. You know, this is a public building. A lot of people can come in. People that are using the gym can very easily access the rest of the building. And this is not to see who moves from one place to another, it’s to (and Mr. Gaynor could testify to this I suppose) is to make sure those senior citizens men and women are safe in a public building. And that’s all it is. It’s not surveilling people. It’s prevailing events that might or may not occur. That’s all this has to do with is has to do with safety. Not anticipating somebody or someone is going to do something wrong. But making sure that if someone is being mugged on one of the corridor and you have staff that’s a block away, I mean that’s a big building they have to run all the way around.

Judy Aiello: That is the philosophy for all the other buildings too. It’s not just for the cash handling.

Ald. Feldman: That’s all that is. Is for safety’s sake. To protect, not only the people that work there, which is important. I have a case, we all know this guy that fell on the ice outside of the Levy Center. He shattered his arm. You remember that whole thing. The same kind of thing could happen someplace else. Somebody has an accident, they can’t move and they can’t call or hear from that distance.
When you have a lot of people using things it would be different if it was twenty thirty people like a hospital walking down every minute, so if somebody in a corridor falls, you're going to see it. But in this particular case it's not that way. I've seen those corridors pretty empty. Somebody could fall and hurt themselves. So I look at that as a safety measure not an intrusion of privacy. I certainly would feel much better knowing that those people doing cardiovascular exercises in the fitness room. Especially if there's nobody leading the class or instruction. If they're there by themselves and they usually are, that room being monitored, so that God forbid or anything happens to somebody, we'll see it. You don't see it that way (talking to Baptiste).

Ald. Jean-Baptiste: Your suggestion is that for the Levy Center, this is appropriate.

Ald. Feldman: I think so.

Ald. Jean-Baptiste: So what about these other locations. What are we doing?

Ald. Feldman: I'll let Mr. Gaynor talk about that.

Doug Gaynor: I think that Judy Aiello represented it well. We're looking for security in our facilities. As you recall, you walk into the Crown Center, if you got to the left, into the ice rink, you go by our office, and we know you're there. If you go to the right where we have our pre-school program, we don't know you're there. It's a public building, the doors are open, and anybody could come in. So it's not a matter of watching staff, it's a matter of protecting the staff and protecting the customer. It's no different with Fleetwood Jordain in the back hallway. We can lock the back doors and inconvenience the customers so they have to come in the front door and pass by the office. But that means people who park along the back and want to come into the gym area, they are going to have to walk all the way around to the front. So we want to be able to protect those individuals in the building. We also want to protect the financial integrity of what's going on. So it's our staff, it's the customer, it's the financial integrity that these cameras are being proposed for in all of our facilities.

Ald. Feldman: By the way, this idea of passing the security desk and that being everything okay doesn't hold water. Because anybody could pass. You just don't look at somebody and say well, they're up to no good. A lot of people look normal, they look like anybody else. And they go in and what we're worried about then is once they're in – distance corridors unpopulated sections of the building can be used for things that the cameras are designed to notice. That's all I see this as.

Ald. Jean-Baptiste: The introduction of this thing talks about protection of money exchange, etc. etc. So in each one of these places, Noyes, Fleetwood, Library, the cameras are supposed to be installed in areas that are inaccessible by our staff people that we don't see.
Doug Gaynor: Yes, that as well as the financial transaction. So again if there’s a problem we would have a picture image of what the problem or who the problem was.

Ald. Jean-Baptiste: This is where we don’t have staff around. For example, I’m very familiar with the Fleetwood Jordain that building. So where would you put the cameras there?

Doug Gaynor: There’s going to be cameras in the front office area and in the back hallway.

Ald. Jean-Baptiste: Behind the gym.

Doug Gaynor: Yea. So when people come in that back door, we’ll have an opportunity to see who’s coming in and to monitor what’s going on in that back hallway.

Ald. Jean-Baptiste: So you have seven cameras here though.

Doug Gaynor: I don’t have the specific layout where each individual camera is being placed.

Judy Aiello: The locations of the cameras were done based upon a survey by the Police Department for safety and security. They did like they would do for any business. They went in and did a security audit and made recommendations as to where cameras should be placed. And those were the recommendations in consultation with the various department heads regarding where they felt for their improved operations they would like to see it also.

Ald. Jean-Baptiste: What about the participation of staff at the centers. The staff at Fleetwood participate for example, ‘cause I’m familiar with the building.

Doug Gaynor: As a matter of fact within the last couple weeks our manager at Fleetwood asked if we might be able to change our safe location so the camera would be on the safe. The safe we deposit our money in until the armored car pick up comes by. And they wanted us to make sure that the camera was focused on that in the event there was a problem. We said we would certainly make that occur. So yeah, Mamie Smith has been involved in this process along with all of our managers.

Ald. Jean-Baptiste: With the camera at Fleetwood, will there be a camera in the fitness center as well?

Doug Gaynor: I think so.

Judy Aiello: I think there is one in the fitness center also.

Ald. Jean-Baptiste: So we generalize it to every fitness center that we have? We put a camera?

Doug Gaynor: We just paid out a law suit, I don’t think you’re aware of because someone snuck into the facility we weren’t aware of, and then became injured, sued us, and so.

Ald. Rainey: Are they going to run 24 hours a day the cameras?

David Cook: The Facilities Management and our Information Systems Department are the ones that did the technical...

Ald. Rainey: Is it going to run 24 hours? Because if somebody sneak in, it’s not going to cover it.

Judy Aiello: It’s motion-activated.
**David Cook:** Yes, it’s a motion sensor so that if someone moves then it will start recording again. If there’s no motion, it stops recording. So it senses motion, that saves us for our storage time.

**Ald. Rainey:** One thing that I wanted to comment on was the Civic Center. When I come in the Civic Center sometimes, it’s - I come in the bottom, it’s that long hallway, I mean I’m not scared, but when you think about it, anything could happen. There’s a bathroom down there. I was trying to count the number of entrances, number of doors. It’s like six or seven doors you can get into this building. I mean it’s – we need a few cameras I think here.

**Ald. Moran:** …that’s a deterrent effect that I think is ….Things like the police department, headquarters building, so many different reasons why it’s significant to have cameras out there. At least in the first instance are happy ones. We’ve seen that in the past year. But still significant even in those unhappy circumstances where video images can clarify factual situations quite readily where we don’t have to rely on conflicting verbal suggestions of what happened in these areas. So I really feel this is a good program. It’s a positive thing too. I think we say we’re securing the safety and health of our customers, we’re securing the safety and health of our workers, we’re enhancing a sense of safety and well-being pretty much for everybody throughout these facilities. So I would encourage everybody to vote in favor of the contract.

**Ald. Feldman:** I do think that when we talk about background that there is a… at least in the first sentence. …it’s a little redundant. It’s looks like, it’s a feeling that while it’s important, my main concern about what I think we’re really accomplishing is protecting people. Is protecting people’s lives, protecting their safety and maybe protecting some money. I’m much less interested, although it’s important, but I’m much less interested in identifying anybody or anything else. I think it’s important by the way. It says after incidences. I would hope that this would prevent incidences. And I think that’s what its designed to do. So if we think of it in terms of protecting people, not only our staff, but people that have every right in the world to walk into a public building and feel safe. We just don’t want anything to happen and we don’t have either the police force or the staff force to be constantly patrolling with canine dogs public buildings. I mean we just don’t have that nor is it necessary. I mean we don’t want that kind of atmosphere. I really think? I don’t think this is an attack on anybody’s civil rights or anything else. I think it’s a good thing to do to protect people.

**Ald. Jean-Baptiste:** I definitely agree with securing the water departments, the parking systems, the police department etc., etc. I think that we may be overreaching in some of these places. In the library we have sixteen cameras going up. Where would we place these cameras?

**David Cook:** Most of the cameras - there’s going to be two cameras behind the check out place looking out at the people and patrons
that are coming in. There will be cameras that will be looking back into the corridors where people would be walking out. There would also be lots of cameras in the garage I think that’s terrific. In the garage looking at the cars to deter ….So they are mostly looking at people exiting the building or down in the car garage.

**Ald. Jean-Baptiste:** I don’t have a problem with the garage. I’m still uncomfortable with the extent of the surveillance and I understand that the intent is to protect individuals, to protect – to prevent crime etc., etc. I think that the direction we’re going in on – I’m just not comfortable with it.

**Ald. Rainey:** I respect your opinion on this. I think though that you’ve accepted many of these as being for the protection of people and our employees. But I think given the delay that we’ve caused here that we should move forward. And one of the great things about our council is you can vote against me and I think you can still argue your point. But we need to move forward. It would be helpful to know once these are in place exactly where they are. I’m glad to see sixteen at the library because there are some very dysfunctional people that have more less made home in the library. Maybe they’ll give us some indication who the people are. So I feel good about those cameras. So I’m going to move approval of this purchase.

**Ald. Moran:** Seconded.

**Ald. Feldman:** Okay. I just want to say one thing. I understand a general objection to the use of surveillance cameras without well established values in reason. I mean, none of us want this. I think it would be hard I think you have articulated it and I would support that kind of articulation. I would have with the information that I have right now – a great deal of difficulty applying that to what’s going on here. It might be. I’m not suggesting that we don’t have one or two cameras. But I would know where that would be and I couldn’t make a case for that. And I don’t think anybody else could. We could make a case that we should be concerned about surveillance, we should be concerned about the number of cameras we use, and they should be used with great reason and restraint. But unless we know that this particular camera is being used inappropriately it would be hard to make that case. Don’t you agree?

**Ald. Jean-Baptiste:** That’s true. My discomfort is that we come to this as a reaction to ratify a particular policy thrust in my opinion, that I think should have been discussed and assessed a little more carefully by the committee the council, you know with a sense of the particulars. In x place or y place we’re moving to do this because of this reality. I just don’t feel comfortable with unleashing eighty-four cameras in various of our public places especially in light of the current atmosphere that we find ourselves in. We just addressed the issue of patriot act in the context of the library, the utilization of books, checking out books and librarians having to report that. I’m not yet
comfortable with this foray into this area. That is not say again, that I’m not for cameras and increased security of the Water Department, Police Department, the Outpost, and I understand the rationale for the seniors at the Levy Center. I’m not sure whether the same rational should apply for the Fitness Center and the Fleetwood Jordain place even though we did have an accident there that we ended up having to settle. So I understand where people are at. I’m just saying that I thought the way we came at this was not the correct way and I’m not comfortable with the reach of the proposal at this point.

Ald. Feldman: Okay. Ann you made a move?

Ald. Rainey: I moved.

Item: (A3.7) was considered, motioned and passed 3-1.

(A6) Resolution 25-R-05 – FY 2005-06 MFT Resurfacing Program - Consideration of proposed Resolution 25-R-05 by which the City Council would appropriate $1,200,000.00 of MFT funds for resurfacing various locations citywide. For Action

Ald. Feldman: Okay, what do we have left. (A6) Resurfacing Program.

Ald. Moran: This is the suggested expenditures $1.2 and I was wondering how that compared to what we have spent on this program in more recent years.

Dave Jennings: Exactly the same as …. probably the last ten years. Several years ago, Capital added another half million dollars. Our plan we programmed was about 1.7. This isn’t all the streets. This is the ….

Ald. Moran: This is money that comes from the State?

Dave Jennings: For this program, it’s the reallocation of the ???.

Ald. Moran: Comes from the State?

Dave Jennings: Yea.

Ald. Moran: When you say that we’ve spent this amount the last ten years does that mean we’ve always gotten this amount?

Dave Jennings: Yes, it stays fairly constant within a $100,000 …. 

Ald. Moran: Do we have other Motor Fuel funds that comes to us that are spent on other programs than this.

Dave Jennings: This council meeting we’ll be approving the use of $650,000.00 for ….. general maintenance.

Ald. Moran: Including that, anything other than those two.

Dave Jennings: Yes, there is a Motor Fuel Tax Budget page in the budget book. We use Motor Fuel Tax for our share of bridge projects, use Motor Fuel Tax for some signal projects. We lay out every year what those funds are expended for.

Ald. Moran: Is there anything in the regulations that require us to spend a certain percentage on one category of projects. In other words if we decide to spend a little less on bridges in one year and a little bit
more on streets in one year do we have the discretion in the regulations to do that?

Dave Jennings: Yes.

Ald. Moran: The other question I had is what is the process you go through to determine the location of the work?

Dave Jennings: We try to do the worse streets first, but we coordinate our street resurfacing program with water main works with sewer works with the water main sewer plant. Maybe four or five years ago, we did a street condition survey. We're getting ready to do that again this summer. We'll use that information to help determine where the streets should be resurfaced.

Ald. Moran: Aside from coordinating with other infrastructure projects, the emphasis is to find the worst streets.

Dave Jennings: Right, we do it two ways: 1. the engineers keep notes they keep records of their observations of the streets. We tie that together with the numerical rankings that were received from the INS report. And we'll do the same thing again this summer.

Ald. Moran: Thank you.

Ald. Jean-Baptiste: Dave, as I recall it from the study that was done three or four years ago, you had a timetable for streets that would be done year after year. I would've appreciated seeing what the projection is for the next two or three years. Particularly because I am also self-interested. I'm interested also in trying to make sure that there is some representation. Even though we talked about doing the worse streets first. There's always an argument for what streets. Because there is no streets here from the 2\textsuperscript{nd} ward on this list. And there may not be streets from other wards on this list as well. But I want to get a sense as to what's goin' on with the next couple of years so I understand that if this year, 2\textsuperscript{nd} ward's streets are left out, then perhaps in the next couple of years you'll be giving us more attention. And there are other issues that I have regarding streets that are not necessarily tied to wards. I look at some streets that are very well traveled. You have Dempster, you have Church, you have Central and various other streets. I would think that we would also give great priority to these streets – to make sure that we take care of them because they have the most wear and tear and they are the most utilized.

Dave Jennings: On the first point we do try to spread the work geographically. This is not the whole program. If there's no 2\textsuperscript{nd} ward streets, that doesn't mean we're not doing 2\textsuperscript{nd} ward streets. In the December 13\textsuperscript{th} memo, you could see the whole plan. Again this is extracted from that plan.

Ald. Jean-Baptiste: If you added that then I might've felt better.

Dave Jennings: The purpose of this is for you to approve the allocation of the funds for this portion of the project.

Ald. Jean-Baptiste: But do you understand? Can you stand in my shoes for a minute and just understand what I'm talking about. If you give me the whole picture, then I understand what's going on. I can see
it. I don’t remember what happened on December the 5th. What about the issue of the very well traveled streets?

Dave Jennings: That’s a good point. We always look for other funding sources and we’re in the process of applying for some funds that can only be used on the FAU (Federal Aid Urban) routes. So that’s your collectors and arterials. We are trying to get some federal money for those. The State doesn’t take care of the resurfacing of streets in Evanston because we have no streets that are strategic regional arterials. That’s the lowest level of street where the State will come in and resurface for you. The highest level street we have is the local arterial. So that kind of cuts us out of some of the State money. We all have paid for resurfacing of the State routes for a long time because of that one hitch in the regulations. We routinely program Sheridan Road, Dempster because we can’t get them fixed any other way so we have spent city tax money on the major arterial streets. That being said, I’m telling you we do try to find other funding sources. There’s what’s called the Surface Transportation Program which is federal money that is reallocated to the municipal plans organization and its spread. Again we’re trying to get some of those funds to do our more heavily traveled streets. Application is going in by the end of this week.

Ald. Jean-Baptiste: Can you update us some projections so we may be able to respond to constituents that say well “Ald. Jean-Baptiste you’ve torn up the streets since you’ve been in office. When are you fixing them?”

Ald. Rainey: That would be good information to give us all and the new council members. So they’ll know too.

Dave Jennings: There’s also as I stated before money in the Federal Authorization Transportation bill T21. That one has passed the House and its most recent version has a deadline of the end of May to make it to the Senate unless they extend it one more time. And I think they’re on the seventh extension right now. Hopefully it can get through this time. In that bill there’s $3 million dollars for Ridge Avenue, $2 million for Sheridan Road, and a half-million for our bike plan. If those projects stay in the bill and that bill passes then we will be programming that money as well. What I’ve tried to do in previous five year plans is to tell you about those things but not program that money. I’d rather not program until it really happens.

Ald. Jean-Baptiste: Can I ask Julia to weigh in? In Naperville you had all new streets. So what happened? When are we getting all new streets?

Julia Carroll: Well the difference is related to what David said which is there were state routes that went through town, Rt. 34, Rt. 59, so the State would pay for those. Unless you have those state routes, it’s very hard to get that money. But what is important is Congresswoman Schkowsky got the $5.5 million in the bill earmarked for Evanston and I would suggest that we contact our Senators to lobby to keep that in the Senate version of the bill so
that we make sure that we're getting our needs represented. I'll be
happy to coordinate letters if you want to send e-mails, however
you want to do that. But I think it's very important that we get our
request notice in to Senator Durbin and Obama so they can vote for
us.

Ald. Rainey: Can you put the details in an e-mail so we can then e-mail to
our constituents to get them to send to Durbin and Obama. That
would be really helpful.

City Manager: Sure. We will do that. Alright.

Ald. Feldman: Okay, can we go on then? Can I have a motion for this?

Item: (A6) was considered, motioned and passed unanimously.

(A9) Ordinance 52-O-05 Amending Title 10 of the City Code –
Consideration of proposed Ordinance 52-O-05 amending
Section 10-11-12: Schedule XII of the City Code, increasing
Parking Meter Rates. This item was held in committee on
4/12/05. For Introduction and Action

Ald. Feldman: Item (A9).

Ald. Moran: I'm a little troubled by the proposal on several fronts. And I'm
not real sure how the current construction of the new Sherman
Avenue garage should enter onto the field at this point. That's not
clear to me although there's some discussion of that in this memo.
To me this is a very significant issue that needs a lot of analysis
and I'm not convinced that the analysis in terms of the
recommendations throughout the April 12, 2005 memo are the best
way to go. One of the things that become very clear to me everyday
and every week is the disparity between... for instance the parking
rates that one pays in a garage in downtown Chicago compared to
downtown Evanston. I'm not saying that to suggest that I think that
they are perfectly analogous I don't think they are. But nonetheless
its... simply put I think we've been giving our parking away pretty
much. There may have been policy reason for us to give parking
away in the past. But as time goes on I see less and less reason for
us to give it away or to give it- to allow people to park in our very
expensive structures at minimal rates. Some of these things, the
first three hours- I think we need- I don't know what was done to
conclude that for instance, we would include the first hour. I know
the Chamber wants us to because they can then say to the
businesses downtown, we're helping you. And that's nice but what I
don't – I don't see a validation of that and somewhere in this memo,
the concession is made that that could be one of the biggest
fetchers of increased parking fees that we could get. And although I
don't think it's counterintuitive to suggest that some people are
invited to shop downtown because they would get one hour free.
But in my own experience, I never heard anybody say to me that
was true, never heard a single person say they came to downtown
Evanston to shop because they got one hour parking free. I've never heard anybody say that. Maybe I'm wrong. Somebody might go out and do a study on that. But there's a lot of money at stake on this. I'm very concerned the analysis in this proposal and I don't mean to be doing an injustice. You might have two-hundred page surveys in a file cabinet somewhere that would perfectly validate this and if you do, I'm sorry and I'd love to read them. But I'm just looking at what I have in my hands and one I'm not convinced but two I'm also looking at a situation where we're trying to raise our revenue and there's already a concession in here that this could be a big difference and we're taking a pass on it on what seems to be a very thin, a very shallow analysis. I know this one part about the Church garage. And I'm concerned about Sherman Avenue and that's again where - I read that and I thought about it. And I'm thinking would it really be a bummer to charge people at night over there because the Sherman Avenue Garage is going up. I'm not sure a logical connection between the two. I don't see it. I understand that there's some pressure on the parking system because we're building the Sherman Avenue Garage, I just don't see how letting free parking at night in the Church Garage is leading off that pressure. Maybe it is but it's hard for me to – you know, and a few other things – I don't know, I was looking there's a couple of comments how the parking fund has kinda gotten hit because of the major expenses intended to operate garages the larger deck structures. Then I see the apportionment of the increased revenues throughout various components in the system: meters, lots, garages and the tax. The tax is a no brainer to me. The three major components being meters, lots, and garages. If the garages are really – I would like to see some analysis to show where we getting hit and then try to remediate our losses by going to the areas that are causing us the problems if possible, instead of going somewhere else where it's really not the problem but we're asking them to make it up anyway kind of thing. Maybe they should make up some of it but maybe the proposal is suggesting that the proportion they make up is much larger than the actual operational expense would suggest. I think that this is an incredibly important issue, I mean in terms of revenue. I've been thinking for years that we really need to take a very serious look at this. We're always getting to budget time and we're always crying the fact that we can't find anywhere else to go. This is a place that I've been thinking we need to look at for a long time. I just would like to do some more work. I'm not satisfied with this proposal. I'd like to do some intensive analysis and again, not to sell anybody short for what they've done. I want to make sure that we get it right. I think it's too important.

Bill Stafford: Just a couple responses: I think we share a lot of issues that you raised. We've been working with the Parking Committee for about six months on this one. We originally went to the Parking
Committee; we had two or three scenarios where the hour wasn’t free, when the hour was paid for. We ran those iterations. The committee through that process – and we asked them on policy decisions as you heard properly about the issue of should that first hour – what the Church Street Garage – as they made those policy decisions we ran iterations on our analysis they made the policy decision to not to charge for the first hour. So then we came back with three scenarios without charging for the first hour. We had ones before that charged for the first hour. All of which – and I apologize we could’ve shared with you we were trying to - again we’re caught between – we’re providing information and iterations to committee they’re making policy decisions, we’re trying to respond to that and then provide the information. One of the issues that we raised and we talked to the committee about back to the whole issue in terms of the cost structure. One of the luxuries we had prior to this was that our ground operations and by that I mean our meters and our lots – had historically for the last ten years had been making significant revenues over and above costs that they were subsidizing our garage as well. Our garages that we’re running now are a whole different economic animal than they were before. We’ve got one massive one and another one on the way and we’re in a whole different business with higher costs of operation for the need for security, for the need for more lighting, for the need for those things that are attractive???? and successful as they have been in terms of assisting the economic generation that is going on downtown. That being said we’re glad to provide any iteration and more information on this. We’re basically coming back with the decisions and the policies based on the Parking Committee. And so we have those information we have those figures that we run on – it wasn’t free for the first hour, we run multiple iterations. We ran three different scenarios and these are the results of those discussions. That being said, just from your Chief Financial Officer’s concern we’re running a deficit. We’ll be running a cash deficit by the end of the year. We’d like to move forward with this at least in the first quarter or four or five months. We’ll be glad to provide more information if the committee wants. I’m not saying this is the solution I’m just telling you this is the direction that it has taken. There’s just a little bit of anxiety. We need to get some rates in the next couple of months. I don’t mean to rush it all I would just be glad to come back and provide whatever information you need. I just want to ???

Ald. Moran: Just quickly, Bill I understand that there’s some pressure and I’m not being oblivious to that. But you know, my concern is that we could use, the whole council could benefit from and I understand that you’re flushing this out along the way but I think the whole council could benefit from some further examination of some of that data. I want to move it along myself but on the other hand I think if we approve this proposal it’s going to take all the pressure off and
we’ll go on to something else. I think we should take at least a little bit more time to look at this.

Ald. Feldman: Okay thank you, Ann?

Ald. Rainey: Well, I think one thing that staff is not sensitive to is the fact that the council members who aren’t on the parking committee have never seen parking committee minutes. I think we saw a little summary since you’ve been here maybe a couple lines of minutes. I know in two years I’ve never seen parking committee minutes. Some of the things that just really eat away at me is I cannot understand how these twelve-hour maximum parking limits have twenty-five cents for seventy-five minutes. It goes on and on. Three pages, four pages of, five pages of lots. Twenty-five cents for seventy-five minutes, maximum minute twelve-hours, nineteen spaces there. Here’s one two hundred and twenty meters, twenty-five cents per three hours, maximum limit twelve-hours. It just doesn’t make economic sense to me that we don’t even bother to maintain those lots for rates that low. Because those are commuter lots – I think.

Dave Jennings: They are and the largest one that two hundred and twenty lot one is the one we don’t control the rates.

Ald. Rainey: Okay, so forget that. Okay so that’s it.

Dave Jennings: … and basically just to come back with a rate structure for those. But when you add up all of the long term meters, we didn’t think it had significant economic impact. Admittedly they’re priced too low. But when you take out that two twenty there aren’t a whole lot left.

Ald. Rainey: Tell us a little more about the conversation of eliminating or adding a fee for parking after 6. Anything other than well, ‘the Sherman Avenue Garage is gone.”

Dave Jennings: We talked about it, we had some numbers on that. There was a consensus that we should try to operate the garages as the parking system. In other words, not have disparate rates and disparate types of programs.

Ald. Rainey: Except our garages are located in different places. That garage, the Church Street Garage is on the edge. Its between the lake and …

Dave Jennings: It is. The program itself was put in to encourage activity or to I guess reward those who parked after six in all the garages. The level of downtown activity is much different than when that program was put in. And so the discussion was we probably need to make them all consistent. Part of that discussion was can we postpone that until Sherman is up with the belief that that will help some people through the next year and they didn’t vote on that. But the consensus of the committee was it’s probably okay. So we’re going to recommend postponing elimination of that program.

Ald. Rainey: What was the cost of postponing?

Dave Jennings: I don’t have numbers on that, I can get it. As Bill said, we went through pages and pages of various scenarios in more detail
than it would appear. We tried to make a decision on how much to bring forward and maybe we thought…

Ald. Rainey: You mean over time with the Parking Committee. Were there minutes to the committee meeting?

Dave Jennings: Excuse me?

Ald. Rainey: Did you do minutes for those meetings?

Dave Jennings: Yes there are minutes. I can get those for you.

Ald. Rainey: It’s too late now. It would’ve been helpful for us to have seen the progression of the development of the policy.

Julia Carroll: If you’re not going to take action tonight, I mean, we could provide that to you.

Ald. Rainey: Why wouldn’t we take action tonight though? I mean we could always take more action later. I mean, one thing that I’m concerned about is that we not be held to this five year plan or whatever it is.

Dave Jennings: The five year plan would be voted on a year at a time. Any time a recommendation exchange rate was needed it would come right through this process. So you would have the ability to vote individually on the recommendations. We want to try to think ahead instead of reacting.

Ald. Rainey: I understand, but we’ve been told what to do about your thinking ahead. I really have no problem getting rid of this tonight, voting for it, moving it forward. As long as we can be involved.

Ald. Jean-Baptiste: Just wanted to know what projection of income would you make if we were to eliminate this first hour parking.

Bill Stafford: You mean if we were to add?

Ald. Jean-Baptiste: If you were to make it paid parking – approximately.

Bill Stafford: Well, a lot of it would depend on the price. If it’s a dollar our usage numbers there would run about $108,000 or so for the two garages that’s about $200,000 that we would generate.

Ald. Rainey: Not bad

Ald. Feldman: For what period of time?

Ald. Rainey: A year.

Bill Stafford: Well, that would be for a year, yeah.

Ald. Feldman: One of the reasons people go into the garage for the first hour is because its free. So you’re telling me that all of those people that go into the garage because its free will now be the same number of people who go in and pay.

Ald. Jean-Baptiste: Pay one dollar?

Ald. Rainey: Do those people stay one hour?

Ald. Feldman: There are people that stay one hour or less.

Ald. Rainey: Really?

Ald. Feldman: Yes. There are people who do that. That go into a store, they go into something – I mean that’s the purpose of it. The purpose of it is not just to reduce the cost of parking for a two or three hour…

Ald. Jean-Baptiste: Well I’m open to moving forward tonight and then coming back very quickly to take a look at all that. Because I now
on’t agree that people going and take advantage of that free hour and they would not if you charge a dollar. If you have limited on-street parking people would look for the next best thing. As opposed to putting fifty cents in the meter and risking getting a ticket, they’ll go park and pay a dollar. I think people are familiar with the parking structures now with the garages. They’re there and they’re trained to use them. So I don’t think that you would deter them. I don’t think that we would lose anything. So I would suggest that move forward but quickly move forward in this next year or two to restructure what we charge at the garages and try to generate more revenue and I think we can, especially because we always run a tight budget.

**Julia Carroll:** Could I just clarify? Are you looking for some study to be done to prove one way or another or you just want to actually charge the dollar down the road. I’m not clear, I want to be sure.

**Ald. Jean-Baptiste:** I’m for charging the dollar down the road. There may be other studies that may be done as to whether or not people will pay more than a dollar down the line.

**Julia Carroll:** Or do you just want to refer that question back to the Parking Committee perhaps?

**Ald. Jean-Baptiste:** We can refer that to the Parking Committee and move forward with whatever proposal is on the table right now. And I suppose we could always come back when the Parking Committee is ready to give us a report. I think its very simple. That people know that parking is very cheap in Evanston, but the consequences are high for parking in the street if you get a ticket. So the garages are available, we need to promote that more and have people go and park in the garages and lets make that $200,000 or whatever we can make. Offset the kind of – ultimately I’d like to see us find other means of generating some money other than taxing ourselves to death. Property taxes. So parking is the least of my concerns right now in terms of the deterrence that that would have on people if we say you pay a dollar for the first hour, you pay a dollar fifty, you pay two dollars. Because I go downtown Chicago and you know, for twenty minutes, it’s six dollars. And then for the first forty minutes to an hour is fourteen and after that you’re into nineteen, twenty, twenty-three, whatever. So, I think we’re busy enough... you know.

**Ald. Moran:** I know a lot of people who live in Evanston who say they really want to shop in downtown Evanston. But their perception is that you know – yeah, almost everybody wants to park right in front of the shoe store where you’re going to go in and buy your shoes. That’s a no-brainer. That’s real simple. We don’t need a study on that. So the question is you say is how do we manage this whole system, but I know people who say on one hand, they say want to shop down there, but the next breath they say they don’t. And they go someplace else, Old Orchard.

**Ald. Rainey:** And they park three blocks away.
Julia Carroll: For free though.
Ald. Moran: And I see this in my own stuff. You go downtown, you’re probably aren’t going to find a spot that’s open or you’ll circle through, thirty minutes to get one, and then you’re going to get a ticket before you get out of that spot. They are going to get you. I can’t figure how to get in and get out of downtown. It’s a 50/50 shot that I’m going to get a ticket. If I go in the parking lot, I’m in the clear. I think we need to think about this managing the parking – I think that’s a great idea. We should think about that – really.

Ald. Rainey: Very quickly. We used to get information about who was parking in the garage. What I would like to see is some kind of typical period a month, three months, how many people are parking for free, and during what period of the day. How many are permit parkers, and how many are parking like a shopping spree like three hours. I think that would be really interesting to know. Especially how many are just parking for free for one hour.

Dave Jennings: We can get you that.
Ald. Rainey: I’m sure you can. I’d like to see that.
Ald. Feldman: The consensus I’m gathering here is support for Item (A9) as it stands but a message to staff and the Parking Committee that they want to be brought along and have certain items revisited and be much more a part of the decision making rather than get the recommendation and never heard of anything before. Is that correct?

Ald. Rainey: That’s a good way of putting it.
Ald. Moran: I’m going to vote against this.
Ald. Feldman: You’re going to vote against it. Okay. So I want a motion to approve.


Item: (A9) was considered, motioned and passed 3-1.

Ald. Feldman: This is off the consent agenda. Items for discussion. Communications. Firefighter monthly report. Police officer, Firefighter vacancy report. Any issues with these?

IV. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

V. COMMUNICATIONS
VI. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Committee, it adjourned at 8:36 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Dolores Y. Cortez
City Manager’s Office