



City of Lawrence

DAVID L. CORLISS
CITY MANAGER

City Offices
PO Box 708 66044-0708
www.lawrenceks.org

6 East 6th St
785-832-3000
FAX 785-832-3405

CITY COMMISSION

MAYOR
MICHAEL H. DEVER

COMMISSIONERS
SUE HACK
ROBERT CHESTNUT
DENNIS "BOOG" HIGHBERGER
MIKE AMYX

May 6, 2008

The Board of Commissioners of the City of Lawrence met in regular session at 6:35 p.m., in the City Commission Chambers in City Hall with Mayor Dever presiding and members Amyx, Chestnut, Hack, and Highberger present.

RECOGNITION/PROCLAMATION/PRESENTATION:

With Commission approval Mayor Dever proclaimed Saturday, May 10 as Sertoma Bar-B-Q Cook-off Day; the week of May 11 – 17, as "Police Week" and Thursday, May 15th as "Peace Officers' Memorial Day"; and the month of May as Mental Health Month and National Historic Preservation Month."

CONSENT AGENDA

As part of the consent agenda, **it was moved by Chestnut, seconded by Amyx**, to receive the Citizen Advisory Board meeting minutes of January 28, 2008. Motion carried unanimously.

As part of the consent agenda, **it was moved by Chestnut, seconded by Amyx**, approve claims to 415 vendors in the amount of \$1,737,935.60. Motion carried unanimously.

As part of the consent agenda, **it was moved by Chestnut, seconded by Amyx**, to approve the Drinking Establishment Licenses for Set'em Up Jack's, 1800 East 23rd, HH Bar & Grill, 4931 West 6th, the Phoggy Dog, 2228 Iowa; and the Retail Liquor License for Dangermond Liquor, 1010 North 3rd. Motion carried unanimously.



The City Commission reviewed the bids for the HVAC System at the East Lawrence Center for the Parks and Recreation Department. The bids were:

BIDDER	BID AMOUNT
Chaney, Inc.	\$117,515
PI Group	\$122,400

As part of the consent agenda, **it was moved by Chestnut, seconded by Amyx**, to award the bid to Chaney, Inc., in the amount of \$117,515. Motion carried unanimously. (1)

As part of the consent agenda, **it was moved by Chestnut, seconded by Amyx**, to set a bid date of June 3, 2008, for the West Baldwin Creek Interceptor Sewer Utilities Project. Motion carried unanimously. (2)

As part of the consent agenda, **it was moved by Chestnut, seconded by Amyx**, to approve the sale of surplus equipment from the Utilities Department on Gov Deals. Motion carried unanimously. (3)

As part of the consent agenda, **it was moved by Chestnut, seconded by Amyx**, to approve the purchase of a 2008 Ford Crown Victoria Police Interceptor from Shawnee Mission Ford for \$21, 783. Motion carried unanimously.

Ordinance No. 8262, authorizing the sale, possession, and consumption of alcoholic beverages at Broken Arrow Park on May 10, 2008 for the Lawrence Sertoma BBQ Cook-off and fundraiser, was read as second time. As part of the consent agenda, **it was moved by Chestnut, seconded by Amyx**, to adopt the ordinance. Aye: Amyx, Dever, Chestnut, Hack, and Highberger. Nay: None. Motion carried unanimously. (4)

Ordinance No. 8246, amending Chapter V of the Code of the City of Lawrence 2008 Edition to revise requirements for plumbing vent systems and unvented gas appliances, was read a second time. As part of the consent agenda, **it was moved by Chestnut, seconded by Amyx**, to adopt the ordinance. Aye: Amyx, Dever, Chestnut, Hack, and Highberger. Nay: None. Motion carried unanimously. (5)

Ordinance No. 8251, the rezoning (Z-01-01-08) of approximately .907 acre from CS (Commercial Strip) to IG (General Industrial), property is located in the 1300 Block of North 3rd Street, was read a second time. As part of the consent agenda, **it was moved by Chestnut, seconded by Amyx**, to adopt the ordinance. Aye: Amyx, Dever, Chestnut, Hack, and Highberger. Nay: None. Motion carried unanimously. (6)

Ordinance No. 8252, the rezoning (Z-01-02-08) of approximately .54 acre from RS10 (Single-Dwelling Residential) to IG (General Industrial), property is located in the 1300 Block of North 3rd Street, was read a second time. As part of the consent agenda, **it was moved by Chestnut, seconded by Amyx**, to adopt the ordinance. Aye: Amyx, Dever, Chestnut, Hack, and Highberger. Nay: None. Motion carried unanimously. (7)

Ordinance 8264, allowing for the temporary sale, possession, and consumption of alcoholic liquor on specific City property, related to the Wilco concert on May 14, 2008, was read a second time. As part of the consent agenda, **it was moved by Chestnut, seconded by Amyx**, to adopt the ordinance. Aye: Amyx, Dever, Chestnut, Hack, and Highberger. Nay: None. Motion carried unanimously. (8)

Ordinance No. 8263, establishing the maximum assessments for improvements to George Williams Way, from 6th Street to Overland Drive, was read a second time. As part of the consent agenda, **it was moved by Chestnut, seconded by Amyx**, to adopt

the ordinance. Aye: Amyx, Dever, Chestnut, Hack, and Highberger. Nay: None.
Motion carried unanimously. (9)

As part of the consent agenda, **it was moved by Chestnut, seconded by Amyx**, to concur with the Planning Commission's recommendations to adopt the findings of fact and approve the rezoning (Z-03-08-08) request for approximately 140 acres for Bauer Brook Estates from A-1 (Suburban Home Residential) to RS-40 (Single-Dwelling Residential). Motion carried unanimously. (10)

As part of the consent agenda, **it was moved by Chestnut, seconded by Amyx**, to concur with the Planning Commission's recommendation to approve a revised Preliminary Development Plan (PDP-03-03-08) for The Oread, located at 618 West 12th Street. Motion carried unanimously. (11)

As part of the consent agenda, **it was moved by Chestnut, seconded by Amyx**, to authorize an amendment to the Lawrence Community Shelter's 2008 Agreement for Use of City Funds, removing the fixed amounts for bus passes and work clothing, allowing LCS to distribute funds as needed between the two categories. Motion carried unanimously. (12)

As part of the consent agenda, **it was moved by Chestnut, seconded by Amyx**, to receive a revised request for acquisition of City parking spaces for the building at 123 West 8th Street. Motion carried unanimously. (13)

CITY MANAGER'S REPORT:

During the City Manager's Report, David Corliss said to follow up on a number of media requests staff put together information regarding costs associated with the NCAA tournament celebrations. The information did not reflect regular wages of police, fire

and other City employees that were already working, but overtime. Staff also sent thank you letters to law enforcement agencies that helped the City of Lawrence. Staff would continue to monitor expenditures to those departments throughout the year and if appropriate, use the sales tax reserve fund as additional resources to respond to those needs.

Also, Police Officer Trent McKinley; Building Safety Manager, Barry Walthall; and, Legal Services Director, Toni Wheeler successfully graduated from Leadership Lawrence and he looked forward to a number of years of community contributions from those employees.

He said the City Manager's Report also indicated staff's continued desire to post information on the City's website regarding additional advisory board agendas and supporting materials.

Finally, he said the Lawrence-Douglas County Planning Office, would release a draft plan for the K-10 and Farmer's Turnpike area and a public meeting was scheduled later this month to receive public input on that area plan. (14)

REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS:

Consider request from Lawrence Arts Commission regarding modifications to Resolution No. 5966 and Resolution No. 5015.

John Reeves, Chair, Lawrence Arts Commission presented the request. He said about a month ago their Commission submitted a letter to the City Commission to review their desire to change Resolution No. 5966 and Resolution No. 5015. Right now, they were into their 25th year as an advisory board for the City of Lawrence. He said part of their work included advising the City on donated art work and applying for community art grants. He said a website was being designed to give a more thorough

explanation of what the Lawrence Arts Commission did for the citizens of Lawrence which would be up and running in June.

He said their Commission suggested the following changes to Resolution No. 5966:

1. "Change the name of the Lawrence Arts Commission to the Lawrence Cultural Arts Commission to better reflect the community of arts (visual, literary, musical, and dramatic) and artists and audiences that the Commission serves";
2. "Adopt the following Mission Statement: The mission of the Lawrence Cultural Arts Commission is to enhance and enliven the community by promoting cultural opportunities and arts education while nurturing an environment of aesthetic vitality;"
3. "In the interest of accessibility to the citizens of Lawrence, for the City to establish a permanent office space for Arts Commission meetings and a reading/resource library at the Carnegie Library or suitable alternative;"
4. "Provide funding up to \$2,000 for the Arts Commission Liaison to attend national conferences to become more attuned to public art practices and current policies in the national network of public art administrator."

Reeves said a few weeks ago, former Mayor Sue Hack was quoted as saying, "It was possible for the City to do just the basics," but Lawrence was more than that, "Lawrence has always prided itself on being a community that enjoys its parks, its bike paths, its arts, its cultural heritage and downtown just to name a few."

He said Resolution 5015 established the policy governing appropriations and expenditures for a public art program. In the past, it had taken a while for the Arts Commission to get a number or idea of what money had been set aside for percent for arts projects and thought it might be a good idea to have a City department, either Finance or City Manager's Office as suggested in the staff report, to handle that. The follow up component was, when the annual budget would be sent to the Arts Commission. Staff suggested March 1st, which seemed like a good day that they could count on this every year.

Reeves said on April 21, 2007, the Lawrence Arts Commission had a strategic planning session that was led by Carol Nalbandian. One of the Arts Commission's priorities was an annual arts plan which required obtaining the amount pursued for arts well in advance, such as the Carnegie Building.

Mayor Dever called for public comment.

After receiving no public comment, David Corliss, City Manager, suggested walking through the specific requests. The City Commission's action would be for staff to come back with drafts of the resolutions. The issue of an office needed to be discussed regarding the timing for that project, the size of space and location. He did not necessarily see a problem with the ability to have some space. One of the reasons why he had advocated for the Carnegie Library improvements was because the City wanted public use of that building. Some of their requested items were budgeted items and those items could be placed on hold until the new budget could be addressed.

He said regarding the 2% for Art Program, every year, at budget time, staff looked at last year's expenses and determined their eligibility. Staff looked at those numbers and provided those numbers to the Arts Commission to make a request to the City Commission to determine that amount or some other amount and then those funds would be available in the next budget year. This year the City Commission would be getting the 2007 expenses to put in the 2009 City budget. He understood the Arts Commission's interest trying to obtain that number early.

He said his recommendation, involving money was to keep track of those items and as the City Commission built its 2009 Budget, staff would remind the City

Commission of those items, put a cost to them, and the City Commission could budget accordingly.

Mayor Dever said he agreed. The first item reflected a name change, the second a purpose statement, and the third was about use of a permanent meeting room or office space. He thought those were relatively simple to resolve and discuss.

Commissioner Amyx said he was comfortable with amending the Resolution No. 5966 to change the name and the mission statement. He said regarding the permanent office space at the Carnegie Building that might be one of the priorities and something that could be discussed throughout the budget process. He said regarding Resolution No. 5015, the request was for clean up language for the Arts Commission to work with members and placing the City Manager's Office in charge of that implementation would be fine.

Commissioner Hack said she agreed with the name change and the mission statement because it better reflected more of the work of the Arts Commission. She asked if the Arts Commission ever used the Arts Center for meeting space because it made sense since it was a City owned building.

Reeves said last night, the Arts Commission used the basement of the Arts Center by the vending machines, which was a little disruptive at times. He said recently their Commission discovered they would be charged to use the Arts Center for the Phoenix Awards in 2008 which was a surprise because it was not budgeted for in 2008. Their Arts Commission had used some of the space at the Art Center in the past, but did not know what their relationship was right now.

Commissioner Hack said the Arts Commission was a City Advisory Board giving City awards in a City building.

Corliss said that was a point of discussion and staff would continue those discussions.

Commissioner Highberger thanked the members of the Arts Commission. He really liked the expansion of the mission statement to give them a conscious effort to give some outlook on the community. He was hoping the Arts Commission could find some reasonable office space if the Carnegie Building did not work out.

Commissioner Hack said those things that have a cost component should go through the budget process.

Commissioner Highberger said the request for the Staff Liaison to attend National Conferences was a relatively minor budget item and was less than the amount the City Manager could approve without discussing that amount with the City Commission and that item could come back as budget item to be discussed.

Corliss said during tight budget times, staff stood down on travel time requests and had a general rule that only department heads and department head equivalents could attend national conferences, at least for funds out of the General Fund. The Arts Commission budgeted \$2,500 this year, but if the City Commission thought the education could be of value, staff could find ways to accomplish that funding.

Commissioner Hack asked if there were other Staff Liaisons on other Advisory Boards that had that same opportunity and was that funding built into their budgets.

He said the Staff Liaison for the Arts Commission was also the Liaison for the Sister Cities Advisory Board who attended a recent training session in the Kansas City

Area. He said the Arts Commission's point was that Lawrence was deserving of the National Conference in Arts Administration and Arts work on behalf of the City. He said travel time came in and out of the budget and was the first casualty when not spending money when the City did not need to. He said he was a strong proponent of training and learning. He said he would gather more information about what the City's practice was regarding travel and discuss that issue to see how that goal could be accomplished. He said if this would be an expense to the City then it should be budgeted. He said \$2,000 was not a lot of money, but in many cases, \$2000 was the travel budget for a certain department. He said this was all appropriate, but just a matter of priorities.

Commissioner Amyx said he wanted to follow up on a comment Commissioner Hack made about an office and resource library to be housed at the Arts Center. He said the City did quite a bit of funding to the Arts Center through various departments through the City budget. He thought they could resolve matters that Arts Center might have with the Arts Commission, if the level of funding, for him, was going to continue to be supported.

Corliss said there could be some good discussions. There was a good relationship with the Arts Center and did not have any reason to think that relationship changed. Staff would discuss that item and other things as well.

Mayor Dever said they should identify three main missions which were to move forward with the name change and mission statement change, identify the need for meeting space, and wait for information from the City Manager concerning travel funding.

Moved by Hack, seconded by Highberger, to direct staff to draft revised resolutions with the changes as discussed regarding the suggested name change, mission statement and provide additional information on proposed travel funding. Motion carried unanimously. (15)

Receive Lawrence Community Shelter Annual Report, as required by SUP-01-02-07.

Scott McCullough, Director of Planning and Development Services, presented the staff report. He said in April 2007 the City Commission granted the Lawrence Community Shelter a three year special use permit for a homeless shelter with six conditions of approval. One of the conditions required an annual report to be submitted, which was the subject of this item.

Loring Henderson, Community Shelter Director, presented the annual report. He said there were four reasons for homelessness, lack of housing, jobs, healthcare, and family support. There were a lot of urban myths about homeless people and why they got to be homeless, but those were the four categories of reasons that brought people to this state. It was important to segue way from the cultural arts commission agenda item to the culture of a community and how it treated the poorest and most broken people in its community. The Lawrence Community Shelter was proud to be part of the community's response to this need in their community's midst.

He said one urban myth was that people came from all over to Lawrence and was told this from time to time. He said if visiting the shelters, it was a place where people needed to be rather than where people wanted to be. Another myth was that

shelter directors, when getting together, often share because every town had homelessness.

He said when people go to a shelter, they were given respect, safety, and programs to get out of homelessness. Lawrence had an excellent police force, but also homeless people know this and feel respected and treated well by the police force. That was an important reason. The police force was not violent and were well trained to handle difficult human situations often seen at shelters.

One of the other things that Lawrence should be proud of was the collaboration of all the agencies that were working on homelessness such as the Salvation Army, ECAN, Ballard Center, and Women's Transitional Care. They were all working together and were a gift because he had been in communities where collaboration did not exist.

They recently joined the balance of the state for HUD Programs so applications could be made to the continued care to the larger pool of money and people were talking in Lawrence how, over time, each could provide a service to make this continued care real and to take advantage of funding that was out there. He said with the vision of housing for the homeless and the vision of the Community Commission on Homelessness, the Lawrence Community Shelter was part of a group that was developing a small pilot project for supportive housing; a major need for people in Lawrence who were mentally ill. They were part of a group that was talking about how they could someday have a detoxification and rehabilitation center in Lawrence.

He showed the police logs, which was one of the conditions of the SUP. There were concerns of privacy, even though the names had been deleted. They did a log, but it would be in a different form. The other thing submitted was the number of calls for

police and ambulance. They also had a log of guests that had obtained jobs and housing. In the case management at the Shelter there were four programs, jobs, housing and benefits and intervention. Intervention was a multifaceted program that could mean medical or psychiatric intervention, or drug abuse intervention.

The last category was jobs and housing. In housing, 2 people got into transitional housing and that was a sign of their availability of family. He said 59 people were helped to submit their applications through their case management program. The Shelter took 40 people to detoxification and 5 people to rehabilitation programs.

He said under the employment of jobs program section of case management was a job coaching program which worked with the individual from the start to the finish. One person just got a job at Presto in North Lawrence and had to be there at 6:00 a.m. so the job coach was getting up to drive them to work because there was no transportation for this person. Until the person was settled and socialized on the job that was what they were going to do. They were looking for someone who was retired or a business person that would like to take this over and take it to the next level. They had a day program at the shelter and a night program. The day program was somewhat divided because they had the Drop in Center and started 10 years ago. Over time, the Drop in Center was to get people out of extreme weather, daily living services, it was a fund, a washer and dryer were provided, limited storage, they served breakfast five days a week. They now had a file on everyone who came in, an intake on them, and kind of knew who they were and a little about them. Case management was another program and it occurred during the daytime and of course in the same building on the day side. They averaged about 53 people who go through the drop in center

daily. At night, they slept 31 people, provided a full evening meal, there was a lot of counseling that went on, and had three folks on staff that were in recovery themselves and at nighttime there were a lot of folks that wanted to deal with their issues. They took people whenever they needed to go to detoxification and there was none in Lawrence so they took those people to Topeka or Johnson County or downtown Kansas City, Kansas City Kansas, and Kansas City Missouri. Whenever they were ready to go, they go. The night staff helped pull that together; also, the note there that they frequently turned away 14 – 15 people, which was particularly during a colder or extreme weather night.

He said one of the interesting parts for them was the communications with neighbors. There was a Good Neighbor Agreement and one of the things the agreement called for was a semi annual report to the neighbors so they had the summer block party. He said people often thought the shelter was controversial. He said regarding the Good Neighbor Agreement, the onus was on the shelter and if they signed the Good Neighbor Agreement, it helped to keep the shelter on its toes. They thought the Good Neighbor Agreement was a good way to promote communications and work with neighbors.

He said they also developed and distributed a card what was distributed to area businesses up and down Mass St, Vermont, New Hampshire, and the side streets. The idea was if a business had an issue with a homeless person, they could call him. He said the point was he was available to respond if there was something going on. The card did not work to well and they were going to rewrite the card. He was told it seemed

like more of an information card for someone who was homeless and looking for help. They needed to change the wording and distribute the card again.

He said he also met with the Jane Pennington and Dan Hughes, of Downtown Lawrence, Inc. to keep communications open. There had been a lot of neighborhood meetings with different organizations.

He said they also worked out a separate agreement with the four churches that surrounded the shelter. It was an outside security plan, which did not mean they were agreeing to take over security for the churches, but an agreement to work with those churches. If they saw someone from the shelter that was across the street on the church property and an issue was going on, the shelter staff could deal with it and had permission from the church to go onto their property. They tried many ways to reach out to the neighbors and work with them. They knew they were in a sensitive space, but were also in a dilapidated, inadequate, and wrong space.

Vice Mayor Chestnut thanked Henderson for the report. He said also included in the report was an updated discussion about hiring someone to help with the fundraising effort. He asked about Greenwood Consulting and whether it specialized in the type of fundraising The Shelter was looking at.

Henderson said Greenwood Consulting was one individual and met that individual when they were interviewing consulting groups. They interviewed four regional and one national consulting group. They liked Jack Greenwood and Greenwood Consulting was based in Lawrence. The group that he was part of, each did individual jobs as well. It was agreeable to his group that Greenwood would work with them individually.

Vice Mayor Chestnut said regarding the annual report, he asked how the number of police and emergency calls compared to years past.

Henderson said he did not have that information. He thought it was a little lower on their end, but he needed to take a look at the entire picture.

Commissioner Amyx asked if Henderson had any comment regarding calls to the police department on surrounding properties of The Shelter.

Henderson said they had one on-going problem with one neighbor with trespassing. He did not know about police calls, but knew about the neighbor's calls to him. He appreciated that he did get calls from that neighbor and he tried to respond. He did receive many calls from other people, so it gave him something of a measure of what was really going on. His property was a path between The Shelter and shops. They posted signs and had group meetings, but some people still trespassed sometimes.

Commissioner Hack thanked Henderson for the report. She said it was thorough and complete and the type of report she was expecting to see. She knew Henderson was working hard to find an alternative location which would be better for everyone.

Henderson said his staff and other agencies felt like they were making progress.

Mayor Dever said the public had a better sense of where things were at because information was posted and it was important for the public to see the work they did, what was needed in this community, and the efforts to achieve the results. He looked forward to looking over more of this information in the future and hopefully they could make more progress on the location.

Mayor Dever called for public comment.

Melinda Henderson, Lawrence, said she lived about a block and a half from the Lawrence Community Shelter. She said she has signed the Good Neighbor Agreement and had been to the two block parties. She said she wanted to support the progress Henderson had made along with the board. She was so terribly sorry that this information was not presented last week before the Special Use Permit hearing and wondered if that information would have made a difference.

She had some concerns from watching that meeting and listening to everything the shelter was trying to do. She was very proud to have The Shelter as her neighbor. As she watched the repeat of the City Commission meeting last Wednesday, she became upset as she listened to several comments that seemed to stray from the specific issue of the SUP of the shelter and industrial zoning. She thought Janet Good made a comment that an SUP for a shelter probably ought to be required in any rezoning and thought that was a good idea.

She said as a Shelter neighbor, she passed by the shelter either on foot or by auto several times a week. Last week, she heard anecdotal catastrophe and if some of the people could have heard Henderson's annual report, it might have helped people understand The Shelter and what it was trying to do in a limited space. She said a lot of those issues would disappear if they could site the shelter in a good location, wherever that might be.

She said she read the executive summary that was attached and the first two recommendations that Greenwood made were important and became clear after listening to the comments last week, the strong public awareness program and the success stories because they did not hear enough about those stories. She said as it

had been suggested, perhaps they needed a national conversation on race and perhaps they needed a local conversation community wide on homelessness. She said there were so many different groups that were working on this issue along with the homeless shelter that the more education people received, and hear from people like her who had been a neighbor, the better. There might be some people congregating outside sometimes which might be because there was no space inside.

As an Oread resident, she did not know the best long term location for the Community Shelter, but knew people were working in groups on that issue. She preferred to continue to be a neighbor to The Shelter rather than living in a neighborhood with a lot of party houses. She was concerned the implied message, last week, was to not put it in their neighborhood. She said when the Barker Neighborhood was being looked at as a site for the Salvation Army, she heard the same argument and the situation had not gotten better since, but getting worse. She hoped the community could have that discussion and education so they did not hear those types of comments.

Commissioner Highberger said he lived in the Oread area and lived about three blocks from The Shelter and would rather have The Shelter closer and some of the party houses farther away.

Eileen Smith, Lawrence, said there needed to be a whole new definition of homelessness or people without homes. There was such a variety of people in that situation and she did not think those varieties of people could be dumped together.

She said she had worked as an independent living model for mentally handicapped in Topeka back in 1977. She said she lived in an apartment building with

5 women and her job was to make sure those women went to work and took care of themselves. She said it was a wonderful job. One woman invited her to her wedding and it was one of the most endearing experiences. She said she was glad there were successes over at The Community Shelter and thought there was a deeper and complicated issue. She said probably those party houses were a step in that direction and it might be good to get some of those people involved in what happened if you drink too much.

Moved by Hack, seconded by Highberger, to receive the annual report. Motion carried unanimously. (16)

Consider adopting the 2008-2012 Consolidated Plan and the 2008 Action Plan and consider adopting Resolution No. 6768, authorizing the Mayor to execute agreements for the 2008 CDBG and HOME programs and other such documents as may be required to be submitted to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development for such programs.

Margene Swarts, Interim Assistant Director, Development Services, said the City was required to submit a five year consolidated plan, an annual action plan regarding the CDBG and HOME Programs. This year, the submission would be a new five year plan from 2008 to 2012 and basically included the action plan and the investment summary. It discussed housing and community development needs and priorities for the community and the investment summary detailed the activities that were recommended for funding to address those needs. Priorities were determined by both the assessment of needs in the community as well as prior activities that had been completed.

The Neighborhood Resources Advisory Committee, or the NRAC, made the final recommendation for the CDBG and HOME Programs with input from other citizen boards and the public, census data, previous homeless counts had been conducted and also took direction from the City Commission from the annual study session.

She said as previously approved by the City Commission the advisory committee continued to consider the Step Up to Better Housing strategy and additionally strong attention had been paid to continue to address the homeless situation in the community with the allocation of funds to both the Lawrence Community Shelter and the Salvation Army.

The advisory committee held a public hearing on April 10th which opened the 30 day written comment period. Several people attended the public hearing and provided comments to the committee and that information would be included in the plan. To date, they had received no written comments, but there were about 7 more days to go and if staff received any comments, those comments would be included in the submission.

She said with regard to the investment summary which was page 18 of the action plan, it was important to note that by federal regulation expenditure of funds was limited in three areas and no more than 15% of the CDBG grant could be used for public service activities; as for administration the cap was 20% for CDBG and 10% for HOME; and for the Community Housing Development Organization, or CHDO, which in their case was Tenants to Homeowners, operating expenses was limited to 5%. The allocations that were recommended to the City Commission were all within the regulatory caps. There was no cap for public expenditures and there was no cap for the

set aside for the CHDO which was a minimum of 15% so more could be allocated. In this year's case, a little bit more money was allocated.

She said she would like to recognize and thank Leslie Rigney who was the Neighborhood Program Specialist who was very instrumental in the preparation of the plan this year. The next step in the process was to adopt the resolution authorizing the submission of the CDBG and HOME grant documents and the Consolidated Plan and 2008 Action Plan and investment summary.

Commissioner Amyx said regarding the sidewalks in the 700 block of New Jersey Street and the sidewalk by Van Go Mobile Arts, he asked if those sidewalks connected with existing sidewalks.

Swarts said the Van Go and the 700 block of New Jersey would be a continuation of what was being put in around Van Go and down the street. The various other sidewalks were either new sidewalks where there had been none before or connecting sidewalks where there were gaps.

Commissioner Amyx asked if the sidewalk at Van Go was going through the parking lot area along the north side of the building.

Swarts said yes. This was part of the entire new site improvements with parking and sidewalks and then the sidewalk would connect down the street.

Mayor Dever called for public comment.

Kristen Roussel, Neighborhood Resources Advisory Committee, said their Board would also like to thank Swarts and all the contributions from staff both in the Neighborhood Resources Department and others that were helpful in providing information in going through the deliberation process and making allocations.

Loring Henderson said when he saw this issue on the agenda, he thought it would be an opportunity to express appreciation from not only him, but also from the group of agencies dealing with the issue of homelessness regarding the wonderful staff support they received from Swarts and Rigney. He said when discussions took place earlier about Lawrence being fortunate and the good will that agencies had amongst each other, there had to be a source and that source was the trust for Swarts and Rigney.

Robert Baker, Housing and Credit Counseling, said he wanted to thank the board for their preliminary funding recommendation and also recognized the job that board did. It was really hard to come up with funding recommendations especially when you have subsequent years of reduced funding. It was a tough job, but the board did a good job.

Commissioner Amyx said the recommendation from the advisory board was unfortunate, but was a sign of the times in that people were affected by housing situations and was glad they were able to help. He also thanked Swarts as he had the opportunity to see the development of the Community Development Block Grant and the professionalism from staff. He said Community Development Block Grant Advisory Board made good, positive and sound recommendations with that large amount of work. He said CDBG funds were decreasing, but they tried to touch as many programs and public improvements as they could.

Mayor Dever said in the brief time he had been associated with CDBG, he had heard positive comments about the work done and looked at all the different items they had to look at and was hard to prioritize. He said Swarts was doing an excellent job and

he appreciated that very much. He hoped staff could continue to properly allocate the funds and put those funds to the best use in the community.

Moved by Highberger, seconded by Amyx, to adopt the 2008 Action Plan and adopt Resolution No. 6768, authorizing the Mayor to execute agreements for the 2008 CDBG and HOME Programs and other such documents as may be required to be submitted to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development for such programs. Motion carried unanimously. (17)

Consider request for Landmark Designation, L-08-01-07, and hold public hearing for consideration of placing the structure located at 805 Ohio Street on the Lawrence Register of Historic Places.

Consider request for Landmark Designation, L-09-02-07, and hold public hearing for consideration of placing the structure located at 934 W 21st Street on the Lawrence Register of Historic Places.

Mayor Dever called a public hearing to consider a request for Landmark Designation, L-08-01-07, a request for landmark designation at 805 Ohio Street and to consider a request for Landmark Designation, L-09-02-07, a request for landmark designation at 934 W. 21st Street.

Lynn Zollner, Historic Resources Administrator, presented the staff report. She said the first item was the Landmark Designation for 805 Ohio Street known as the Simmons Hospital, but it was actually the Jacob's House Residence. The staff report outlined how this designation met the qualifications for the Lawrence Register of Historic Places. Also, there were the minutes from the Historic Resources Commission meeting and the environs definition and associated map. The criteria were met for the Jacob's House Residence and was eligible for the Lawrence Register.

The residence was located in the Old West Lawrence Historic District as a contributing structure to that district, so it was listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Currently that district had environs, so all the properties that would be included in the local environs of the Jacob House Residence were already included in the environs of the state or national environs. She said when they listed properties on the Lawrence Register of Historic Places, the Historic Resources Commission defined the definition of the environs so it was clear what projects could be reviewed administratively and what projects must go to the full HRC Commission. She said in Chapter 22, there was a presumption that any project in the environs would be improved unless there was some specific cause for harm to the listed property. Those definitions helped clear up what projects might be reviewed and how they could be reviewed.

She said the next nomination, 934 West 21st Street, known to many people as the Airplane House or the Double Hyperbolic Paraboloid House was up for a nomination tonight to the Lawrence Register of Historic Places. This property was also listed on the National Register of Historic Places and the Kansas Register of Historic Places. She showed the criteria that it met for listing on the Lawrence Register of Historic Places. A map showed the existing environs and was listed on the National Register of Historic Places and had a 500 foot environs boundary under Kansas State Law because it was listed on the National Register and the house directly to the east was the Dudley Wiggins House. It was on the Kansas Register and also had a 500 foot environs under state law. It had been listed since 1982. The local environs would be listed if the

property was listed on the local register. All the properties that would be listed in the Lawrence environs were already encompassed in the national environs.

She said staff included information on the environs definition in case there were any questions about what projects needed to be reviewed, whether it held up a building permit, or took an extraordinary amount of time. Most of the projects were administratively reviewed by her and usually took about 10 days. Planning Staff was now working with Development Services to speed that time up as much as they could by doing almost all of their communication electronically; using PDF's and PDF date stamps so she could approve something and e-mail it back sometimes on the same day. Staff was working toward that process as staff became one agency to have better communications to turn those around. She said she anticipated that 10 day time would shrink, even though the number of cases may go up. She said most things could be approved administratively, except for demolition, new construction, and major building additions. Everything else would be an administrative review.

Commissioner Amyx said the environs were the key for adjoining property owners because they were already in the environs of another structure that was listed so any of the requirements to develop or redevelop or pull a building permit, they were already in those environs.

Zollner said that was correct.

Mayor Dever asked whether there would be any additional burdens on the homeowner as a result of the designation.

Zollner said no.

Mayor Dever asked about the importance of this designation.

Zollner said the Lawrence Register was like a high school honor roll and was not used enough. It would be used as a community tool with heritage tourism and most people would call and ask what was listed on the Lawrence Historic Register. Right now there were not a lot of properties listed on the Lawrence Register because they were listed on the State or National Historic Register. A lot of times people were looking for the local flavor and what was important to the local community. Staff was encouraging properties, as staff was looking at or reviewing a National Register nomination, that they might want to consider being on the Lawrence Register of Historic Places because it was like an honor roll and were properties in the community that were significant to Lawrence's heritage.

Mayor Dever called for public comment.

Dennis Brown, President of the Lawrence Preservation Alliance, said he lived in the environs of the Old West Lawrence Historic District for 20 years. He said the Lawrence Preservation Alliance was very supportive of both 805 Ohio and 934 West 21st being added to the local register of historic places. He said he wanted to speak a little bit about the Hyperbolic Paraboloid House.

He said this house was designed in 1956 by then Kansas University Assistant Professor of Engineering Doctor Donald Dean in order to, in his own words, demonstrate the feasibility of this type of construction and to check qualitatively the adequacy of the design methods and had indeed withstood the test of time and had become quite a conversation piece for Lawrence as well. This register listing also gave them, as preservationists, the opportunity to explore the idea of historic listings in general. They were at times accused of wishing to freeze neighborhoods in time or

wishing to only live like it was 100 years ago, yet this house of tomorrow, as it was built in the 1950s, was clearly no Queen Anne, Italianate, or Bungalow. He asked how this could be. He said it was because the register listings were meant to tell the story of who they were as a community or where they were at particular points in time. Survivors of building types that were repeated within the community due to their suitability or popularity or as in the case of this house, something that was just totally unique. History was not static, it was alive. What they were doing today was tomorrow's history, which was why their comments of Dr. Dennis Domer who encouraged what they attempted to do today was to build buildings of their own time that say who they were as community members of Lawrence at this point in time were so very important to understand. To a preservationist, particularly regarding infill development, it was not desirable to attempt to replicate older styles. Authenticity had more value than replicas. What was more important was that the new building respected its elders, which was accomplished not by copying specific design elements, but rather by suggesting them or expanding them, and paying close attention to principles like scale, massing and setbacks. He said new buildings or additions to old ones need their own personality while still taking care not to compete with or inhibit the older structures that they as a community have determined to have great value.

Beyond the specialness of 934 West 21st itself, was to him the great lesson of the 1950's Hyperbolic Paraboloid. As builders of today's structures, they should be aware that over 50 years from now their design creations would achieve eligibility for historic register listing. To do so, their structures would still need to be structurally sound and if they were not then they were not doing a good job of sustainable building. Beyond that,

it would not be for them to decide and would fall to their children or grandchildren to make the determination that if what they built was worthy of recognition as their own recorded chapter in Lawrence history based on what they had in registers for historic places. To be judged by their children was a stern test indeed and hoped their children felt, when that time came, they had left a built environment worthy of preservation and recognition.

Tim Weston said he was a neighbor to the Paraboloid House on Carolina Street and lived on that street for 18 years. He said that house was unique and they were within its environs for years. He said the Centennial Neighborhood had its ups and downs over the years, but neighborhoods did not decline because people put their homes on the national registry. He said neighborhoods decline as houses go to pieces and criminal elements move in to get a foothold, but he saw none of that in their neighborhood. He said he saw a beautiful home his neighbors had chosen to place on the National Register and commend his neighbors because a lot of homeowners were not willing to do that. He said he and his family were asking the City Commission to give consideration to adding the Paraboloid House to the Kansas Registry and local registry to go along with the National and State listing.

Sharla True, Lawrence, said she lived in the neighborhood of the 805 residence and was not sure how it affected rules and regulations of those who lived in the neighborhood. She said as long as it was just recognition for their beautiful home she had no problem with it but if it affected the rules and regulations of fencing or remodels to homes she had a problem with infringing on the rights of neighbors and future homeowners. If being on the register meant they could not fix the garage when a tree fell on

it or what have you. She said a classic example was on Rhode Island Street in the 800 block. There was a house which was falling to pieces and was on the National Registry so not all homes that were on the registry stayed beautiful. The garage was falling in, it leaked profusely, the doors were falling off the garage, and one of the tenants that moved in had to fix 16 leaks in the pipes. It was fine to place a home on the registry that was beautiful now, but asked not to ban the new owner from expanding, remodeling or making any change they so choose including knocking it down. She said that might be something that needed to be rethought. If something went wrong, they should have the right to do as they pleased because they owned that house.

Randy Masten said he and his wife were co-owners of the structure at 934 West 21st Street. He said since they purchased the house, on several occasions they had been approached by art students at KU requesting to use the house in their drawings. It had been written about by architectural students who had gone back to look at the history of the home. Its linkage to KU went not only to the people who lived in the home, Dr. Dean and a medical chemistry professor who now had a lecture series named after him at KU. It was linked to really every person he had come in contact with in Lawrence. They seemed to have, at some time, either been in the house or remembered it being built. Its connection to Lawrence was great, but there was also an appeal nationwide. There were people who had written and e-mailed to ask questions about the house.

He thanked Tom Harper in his efforts in researching this home. He did quite a bit of research and since he had moved into the house they had done more research and were remarkable. As time went on, it would be more noteworthy.

Moved by Amyx, seconded by Hack, to close the public hearing. Motion carried unanimously.

Commissioner Amyx said he thought both of those pieces of property were deserving of landmark designation in the city. He said one question he had earlier because it was a question of environs and what had to happen because the environs already existed, if either one of those properties had designation that did not go forward, those rules and regulations were there. He said the two pieces of property being discussed were important and everyone had ideas about that house, past and present. He said he was in support of those two designations and appreciated the work staff had done and the owners of the properties in keeping those houses in a way that all of Lawrence could be proud of.

Commissioner Hack said both properties were beautiful and it was very smart idea to place those properties as landmark designations.

Mayor Dever said jewels came in all shapes and sizes, but both structures were two very different beauties and deserving of this designation. He was glad to honor it and place those structures on the honor roll.

Moved by Chestnut, seconded by Hack, to direct staff to draft an ordinance for landmark designation for 805 Ohio Street. Motion carried unanimously. (18)

Moved by Chestnut, seconded by Hack, to direct staff to draft an ordinance for landmark designation for 934 West 21st Street. Motion carried unanimously. (19)

Consider the following Traffic Safety Commission (TSC) Items:

- a) **Consider approving the recommendation from the TSC to establish a marked crosswalk together with pedestrian refuge islands on Louisiana Street adjacent to Dakota Street.**

- b) **Consider the recommendation from the TSC to deny the request to establish stop signs at the four traffic booth entrances on the Kansas University Campus. (TSC approved 4-3) The University of Kansas has made the request for the stop signs. The stop signs are necessary to improve student safety on the campus and comply with the MUTCD. The TSC did recommend denial of this request; however staff is recommending that the request for stop signs be approved.**
- c) **Consider approving the recommendation from the TSC to establish a mid-block marked crosswalk on Naismith Drive between 18th Street and 19th Street. (TSC approved 5-2)**

Chuck Soules, Public Works Director, presented the staff report. He said the first item was a request from the neighborhood to establish a pedestrian crosswalk at the intersection of Louisiana and Dakota Street. He said during the agenda meeting Vice Mayor Chestnut requested information about the distances to 23rd Street which was 840 feet, from Dakota Street down to the next pedestrian island, the difference was about 800 feet, and down to the tunnel was 1800 feet.

The Traffic Safety Commission approved the pedestrian crosswalk unanimously, but staff wanted to make sure it was brought to the City Commission because there would be a slight cost which would be done in-house to put in a pedestrian refuge island. He said there were issues with the pedestrian refuge islands when those islands were installed on Louisiana. Staff had changed the design and the design would not be so abrupt, but staff wanted to make sure the City Commission was aware of this issue.

Vice Mayor Chestnut asked about the proposal for Dakota Street, and if the proposal included a pedestrian island.

Soules said yes.

Vice Mayor Chestnut said between Dakota and 23rd Street was about 1600 feet.

Soules said that was correct.

Commissioner Hack asked if the Bicycle Advisory Committee looked at this or commented on it.

Soules said he was not aware of any comment from the BAC.

Commissioner Hack said the e-mails she received dealt with bicycle safety and wondered if Soules had any information on those pedestrian islands.

David Woosley, Traffic Engineer, said some bicyclists had some concerns, but usually they were bicyclists who were less experienced because the ones who were more experienced knew it was a narrow lane and the bicyclist had the right of way and could claim that lane and move over. Louisiana did not have a marked lane for bicyclists, but was a bicycle route. The bicyclist could move over and claim that entire lane as their own when they were approaching one of those islands. The more experienced ones did not have much of a problem with it but the less experienced ones did because they were not that familiar and sometimes they were a little inattentive in traffic sometimes.

David Corliss, City Manager, said when those pedestrian refuge islands were installed on Louisiana, staff had significant conversations with members of the community about it. He said staff kept those islands at those locations, and were eventually modified on the signage and other things to try and make those islands more obvious to drivers, especially at night. One of his questions was

whether or not they knew where the street lighting was to make them visible at night time. He understood the interest in trying to improve pedestrian safety, but staff had to make sure they were notifying the traveling public and it could be seen because it was a major concern. If this proceeded, he was going to work with Soules and others to make sure they had a good plan to have drivers see this and have some type of phased approach.

Mayor Dever said as far as experience, he was more concerned about less experienced drivers, than less experienced bikers because those two met often. He said he considered himself a fairly experienced rider, but sometimes a person could run into a situation where the car tried to pass a biker as opposed to a biker passing a car. He said in his opinion it was a conflict of two modes of transportation and often times there was no room and it ended with a problem.

Mayor Dever called for public comment.

Sharla True said one word, stop signs. Those roundabouts or walk through areas were costing tremendous amount of money and upkeep. It was difficult for women with strollers on roundabouts and walk through areas. She said it was just mentioned that this was a terrible insult to bicyclers and it narrowed the road and bicyclists would jump the curb if they saw a car coming. She said they were talking about high school and junior high drivers, buses and City buses to contend with. Due to the roundabouts, buses would not let you off as close to the corner as a person needed to get off. It did not calm the traffic, but impedes the traffic. It was very unsafe and every driver she had been hit by

had been a high school person or college student and was very well traveled by both.

Michael Pomes, President of the Parkhill Neighborhood Association, said he came in support of the pedestrian refuge island. He said mostly because he drove by there every day and part of the neighborhood both on the east side, which was the Parkhill Neighborhood Association and on the west side was the Belle Haven Neighborhood, what he saw over and over again were a lot of pedestrians that were attempting to go from one side to the other side. So far they had not had the climate to walk around, but as the weather started to get nicer, he saw a lot of activity going from the Westlake area or to the Checkers area. There was a lot of traffic and he slowed down many times to give the pedestrians the respect and courage to walk in the neighborhoods. He hoped the City Commission would support having a refuge island so that at least in their case, residents, especially elderly residents, would have a place to stop and if there was a lot of traffic especially during the 5:00 rush hour there was a lot of traffic going through that area. He said he had been cycling for a number of years and had to ride defensively because the traffic was increasing.

Commissioner Highberger said he understood the concerns of bicyclists, but he said they had a number of those islands and although there was concern, he did not have strong evidence of actual difficulties or accidents. He said on a street like Louisiana Street there should be a safe pedestrian crossing at least 600 feet. He said there was a gap in pedestrian accessibility and he would support the recommendation of the Traffic Safety Commission.

Vice Mayor Chestnut said he had to respectfully disagree with the Traffic Safety Commission, especially one of the concerns he had was with process. In reading the minutes, bicycles were not even in the discussion. There were basically two public comments one that the speaker did not expect the sidewalk to protect them from the traffic and the other that the crosswalk define the area where pedestrians should be crossing. He was not sure they were opposing the recommended solution that came up to it.

He was a little bit confused by several comments by Commissioners. One Commissioner said he was interested in seeing the kind of traffic they were walking in the area before they did anything. He was perplexed about that and was particularly concerned about bicyclists. Ultimately they had to make decisions between autos, bicycles and pedestrians. In this case, bicyclists were not even considered in the equation. He said he agreed with the map Soules brought that it might be appropriate to have some type of crossing but was concerned something was designed that did not meet the needs of one of the three groups that used that road and was not even really considered.

Commissioner Hack said she agreed with the Vice Mayor. She was usually hard pressed to go against a unanimous recommendation of the Traffic Safety Commission and was quite frankly unaware of the hazards of the bicycling public, but knew those pedestrian refuges and island had been a constant concern for folks. Louisiana in and of itself was pretty much a nightmare because it was too narrow for traffic with three schools and a lot of pedestrians. She was not sure this was the best solution to the problem.

Commissioner Amyx said along with what Vice Mayor Chestnut and Commissioner Hack spoke about, he really did not think much about what cyclists had brought into this discussion until the comments received in the last 48 hours. He said Corliss pointed out an important part that if the City Commission were to proceed, that proper lighting would need to be available. He said if the refuge island was the only thing that was being constructed he could not support that and did not feel safe placing people in those situations on that street. If the City Commission wanted to send this issue back to look at other types of crosswalks or something else that was going to protect that lane from narrowing down, he would look at that and along with the comments of the City Manager about the lighting. He wanted to make sure it was a safe situation for all involved. He felt comfortable sending it back to the Traffic Safety Commission to look at other alternatives.

Commissioner Hack asked if there were any other alternatives besides the refuge islands. A stop sign tells people what they were supposed to do and those in terms of yielding to the bicyclists, but were there other options for this or a raised crosswalk or something that would note that.

David Woosley, Traffic Engineer, said he was sure there were several different things that could be looked at and staff could work with the neighborhood to see if they would like to take a look at any other option available.

Commissioner Hack said she was not sure this created the safest situation for the pedestrian or bicyclist. Looking at other alternatives might be a good way to handle it.

Commissioner Amyx said rather going all the way against the TSC he would feel better sending it back to the TSC to receive additional information on what other types of safety crossing could be placed at that location.

Commissioner Highberger said if those crossing were as dangerous as everyone believed, those crossing should be ripped out.

Mayor Dever said this was a major bike route in and out of town for people going to and from high school. Plus, it was a designated bike route. He thought there was a majority that would like this issue to go back to the Traffic Safety Commission and make sure that there were bicyclists involved in the process and the designation because they had concerns with the current configuration, construction or location of the pedestrian refuges as they were.

Moved by Amyx, seconded by Hack, to refer the Traffic Safety Commission's recommendation to approve a marked crosswalk together with pedestrian refuge islands on Louisiana Street adjacent to Dakota Street back to the TSC to take into consideration the cycling public. Motion carried unanimously. **(20)**

Soules said the second item was a request from the University of Kansas. The University of Kansas maintained all their roads on campus and all their law enforcement on campus. In order to have any citations or violations enforced, there had to be an ordinance and process those through the municipal court. Currently, there were four locations where they had their security booths as you enter into campus and all were on

the University of Kansas property. The University had requested to be allowed to place permanent stop signs at this location. The Traffic Safety Commission heard their request and voted to deny the request. Staff was recommending the City Commission reconsider this request and potentially remove those requests so the University of Kansas could enforce those lawful stop signs.

He said the third item was a second request from the University of Kansas to place a pedestrian marked crosswalk on Naismith between 18th and 19th. The University had their Student Safety Advisory Board recommendation that was basically between two high traffic generators and kids were crossing in the middle of the block. This was a City street and the University of Kansas, through student fees, would pay for this crosswalk. The Traffic Safety Commission recommended this crosswalk and which was a marked crosswalk to enhance driver awareness of the signage. It would be a sidewalk with handicapped ramps. It also allowed kids to get back and forth in front of the bus instead of crossing behind the bus.

Commissioner Highberger said regarding Item B, currently the way he understood it, there were stop signs up when campus was closed and the rest of the time there were no stop signs. He asked if Item B dealt with a change of that policy.

A KU representative said yes.

Jim Modig, Director of Design Construction Management at the University of Kansas, said he was present to answer any questions the City Commission had regarding this item. The University's stop signs at those traffic booth entry points were mixed in with other informational signage. So there was a stop sign that was not a legal stop sign and other information and for visitors and other people out of town who did not

come to the campus on a routine basis it was a little bit confusing for those individuals. He said from time to time people ran those signs because those signs were not legal stop signs and the rate of travel onto campus was an issue and concern, particularly with the crosswalks nearby and students crossing. These proposed changes would help address the signage issue and would put up a sign that would slow the traffic down because when campus opened at 5, it was a gridlock and would help slow some of the traffic down allowing pedestrians to get their crossing at some of those locations.

He said there was one minor correction. They relocated one of the booths; the booth at 13th and Jayhawk Boulevard had been moved back to between 14th Street and Lilac Lane on Jayhawk Boulevard which pulled it back from the intersection.

Commissioner Amyx said if he understood this right, as he was driving up to the booth, the stop sign would be at that location when coming onto campus.

Modig said the stop sign would be on the right hand side, off of the curb.

Commissioner Amyx asked about the stacking of vehicles. He asked if the stacking would block any intersections.

Modig said the stacking of vehicles had been there for as long as he recalled. What would happen would be a stop and go. If a person had a permit to get on campus that person would come up to the stop and then move on, which was basically what happened now. Some of the people were slowing down and get the sign from the attendant and move on. It might be a little bit slower, but it was basically the same condition. The Chi Omega Fountain area was probably the one that got congested the most, but that was also because students were doing drop offs at that location to get

students onto campus. The other three entry points were far enough away from intersections that it had not been a problem.

Commissioner Highberger asked if by placing stop signs at those locations 24/7 that would slow down some of the on campus traffic.

Modig said yes. It also made that stop an enforceable stop as well, which would help traffic flow.

Mayor Dever said the way the signs were right now, they could not legally enforce the stops.

Modig said no, they were not a legal stop sign.

Robin Smith, Lawrence, said he was a member of the Traffic Safety Commission, but was present as an individual and not a representative of the Traffic Safety Commission. Yesterday, he sent the City Commission an e-mail that set out his concerns related to the stop signs at the booths. He said he stood by all of the comments he made in that memorandum. He said he would like to add something he did not address in his memo which was his displeasure and satisfaction with City staff that was recommending the City Commission go ahead and approve the stop signs in spite of the TSC's recommendation to deny the request. If City staff had a problem or additional information that should have been considered, he hoped they would come back to the TSC and they were willing to reinvestigate the request.

He said his granddaughter who was 3 years old and he went onto campus to have lunch at the student union and it turned out to be an ideal time for him to observe a couple of the booths on campus. He said they sat by one of the toll booths closest to campus on about 14th Street. During that period of time, it was amazing. There were a

number of people that did not stop at the current stop sign by the booth and those were the KU vehicles and traveled through that area fast. He said in the five minutes he was at that location, he observed 7-8 buses, 3 or 4 pick up trucks, a trash truck, 2 KU vans, several bicyclists, a John Deere lawn tractor, and a privately owned vehicle that went buzzing through waiving at the toll person because he thought they had a sticker, and one person stopped and was sure it was a visitor. He asked if KU wanted stop signs to stop all of those busses, trucks and lawn people because if that was the goal, he asked if KU could take care of that goal administratively. He said if KU needed to change behavior, KU should do it through the department heads and tell them to stop and hold them accountable. He said there was a bright side to all of this. He said KU wanted to make those stop signs a City traffic code violation which was a City plus. He asked what a stop sign violation was worth.

David Corliss, City Manager, said in the neighborhood of approximately \$60 - \$70.

Smith said along with that amount, court costs could be added which could be tens of thousands of dollars. If a stop sign was placed at those locations, the KU Police had to be willing to start writing tickets against all of those state employees that were driving through those areas. He said if KU police would not enforce it, City police could go on campus and could write tickets. He said could they imagine what it would be like before, during and after football and basketball games the amount of money that could be brought in which was the fun side of this issue.

He said the serious said of the issue was that he hoped the City Commission would reject KU's request for the stop signs. The single most important issue for him

was they wanted to make it 24/7 which was not needed. At the stop sign at Sunflower and Sunnyside, it was already a four way stop and they were going to add a 5th one. Again, it was not needed. He asked the City Commission to uphold the TSC recommendation on this item.

Corliss apologized to Smith because staff did not mean to offend him or other Traffic Safety Commissioners with staff recommendation because staff valued the TSC input. Those issues put staff in an awkward situation because they generally defer to KU on their regulations on their campus and serve as the lawmaking body in those regards, but basically defer to KU on those traffic issues as appropriate. He thought there were a lot of issues with this situation. The City traditionally served as the entity that adopted the ordinance, prosecutes and adjudicates and collect the fines. Their intent was to assist the University of Kansas in those situations.

Smith said he appreciated Corliss' comment. He said he wanted to point out when he was on campus today, he stopped at one of the toll booths and they gave him the parking regulations. Contrary to what was said, it did say in KU's parking regulations that the University of Kansas through the Board of Regents and its administrative officers was authorized by state law to establish parking rules and regulations and provide penalties and infractions for the regulations. Traffic control booths were located at the entrances to the central campus in order to control and restrict traffic in the central campus area. Generally, traffic is controlled from 7:45 am to 5:00 p.m. The stop sign shall always be observed, which was currently right now the busses, trucks and staff of KU were not abiding by the existing regulation. He was very familiar with statutes and Kansas Administrative Regulations and suspected if

investigating this issue, there should be Kansas Administrative Regulations to support whatever Kansas statute allowed them to do. Also, there was a provision if a person runs a rectangular stop sign, the fee was \$50.00 which was unauthorized entrance to closed areas of campus, so even right now there was a \$50.00 fine they could impose which was not acknowledge before.

Vice Mayor Chestnut said he knew where the private street starts and stops, and on the two gate accesses, the access on Mississippi coming up to campus as well as the access on Sunflower where Indiana went up and Sunflower split off, he asked where did the City end and KU property began.

Corliss said on Mississippi's north campus, the City's jurisdiction ends close to the parking garage 500 to 600 feet from the gate. On Sunnyside it was to where it met up with Indiana. He said staff's understanding from City attorneys and KU attorneys was the reason why they did this was because KU had made the decision and staff thought it was a wise decision that the best place to prosecute and adjudicate their traffic, not parking, violations was through City court system because of its business in handling that. He was sure the regulations Smith submitted were accurate, but the City had done it through City ordinance as well as a dual law. What Smith was reciting were regulations that he assumed KU had followed the right statutes and KAR's to implement. Also needed was another layer of City ordinances so the KU police officers could cite those as well and those violations were noted through the municipal court and if someone wanted to contest it, they would go through those proceedings. He said if found guilty the fine was paid, and if not guilty, the individual would be adjudicated and found not guilty.

Smith asked if City police could write tickets on KU campus.

Corliss said absolutely. The focus was the safety of the pedestrian.

Sharla True, Lawrence, said if a stop sign was violated and a car, bicycle or pedestrian was hit and injured, she asked if the fine went up.

Corliss said if there was a vehicular accident it might be a civil claim which would not have a fine, but would be adjudicated. If it was determined it was a crime, a vehicle hitting a pedestrian that involved a crime would be prosecuted and adjudicated in state court and there might be a fine and imprisonment.

True asked if someone ran the stop sign and did not injure someone, there was no additional fine.

Corliss said there could be an additional fine depending upon the severity of the offense.

True said she was in favor of stop signs, including adding more stop signs for walks and allowing for safety crossing, including putting more on campus because she and a friend were trying to cross, but no one would stop, including the police.

Eileen Smith, Lawrence, said there might be a need for other alternative types of signs because another stop sign might not solve the problem. In the State of California on Highway 101 because numerous people were killed, they used reflective bright lights in places that were in question. She said on campus, instead of putting another stop sign at that booth, she suggested putting a fluorescent light on the pedestrian walkways.

Commissioner Amyx said the crosswalk was ideal because the crosswalk was between two residence halls and depending on which side of campus they were on, they had access to both.

He said during the years he had been on the City Commission, the City had deferred those recommendations to KU. He said his only concern was stacking, but that question was answered. He said he did not have any reason to deny KU's request. He said it probably was not needed 24/7, but he did not have a reason to deny the request.

Commissioner Highberger said regarding the crosswalk, architect Christopher Alexander recommended not putting in sidewalks and to see where people walked and then put the sidewalks in after that. He thought the City Commission was giving the people what they were going to do anyway.

He said in terms of the stop sign, he was not sure that 24/7 was necessary for the stop signs and there might be some back up problems, and would hate to go against the Traffic Safety Commission recommendation, but suggested continuing their practice and defer to KU on their decisions.

Commissioner Hack said she would echo what Commissioner Highberger stated and she did not have anything different to add.

Vice Mayor Chestnut said he was inclined to support the Traffic Safety Commission on this issue. He said if the TSC did not have precedent to hear the recommendation from KU, then the recommendation should have never gone before that Commission. He said if the City had a policy of basically granting the request of the University, he was unsure why the recommendation went before the TSC. Given the fact, the City believed the Traffic Safety Commission had some jurisdiction, he agreed with the TSC recommendation. He said he was concerned with snow and ice, because

two of those entrances he commented on were both sloped and if that traffic was stopped, it might be problematic. He would support the recommendation to deny.

Commissioner Amyx asked if there was a better way of handling traffic on a business day for the University.

Vice Mayor Chestnut said the 24/7 issue was going to be a big issue.

Mayor Dever said the problem he had with partial was that a behavioral response needed to be established for that sign. It was one of those situations where it was either in or out.

Commissioner Amyx said one reason he concurred with the Traffic Safety Commission was one of the comments made was that those stop signs were going to be used to slow traffic down. A stop sign was stopping traffic.

Commissioner Highberger said instead of cruising through, a person had to stop and the average speed on campus would be slower, theoretically.

Commissioner Hack said it was pedestrian centric anyway which was what they were trying to accommodate.

Commissioner Highberger said he was skeptical of whether it would work.

Mayor Dever said it was a cheap test to put up stop signs to decide if it would work.

Commissioner Amyx said if the signs were being put up, the signs would not be coming down.

Commissioner Hack said they were not the City's to put up or take down.

Mayor Dever said he was trying to defer to tradition and history to allow KU to enforce their rules. He was a little skeptical of whether or not they were going to slow

down traffic because he knew people had a tendency of speeding up after a full stop. People who were speeding were likely to continue to do so. He thought if it was enforced, then it might end up solving the problem. The City also had an additional source of revenue if they chose to do that enforcement. He thought there was probably an alternate way of handling this issue.

Commissioner Amyx said since the City would be taking care of the fines through Municipal Court, he asked what this would fix.

Corliss said as he understood, there were already signs that advised people to stop, but were not enforced through the municipal court and that needed to be fixed. He said Modig got the message that no one was following the signs right now and with an appropriate sign, they were going to do a good job in educating their own users and other users that they were going to have this legitimate sign and it was going to be enforced. He said KU was going to achieve the goal of slowing down traffic and to the goal of better safety.

Commissioner Amyx said if they were going to make a change at a location, then something was broken and needed to find a way to fix it. On this particular item, he wanted to make a motion to defer this for a couple of weeks to give the City Commission an opportunity to go look at those areas.

Moved by Amyx, seconded by Highberger, to defer the request to establish stop signs at the four traffic booth entrances on the University of Kansas Campus. Aye: Amyx and Highberger. Nay: Chestnut, Dever, and Hack. Motion failed.

Moved by Hack, seconded by Highberger, to approve the request to establish stop signs at the four traffic booth entrances on the University of Kansas Campus. Aye: Dever, Hack and Highberger. Nay: Chestnut and Amyx. Motion carried. **(21)**

Moved by Amyx, seconded by Hack, to concur with the Traffic Safety Commission's recommendation to approve the request to establish a mid-block marked crosswalk on Naismith Drive between 18th Street and 19th Street. Motion carried unanimously. **(22)**

The City Commission recessed for 10 minutes at 9:30 p.m.

The City Commission reconvened in regular session at 9:40 p.m.

Consider candidate projects for the Federal-Aid Safety Program for fiscal years 2010 and 2011 and provide staff direction on which projects to submit

Chuck Soules, Public Works Director, presented the staff report. He said the Kansas Department of Transportation was soliciting tentative projects for the federal safety aid program for fiscal years 2010 and 2011. Typically, this was a 90/10 federal local match project. The City of Lawrence had received substantial amount of funding in the past.

After reviewing high crash locations for the period of 2005-2007, staff was recommending the following locations:

1. "6th Street between Hy-Vee & Folks Road (26 crashes). Possible solution: Widen 6th Street to provide a center two-way-left-turn-lane. Approximately 24-hour traffic volume – 19,000. Total estimate project costs: \$750,000; and,
2. "9th Street at Avalon Road (21 crashes). Possible solution: Widen 9th Street to provide a short two-way-turn-lane and reconstruct the north leg of the intersection as far east as possible. Approximate 24-hour traffic volume – 17,000. Total estimated preliminary project cost: \$400,000.

KDOT would be taking applications across the state and both projects could be submitted where KDOT would evaluate a cost benefit analysis and would look at the cause of the accident, the solution and its costs.

He said staff provided additional information to the City Commission regarding three other high accident locations. He said possible solutions to those locations involving access and neighborhood issues had not been thoroughly examined and would need additional public input.

Commissioner Highberger asked if there was any neighborhood discussion on the 9th & Avalon item.

Soules said the 9th and Avalon location would probably not affect very many people other than the traffic. As far as the neighborhood issue went, they could widen within the right-of-way.

David Woosley, Traffic Engineer, said basically it would be a two way left turn lane between the two intersections to get the left turners out of the through traffic.

Soules said staff had not had any public meetings on those projects.

David Corliss, City Manager, said staff had not contacted the neighborhood association on this issue either. He said one of the issues in trying to analyze neighborhood impact was if the left turn lane would create cut through traffic or those types of things. In staff's initial analysis, they did not see it generating those types of problems and would not significantly impact property owners.

He said the City Commission was kind in saying staff needed to work with the neighborhood on the additional analysis. The improvements on Iowa had been discussed and as recently as last March the City Commission directed staff not to

proceed with that project. He said with staff's indications with KDOT, he did not think KDOT would look with favor at that application because they felt like the City would not likely be proceeding with that project. He said back in the 1990s, he thought they got as far as a design contract.

Woosley said that project went as far as the actual design, but the neighborhood was concerned about the design and the City Commission requested another study of the neighborhood be done.

Corliss said there were some neighborhood representatives that indicated they were in favor of it and some representative that were not.

On the other items, staff wanted to make sure the City Commission had the accident location information, but the median issues on 23rd east of Haskell and Wakarusa Drive south of 6th Street where they talked about possible solutions, staff had not contacted the neighborhoods or the property owners. Staff could do the notification and had until June 13th.

Soules said if those projects were eligible, KDOT would send a letter and last time staff was given 45 days to respond if they wanted to do that project or not. He said staff could start talking to the neighbors at 9th and Avalon, but he did not think anyone would be affected and would only be helping the situation.

Vice Mayor Chestnut asked if additional right-of-way was needed.

Soules said he did not think additional right-of-way was needed because with the new design, it was 11 foot lanes. He said staff needed to look at waterline issues.

Mayor Dever asked if it was typical for the City to solicit public comment.

Soules said yes. He said last year staff received the recommendations and Iowa Street was one of the recommendations.

Corliss said on March 27th, the City Commission voted to not authorize staff to proceed. He said staff's recommendation was that it was an important area to solve.

He said this was a little awkward in that staff did not have any idea that those were viable projects. Staff clearly needed to contact neighbors and adjacent property owners if those proposed projects were to proceed any further. He said staff received those requests when KDOT had the money and staff wanted City Commission's input and direction on how to proceed.

Mayor Dever said if the City was trying to pursue lower cost items, but perhaps higher proficiency in solving some of the City's safety hazards, he asked if that would be possible. He said the lower cost items would more likely be funded and could possibly solve some of the City's problems. He said for example, 23rd and Haskell seemed to be a major route with a number of crashed especially in 2007. He said even though the improvement was only \$70,000, it might solve a lot of problems from a safety standpoint.

Soules said at some point, all of the proposed areas needed to be addressed. Staff had not talked with those owners and thought the access issues would be issues to discuss with them.

Mayor Dever called for public comment.

Sharla True, Lawrence, asked why a stop light across from Hy-Vee would not work at that location.

Commissioner Amyx said if looking at the left turn lane the length of 6th Street, this application was the final piece for the two way left turn lane that ran the entire length of 6th Street.

True said that would not help people cross that street and it would make it more difficult because a person would need to watch five lanes of traffic if adding a turn lane. If the traffic was stopped then people could turn one street up and go to Hy-Vee the back way.

Mayor Dever said those were vehicle safety items and the City Commission was looking at trying to improve the safety of the transportation grid, not necessarily the pedestrian grid. In this case, they were trying to seek funds to reduce traffic accidents. Pedestrian and traffic accidents occur, but they were looking for solutions to the traffic issues as opposed to putting in more stop lights or pedestrian walkways. This was strictly money earmarked for the highway transportation.

True said but down the road in time, as that location grew, there would be a lot more foot traffic. If looking forward in time and the City was spending that type of money on turn lanes, she asked why not include a three way stop at this time.

Mayor Dever said that was a good question, but KDOT was interested in moving traffic through and not stopping and allowing people to cross the street. That was who was providing the money and KDOT's goal was to move traffic through the community in an effective fashion.

Commissioner Amyx said there was a stop light 300 feet to the east at Monterey.

Corliss said there was a traffic signal at Monterey and 6th Street and Folks and 6th Street. Staff was identifying this location as a location on a collector arterial road in

this case it was an arterial road, where there have been a number of crashes at this location so it qualified as a safety concern. Staff saw as a possible solution, widening 6th Street and putting in a 5th lane that exited between Wakarusa and Iowa. That might or might not be the final solution as it came back through engineering and they might say a traffic signal was needed at Eldridge and 6th Street, for example, which was not a collector road but was serving as a collector road to the north of 6th Street. Clearly, part of the analysis would include how this impacted pedestrians. There was a gap between Monterey Way and Folks, so staff needed to look at that issue as well. Pedestrian concerns would be addressed when looking at the engineering portion, but staff was giving a possible solution that was done elsewhere on 6th Street, which was to put in a 5th lane. He thought this was not only because of the crash history, but the City approved a residential subdivision that was the old Doolittle Farm between Monterey Way and Eldridge and the streets were in and the residential buildings had not been built, but would funnel all of its traffic out to Elbridge so there would be more traffic on Eldridge and more access issues on 6th and Eldridge.

True said her concern was the clump of apartments back in that area and could be causing some issues. She said people were already running on foot across the street or with a bike trying to get across the street in that area.

Commissioner Amyx said the two recommended projects to KDOT would probably receive favorable comment from KDOT. He still believed the Iowa Street left hand turn lane was probably the most important as seeing crashes continue to mount, but that was a project he agreed with staff on that KDOT probably would not look very

favorable toward right now given the City Commission turned it down last year. He said he was in support of the two recommended projects by staff.

Moved by Amyx, seconded by Chestnut, to approve the recommendations as provided in the May 1 staff memo. Motion carried unanimously. (23)

City Commission discussion and direction on possible sales tax initiatives

Mayor Dever asked for Commission comments.

Commissioner Amyx said as he understood it, Vice Mayor Chestnut came up with a basic plan for a half cent sales tax with a sunset clause built into it. It included .35% of the .5% was going to go to infrastructure and .15% into Transit, and those sales tax issues would be set up as two ballot questions. He asked why they were divided into two ballot questions.

Vice Mayor Chestnut said in considering this issue, he looked at a number of factors. One factor was taking the Mayor's initiative to start with sales tax as a consideration for Transit after the City Commission was presented with some pretty significant increases and he thought it was a consensus that it was going to be very difficult to fund the City's current level of Transit with existing funds. He said he derived the allocation based on what it looked like Transit would require for next year in funding which came to .15% which was roughly \$1.9 - \$2 million worth of funds.

As far as the two separate issues, he knew that most of it surrounded transportation. He said his biggest concern was there were two different initiatives. Transit was an operational fund and the funding would go toward the operation of the T and it was an ongoing operational fund that would grow at a compound rate of 6-7% a year over time. The infrastructure fund would be directed at projects that were not

funding personnel, but projects. The street maintenance and some of the big items which were infrastructure focus for any possible type of economic development projects. He said there were discussions in recent days of recreation and if they needed street help and they felt like it would be a big economic benefit to the community, he thought it would be reasonable to entertain.

Also, he agreed that with anything that was done, sidewalks were important, but again, that was not addressing the problem.

One of the big concerns was the \$6.5 million and if it was assumed that sales tax revenue grew 2% or 3% a year and Transit grew at a faster rate, what would end up happening was Transit was about 1/3 of that money now and in 10 years would be 65-70% of that money because they had seen a significant growth in Transit costs and could depend on it to be faster than the rate of inflation. He said the City needed to look at those two areas as separate issues because what would end up happening was the operating fund in Transit would gobble up the majority of this money over time unless somehow it was bounded and he wanted it to be bounded.

Commissioner Amyx said the Mayor had the opportunity to visit with the university and KU on Wheels as to whether or not a merger of the two programs was even something that was remotely a possibility.

Mayor Dever said from the discussion he had, the most likely opportunity to merge was if they were able to come to the table with the transit system in its current condition and perhaps boil down the system when a merger would be proposed. He was told if they were to scale down bus operations and try to return to the table, it would be less likely to occur.

Commissioner Amyx said he tried to take into consideration what a system looked like if the system was cut by 50% and assumed mileage would be looked at. If a plan was put together merging the two systems and the "T" ran Iowa Street, east, and the University ran Iowa Street, west, then there could be transfer points along that route. He said given that, he asked if the City could shrink its system down by that amount of miles that was necessary to take Vice Mayor Chestnut's concern about having a growing transportation system that was not going to outpace the growth on dollars of revenue that came in.

Mayor Dever said he thought everyone was in agreement regarding a more efficient system. He said two separate systems were probably not in the best interests of the community long term, because of the costs associated with two systems. He said if they were going to do anything, it would be under the stipulation that it would not grow exponentially and do everything they could to maximize the efficiency and serve the most amounts of people given the current information. If it meant being more strategic in the route and taking the time to revisit and restructure the routes, it was a laudable goal to do. He did not know if the City had time between this date and the date of the negotiation time of KU to make all the right decisions unless they knew if KU was part of the formula. There were a lot of wild cards and a lot of opportunities for them to consider, but from what he understood, it was in the City's best interest to keep the system intact as they made those decisions because there were some overlaps and service needed at KU and some that did not. If they were truly going to maximize the system, they needed to overlay the two systems and figure out how they could serve the largest amount of people the most efficiently.

Commissioner Amyx said in looking at this through the budget process, the City did not have the money anywhere other than to raise mill levy to offset the additional money the transit system was going to need to cover the cost unless they come up with a new revenue stream. The vote on the "T" system, no matter how it was structured, was an ultimatum vote because he did not see them raising the mill levy by 1.5 mills to cover the shortfall of money. He said he was looking at this issue as an entire transportation issue.

He said he knew the City had other priorities and there was a lot of concern about equipment needed by the Fire/Medical Department and the City Commission shared that concern. He did not think the City's fire equipment could last and they needed equipment that would address the problems. If there could be a way to combine those questions, he could proceed with the Carnegie Library building right now, but would put his support to bonding fire equipment that was necessary.

Mayor Dever asked if he wanted to put the two questions together and then also add to the ballot a question on whether to bond fire equipment.

Commissioner Amyx said yes, and put the Carnegie building decision on hold.

Mayor Dever said his desire with the concept of trying to figure out what to do with the public transportation system was allowing the public to identify this as a priority expenditure of their dollars and not to have a competition or try and defer attention away from it. The fact of the matter was they as a community needed to make a decision on the public transportation system because it was going to double in cost for the next few years and they failed to create a suitable reserve and mill that would sustain this. They were at a point now where they had to make a choice with the contract and he was not

comfortable signing a long term contract for services he was not sure the majority of the community wanted and the only way to get those answers was to ask the people. Not about the specific funding, but if it was truly a public need. He felt the direct question would get a direct response. By combining them, he was afraid it would blur the line they were trying to achieve with this vote. He understood the point by combining them it might be more effective than perhaps viewing the result they thought was best.

Commissioner Amyx said the public did not make the original decision on the transportation system, but the City Commission did.

Mayor Dever said he thought it was a campaign issue and believed those people that were elected with the intent in instituting a public transportation system.

Commissioner Highberger said earlier they approved setting a bid date for a \$6 million sewer project. He said it was a different fund and these items were probably less money per year. He said the question he received from the public was why something like that was not a matter of public vote and the bus system was. He said they had responsibility as Commissioners to make a decision about if they needed a good transportation system and there were other things they were elected to decide. He thought there was a lot of talk about what the City could afford and what they could afford was what got three votes on this Commission. He was willing to support a sales tax measure that included funding for a good public transportation system for this community. He said it was a public need. He said the City was looking at a situation where energy prices were going to be increasing for the indefinite future and the City's population was going to be increasingly aging and more and more people were not going to be able to drive, even if they wanted to. Environmental concerns were

increasing and this was not the time to be cutting back on public transportation but was the time to be increasing it. He would wholeheartedly get behind the sales tax effort if it included some expanded bus service that would enable the City to serve people who ride by choice rather than because they had to. If the City kept its existing service they were going to remain a social service and if they cut back significantly, they would kill the whole project because it would become less and less functional for more and more people.

He appreciated Vice Mayor Chestnut's memo on this issue because it was thoughtful and placed a number of issues on the table. He suggested they look at some of the possibilities for increasing service as were set out in the transportation study as they did with KU and look at adjusting the numbers a little bit.

Vice Mayor Chestnut said they talked about discussions about dividing the city between sides. He asked if there were quite a few limitations given the City was federally funded in what the City could do in that they could not do some of the allocation choices on routes. He said there were significant issues on what the City could do because the federal funding was provided for the holistic system, so if they tried to allocate routes, he asked if that would compromise some of the City's federal funds.

Corliss said it might compromise some of those funds. The fixed route did not go down every street and did not serve every neighborhood in the community. There were requirements when routes had to be altered and certain procedures followed. The para-transit system had to serve the entire community the City served, so it went anywhere

within half a mile within the fixed route system, which meant the entire city because they were throughout the whole city.

One of the things he thought would be important as the City Commission made this consideration and possible decision was the City Commission knew exactly what the \$1.9, close to \$2 million of the .15/.35, the .15 purchases roughly \$2 million coupled with the federal funding and state funding, then where they were in earmarks. It would be important to show what the City would be able to provide with the possible contracts and would be good to know if there were capital needs to get budgeted in the future. He said they did not have money for everything, but wanted them to know what they were and were not getting at \$2 million.

Vice Mayor Chestnut said he did not disagree with Commissioner Highberger about if the City was going to be committed to Transit, the City needed a system that was robust. The issue was he did not see a path where the City was making a tremendous amount of progress for combining the systems. He said ultimately, it would be a much more cost efficient system if it were totally integrated. He said with fare receipts and federal funding and what the City would put in, they were rapidly approaching 4 million dollars worth of funding and he thought they would be able to provide a system for that. He said he still thought they had contract issues to negotiate with MV Transportation. He said the intent was to maintain the level of service the City had, possibly look at creating a little bit of reserve because he realized capital needs were needed, but to make it something that would be self sustaining in its own realm as a fund.

Commissioner Amyx asked if Vice Mayor Chestnut took into consideration, regarding capital needs, the possibility of purchasing smaller busses.

Vice Mayor Chestnut said those were all good questions, but the challenge before the City Commission was a level of complexity that he did not go to in putting his idea together. He said they were taking a slightly different approach than before which was trying to set some parameters about saying there were “x” amount of dollars out there and to some extent he was also proposing that on the mill levy which was to say taking some of that mill levy that was part of the Transit system, putting a little bit in the General Fund and putting it in the Bond and Interest Fund recognizing the fact the City had some challenges with those funds as well. He said he was trying to move around to better shape the City’s condition. There were a whole lot of challenges, but he was trying to set some parameters.

Commissioner Amyx asked, under Vice Mayor Chestnut’s recommendation, what was the mill levy cost savings.

Vice Mayor Chestnut said the mill levy cost savings was .24 mills. He said if looking at City and County funding of everything, in 2002 that split between property tax and sales tax was about 60/40 and 2006 was 67/33, property tax being the bigger part. As assessed valuation had continued to drive up and sales tax had grown at the rate of inflation, essentially that gave him some comfort in saying this was a vehicle the City Commission should entertain because there was a greater and greater amount of infrastructure amenities being funded by property tax and did not even take into consideration, during that period of time, the bond issue for the schools. He said those were all tax amenities that needed to be taken into consideration. He said he did want

to take a look at the change in the proportions and what it did was bring it back into line with what it was 5 or 6 years ago.

He said to look at some fairness issues, Commissioner Highberger and he had discussions about a whole lot of issues to consider, but he tried to put it all into a bowl to see if mixed into a cake.

Commissioner Hack said regarding the infrastructure portion, she liked Commissioner Chestnut's four divisions and thought they made sense. She also liked the fact that they were not tied to an amount. One of the things that she was concerned about was the portion of the .35 they would spend on street maintenance that would reduce some of the General Fund that would go to street maintenance. Her personal feeling would not to have that happen. She said having listened to Soules so many times about how they were not getting ahead. If they were going to do this, they needed to show that this would allow them to slow down the deteriorating curve of the quality of the streets because they have not been able to maintain those streets and she hoped to go beyond just maintaining those streets.

Vice Mayor Chestnut said he looked at street maintenance and larger street construction projects. One of the things he heard was because they have not been able to take on some of the larger street construction projects, it had effectively increased the maintenance costs significantly because they could not do the large projects because their bond and interest funds constrained the City's capital. He did not know what the proportion would be and did not see the street maintenance amounts going down, but he was trying to get some of that amount out of the general fund because if they looked at the last three or four years, that number had gone up precipitously and had put a lot

of constraints on that. Another thing he was aiming for in the general fund was to get it closer to balance because they had a deficit of \$3.4 million in 2006, 2007 was a slight surplus but that was deferring transfers they could not defer every year and the budget for 2008 was a \$1.4 million deficit and the 2009 initial was \$1.7. He was trying to figure out how to move some of the pressure out of the general fund from street maintenance going from \$1.8 and put it where they were constrained on police, fire and some of the other core services. He did not propose taking the number down, but hopefully the combination of having larger street construction funds for larger street construction projects along with getting some of the maintenance out of the general fund would provide for that grading going up.

Commissioner Hack said she would want further information from Soules about if the City was going to receive “x” amount of dollars what would it allow the City to do. Also, if the general fund balance was reduced by a certain percentage, she asked if that reduction would harm the overall infrastructure. The public was going to have a hard time with the whole idea of money going for infrastructure improvements if they could not show what was being done all along.

She said in terms of the Transit, she did not think until the City showed they believed in a viable transit system the University’s Student Senate would not give up control of its bus system. They were in the most amazing rock and a hard place with the bus system because the City had to show they believed the bus system was viable and one way to keep it viable was to join with KU.

She said if this portion of the sales tax question was simply at a level of a thumbs up or thumbs down, then she thought it was a City Commission decision. If it was a

question of whether or not this was a viable transit system if they were going to put that good faith effort to join with the University to accomplish that efficiency goal, then she was in support of a public vote, but if they were just saying it was a “yes” or “no” on transit and would rise or fail on its merit, the Commission knew that a large part of the community were not riders and that portion of the community would not understand the need for the bus system. She said the bus system was an economic tool for many and it was a difference between having a job and not having a job, a difference between medical care and no medical care. There were some serious social service issues as well.

Vice Mayor Chestnut said he did not disagree with the goals and he might be too much of a numbers person in terms of where the City was, but to reinforce the City’s commitment, if the City was saying they were willing to support transit at its current service level regardless of what happened in a sales tax election, he was challenged, not because he did not believe in its goals, but asked where that money would come from. He said given the discussion about property tax, he was really resistant and probably unwilling to look at significant mill levy increases to get there. He said the question would be if they wanted to turn this discussion in a different direction where would they come up with another 1.2 million dollars inside the City’s existing revenues. Given a general fund deficit spend of 1.7 million projected for next year, the City had reserve fund declines in the last couple of years and understood the economy would turn around, but not in the next couple of years and that was where he hit a wall.

Commissioner Hack said another concern was the 1.2 million next year and she could not anticipate the trend. She said she was willing to have this type of

conversation and applauded Vice Mayor Chestnut for giving the City Commission a point of conversation. She said she would support the process, but there were tweaks that she would be concerned about.

Mayor Dever said the whole concept of the City Commission making a decision on the bus system was in question, but he would be more than happy to make a decision on transit, if that was the goal of the Commission. He said by having a sales tax that was specifically devoted to transit, the defacto answer to the question by voting “no” was that the City could not operate the transit system in its current condition which meant that the City Commission needed to decide whether they wanted to operate the bus at a reduced level or not because the City could not afford to keep the bus system at its current level. A defacto vote would give the City Commission, as leaders, a determination that this system was something the City could or could not piece together the funds in order to maintain the bus system or operate at a reduced rate. He said the City Commission would at least have direction from the voters of this community that it was or was not a way the community wanted to spend its money. He said he was not trying to relinquish his responsibility in making that decision, but it was unwise for him to think that in a year, he has received enough information from the public to say he could make that perfect decision without some public input. He said he was really after trying to maintain the bus system by getting more money into that system if possible. The defacto response to not supporting that the public needed to know the bus system could not operate under its current size with the money the City had available in the City’s budget or without a property tax increase. Personally, he was not in favor of a mill levy increase of this size, especially in the long term for transit. He said if the City

Commission decided not to put this issue to a vote, then he was okay with that decision, but his goal was to try and maintain the current bus system and not burden the homeowners and the mill levy.

Corliss said the City had two City sales tax elections. One sales tax election was in the 1970's and was one of the first cities in the state that had a half cent sales tax and another sales tax election in 1990 which brought the City to the full statutory 1% at that time. He said the City was a strong participant and proponent with the County-wide sales tax because the City received approximately 60% of that revenue in the mid 1990's. The statute was amended in the past two years to give the City additional sales tax authority. One percent for any purpose and one percent for a specific purpose as long as it was sun setting. He said the City had essentially two percent sales tax authority under state law.

Commissioner Hack asked if one ballot question would be written with .35 for infrastructure and .15 for transit.

Corliss said that was one item the Vice Mayor suggested and could be made with specific choices or a sunset, but staff would like to receive the Commission's consensus and then staff could give the City Commission all the different options.

Commissioner Amyx asked if it would be wise for the City Commission to have discussion that if the Commission did not find an annual revenue stream and a sales tax initiative that came from the voters, that the Commission give their sentiments on whether they could proceed with the City's current transportation system.

Mayor Dever said yes.

Commissioner Amyx said if the City was going to end up 1.9 million dollars short next year, there would be no way to proceed with the bus system, either that or reduce the system by 50% and there would be no system at all.

Commissioner Highberger said the City was facing difficult budget times, but a City of this size needed to have a transportation system and it was their job as elected officials to figure out how to fund the bus system whether by biting the bullet and assessing enough property tax to cover the costs or to find sales tax revenue to cover the bus system.

Commissioner Amyx said he appreciated Commissioner Highberger's comments, but by being a small business owner and homeowner taxes were getting to a point of hindering their business. He said if looking at another 2 ½ to 3 mil increase to cover the cost of the transportation system, those were the kind of decisions that sales tax needed to be looked at to bring this issue under control. He said he did not think the property tax could continue to support a whole lot more. He said if the City was going to proceed with the transportation system without this new revenue, the City needed to eliminate some of the service provided to help support the system.

Commissioner Highberger said what was really needed was for the State to restore the transfers back from the State general fund to cities and counties.

Vice Mayor Chestnut said he wanted to be clear that he was not necessarily married to the .35/.15 because that was where the numbers came out based on input. He said those numbers needed to be in that range, but if there was a consensus around the half cent, the separate elements which he understood there was a diversity of opinion about that issue, but making it two separate votes he was not sure that

necessarily had to be decided at this time because he was not sure the Commission had enough information to decide. He said the Commission was still in the process of looking at different proposals. He said the Commission had an initial memo but that was very definitive on where this issue could go. As far as the contract negotiations, it was still in progress and he had not been as close to those negotiations as staff. He said his idea was intended to create a structure and framework and get everyone's feelings on the issue. The intent was to provide the level of funding required to keep the system intact and look at the balance and discuss the project.

He said he was intentional in not trying to make the infrastructure fund broken down into a whole bunch of elements because what would probably happen, if looking at possible infrastructure for economic development projects, they tended to come in fairly sizeable chunks. If looking at sidewalks his guess was if the City was to pursue sidewalks with a plan, they might want to do it fairly aggressively in a big way and do a lot of sidewalks at once. He said what came to mind was Kasold Drive. Kasold was a big number, 6 million dollars, and the community had a good idea that had to happen sometime in the next 3 to 5 years and that those improvements tended to come annually in big chunks and the way he saw this money allocated was all of those types of projects, but they might not be allocated in equal amount every year.

He said he also agreed with Commissioner Hack on how that money would be spent and the Commission needed to start going down their list of Capital Improvement projects.

Commissioner Hack asked if the Mayor was looking at some general feeling from the City Commission on whether or not the City could support this type of a concept with a portion of the funds going to transit and a portion to infrastructure.

Mayor Dever said yes and the details could be worked out. He said the future of transportation would be a huge question for the City's budget. He said he wanted to hear pro's and con's on splitting the questions on the ballot,.

Corliss said staff was just now getting their hands around the 2009 budget requests from the various City departments. There were any number of different challenges with those draft budgets and staff needed to find out what that meant for what the City Commission wanted to accomplish next year. The helpful thing in Vice Mayor Chestnut's memo was setting out goals for mill levies and how to try and achieve those goals, but it was staff's role to tell the City Commission the consequences and prioritize things accordingly. He said they could call it a shortfall for transit next year, but it was an increase in costs and a gap in what the City has historically been able to achieve. He said the City had benefited from the City's current contract and benefited from lower gas prices. He said the City was seeing the impact of gas prices in a lot of budgets. Commissioner Hack mentioned the importance of continuing funding on street maintenance and when looking at their proposals, one of the things the Public Works Department did in their budget for 2009 was respond to the increase in gas prices, but did it by cutting things such as street maintenance.

Commissioner Hack said if getting general Commission agreement on pursuing a percentage of increase of sales tax for transit, that might send a strong signal to the University the City was taking that into consideration.

Mayor Dever said that was why he felt this was a different situation than last year where the Commission had come to a crossroads where a decision needed to be made.

Commissioner Amyx said everyone needed to think about the future of this community, this was a big picture and combining the questions was an important way to do it.

Mayor Dever called for public comment.

Dudley Crowe, Lawrence, said he had some questions about the public transit system. He said not being in the Commission's position and not having to evaluate all of this, from a citizen standpoint, it was hard to understand why they would spend more money to continue to support or expand a system that seemed to have far more capacity than demand. He had not done a study of all the routes, busses or usage. All he knew was what he saw and seemingly there seemed to be very few riders. He was in business for himself and realized you could not always approach a city problem as a business problem. If this was a business model and wanted to continue to support a system but needed another million and a half to do that, they would say to him what cost cutting could they do and still provide the services to the community they needed to provide and he had not heard that. When he saw the newspaper article that morning, he saw the tax increase the Vice Mayor suggested, but did not see any other alternatives. He asked what alternatives they had to the system to cut some costs and sell the public on this. If they took this before the public now and suggested there be another tax increase to support the bus system, he thought it would fail. They were not selling the public on the fact they needed to put more money in the current transit system, but it would not pass. The majority of the people did not use the system. In

order to pass this on the ballot, they would have to sell the public and did not think they could do that today. He would look for other ways to provide the same services.

Bill Reynolds, a retired Douglas County resident, said based on his status as a federal taxpayer and a Kansas taxpayer and a person who spent most of his sales tax dollars in Lawrence by spending locally, he had to add a couple of comments. He liked it when someone told him he needed a sewer system. It was not a glamorous project, but if you do not have one, you find out you need one. He wanted to compliment City Manager Corliss and Cliff Galante with the public transit. They had been very forthright and helpful in providing information on how much it cost to ride the T and how many people ride it.

He said most information published about public transportation did not identify the actual ridership, the total cost, or the source of funding for the T and T lift services. You could get that specific information at the transit website in their annual report.

First, in 2007 one way T rides decreased by 8% over 3300 rides. One way T lift rides increased by 4.2% or 2300 rides. Total combined one way rides decreased by 6.6% in 2007 which was more than 31,000 rides to a total of 445,000 rides. The average number of one way rides per day in 2000 was approximately 1,500. If each rider made a round trip, it meant approximately 750 people used the T and T lift services on an average day. The highest ridership days in 2006 and 2007 were on free ridership days when there were about 2,000 one way rides which were scheduled in conjunction with the downtown sidewalk sale. Riders who say they use the T for work and school decreased from 65% in 2006 to 55% in 2007. On average, they had about 400 people per day who ride the T or T lift for work or school, which was $\frac{1}{2}$ of 1% of the

population of Lawrence. While ridership decreased, operating costs increased by 4.6% to \$3.3 million. The 2007 cost per ride was \$7.41 and riders on average paid 49 cents per ride. Taxpayers paid \$6.92 per ride. He said 93% of the cost of the T was funded by the taxpayer. Local tax property taxes provided a quarter million dollars or 38%; Federal taxes provided \$1,400,000 or 43%; State taxes provided another \$400,000 or 12% and the rider actually paid \$216,864 or 7% of the cost. He said essentially the City had a free public transportation system in Lawrence.

Public transportation has not, would not, and would never pay for itself. The City of Lawrence did not have the population density or employment density to make public transportation a necessity. Public transportation was not economically sound or environmentally sound when most routes were running virtually empty. He said if feeling like public transit should be put to a vote, they should put it through mail so other states and entities that use this, could get a true picture about how the public would feel. If combining the issues of public transportation and infrastructure, it would cause a conflict for him because while he knew and supported the need for one, he did not think the other was a need and did not support it. Realistically, they had to separate those issues so the voters could tell how they felt on one and not a combination. He asked the limit, if any, on the amount taxpayers were going to spend to support these systems.

Sharla True, Lawrence, said there were many remarkable and good things about the City bus system that did not need fixed. As they heard, people were going to work, to and from a sitter, picking their children up at daycare and doctor appointments they could not make. She said it was difficult for her to plan trips because of how some do not coincide. When transit began service in 2001, she was driving for Laidlaw and prior

to that she planned routes for her drivers. They often handed her the list of children and she would plan the trip. It was important to be efficient. There were 10,000 students and 3,000 eligible to ride. She did a lot of route planning and mentioned that she spent over 40 hours revamping routes and timing because she thrived on that sort of thing. She found ways to make it more efficient. She said they should also put a bike rack on the bus and would see an increase in ridership. She said they needed to pick people up where they were standing. She said when they did only three stops every 6 blocks they decreased in ridership because people did not have time to walk out of their way. She said reading the maps were hard and could not see the streets on the map which also decreased ridership. She said she wanted to see the bus system thrive because she was a rider and because the economy was still recovering from 9/11. They were going to gain ridership if they straightened out the routes.

Commissioner Amyx asked how much money would be available in 2009 if they did not have a T system.

Corliss said \$1.4 million.

Commissioner Amyx said that was a question that had to be asked.

The Commission then asked staff to come back with sales tax options.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Eileen Smith, Kansas Solar Electric Cooperatives, said April 2nd, 2007, the City issued an endorsement of the Kansas Solar Electric Cooperatives letter of endorsement. That was the day the U.S. Supreme Court issued a ruling on greenhouse gases, so it was an historic date for them to endorse her program. Since then they have had the Bremby decision that had been controversial with the coal plants. In the

meantime, she was delayed in getting her book done because she wanted to include those things. Recently they incorporated the Kansas Solar Electric Cooperatives and were issuing stock now. They were making progress and over the next three months she was scheduled to be giving a solar fair in each county of Kansas. She asked if there was a way the City would be supportive of what they were doing. She was asking each county to pay \$150 to cover the costs of transportation to give the solar fairs. The goal of the solar fair was to educate the public and establish 21 Kansas Solar Electric Cooperatives around the state and the third was to compile a database to get funding. It was leading into a lot more funding. She gave the City Commissioners a schedule of presentations all across the State of Kansas that would help put together the co-op program.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS:

- 05/13/08 • Commissioner Hack will be absent.
- 05/20/08 • Commissioner Hack will be absent.
- 05/27/08 Airport business park land use and public financing issues. ***Because valid protest petitions have been received, a super-majority vote (4 votes) would be needed regarding the rezoning items.***
 - (a) Consider approval of the requested annexation of approximately 144.959 acres and direct staff to draft an ordinance for A-06-05-07, for Airport Business Park No. 1, located at E 1500 Road and US Hwy 24/40. Submitted by Landplan Engineering, for Roger Pine, Pine Family Investments, LC, and Kathleen and Brian Pine, property owners of record. (PC Item 16A; approved 5-2 on 10/24/07)
 - (b) Consider approval of the requested rezoning and direct staff to draft an ordinance for Z-06-09-07, a request to rezone a tract of land approximately 99.31 acres, from A (Agricultural) and B-2 (General Business) Districts to IL (Limited Industrial) District with use restrictions. The property is located at the intersection of E

1500 Road and US Hwy 24/40. Submitted by Landplan Engineering, for Roger Pine, Pine Family Investments, LC, and Kathleen and Brian Pine, property owners of record. (PC Item 16B; approved 6-1 on 10/24/07)

- (c) Consider approval of the requested rezoning and direct staff to draft an ordinance for Z-06-10-07, a request to rezone a tract of land approximately 43.48 acres, from A (Agricultural) and B-2 (General Business) Districts to IL (Limited Industrial) District. The property is located at the intersection of E 1500 Road and US Hwy 24/40. Submitted by Landplan Engineering, for Roger Pine, Pine Family Investments, LC, and Kathleen and Brian Pine, property owners of record. (PC Item 16C; approved 6-1 on 10/24/07).
- (d) Consider approval of the requested rezoning and direct staff to draft an ordinance for Z-06-11-07, a request to rezone a tract of land approximately 26.22 acres, from A (Agricultural) & B-2 (General Business) Districts to IL-FP (Limited Industrial-Floodplain Overlay) District. The property is located at the intersection of E 1500 Road and US Hwy 24/40. Submitted by Landplan Engineering, for Roger Pine, Pine Family Investments, LC, and Kathleen and Brian Pine, property owners of record. (PC Item 16D; approved 6-1 on 10/24/07).
- (e) Consider accepting dedication of easements and rights-of-way for PP-06-07-07, a Preliminary Plat for Airport Business Park No. 1, located at E 1500 Road & US Hwy 24/40. The Planning Commission will also consider a number of waivers from the Development Code with this request. Submitted by Landplan Engineering, for Roger Pine, Pine Family Investments, LC, and Kathleen and Brian Pine, property owners of record. (PC Item 16E; approved 6-1 on 10/24/07).

- 06/03/08
 - Conduct public hearing regarding the sale and serving of alcohol within 400 feet of a school or church for a proposed outdoor event and concert (Lawrence Live) on the 900 block of New Hampshire.
 - Consider modification to site plan conditions (SP-08-53-04), Louise's West, 1307 W. 7th Street, for outdoor patio smoking area to remove the restriction of not allowing drinks on the fenced-in patio area.
- TBD
 - Consideration and discussion of proposed Neighborhood Revitalization Act plans. The Lawrence Association of

Neighborhoods has indicated an interest in establishing a task force to review applications of the NRA.

- Discussion of City/County funding relationships
- Sidewalk dining regulations and guidelines.
- Rural Water District contracts.
- Economic Development study session follow-up items.
- Consideration of ordinances to change the composition of the Convention and Visitor's Bureau Advisory Board.
- Consider adoption of Tax Increment Financing and Transportation Development District policies.

ACTION: Adopt policies, if appropriate.

- Receive staff memo regarding green burials.
- Approve rezoning Z-02-07A-08, a request to rezone a tract of land approximately 6.99 acres from UR (Urban Reserve) to RM12 (Multi-Dwelling Residential). The property is located S of Overland Dr between Stoneridge Dr & Queens Rd. Adopt on first reading, , rezoning approximately 6.99 acres (Z-02-07A-08) from UR to RM12. (PC Item 6A; approved 7-0 on 4/21/08)
- Approve rezoning Z-02-07B-08, a request to rezone a tract of land approximately 20.92 acres from UR (Urban Reserve) to RM15 (Multi-Dwelling Residential). The property is located S of Overland Dr between Stoneridge Dr & Queens Rd. Adopt on first reading, Ordinance No. 8266, rezoning approximately 20.92 acres (Z-02-07B-08) from UR to RM15. (PC Item 6B; approved 7-0 on 4/21/08)
- Approve rezoning Z-02-07D-08, a request to rezone a tract of land approximately 5.669 acres from UR (Urban Reserve) to CO (Office Commercial). The property is located N of 6th St between Stoneridge Dr & Queens Rd. Adopt on first reading, Ordinance No. 8267, rezoning approximately 5.669 acres (Z-02-07D-08) from UR to CO. (PC Item 6D; approved 7-0 on 4/21/08)
- Accept dedication of easements and rights-of-way for PP-10-09-07, a Preliminary Plat for Creekstone, Stoneridge Dr to Queens Rd & 6th St to Overland Dr, a 7 lot subdivision containing 34.864 acres. (PC Item 6E; approved 7-0 on 4/21/08)

Moved by Chestnut, seconded by Amyx, to adjourn at 11:35 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.

APPROVED:

Michael Dever, Mayor

ATTEST:

Frank S. Reeb, City Clerk

CITY COMMISSION MEETING OF MAY 6, 2008

1. Bid – HVAC System for E Lawrence Center to Chaney Inc. for \$117,515.
2. Bid Date Set – W Baldwin Creek Interceptor Sewer Utilities Project, June 3, 2008.
3. Sale – surplus equipment on Gov Deals.
4. Ordinance No. 8262 – 2nd Read, Alcohol sales, Sertoma BBQ.
5. Ordinance No. 8246 – 2nd Read, Chapter 5, plumbing vent system & unvented gas appliances.
6. Ordinance No. 8251 – 2nd Read, Rezone (Z-01-01-08) .907 acre, CS to IG, 1300 Blk N 3rd.
7. Ordinance No. 8252 – 2nd Read, Rezone (Z-01-02-08) .54 acre, RS10 to IG, 1300 Blk N 3rd.
8. Ordinance No. 8264 – 2nd Read, Temp Sale of Alcohol, Sertoma.
9. Ordinance No. 8263 – 2nd Read, Max Assess GWW form 6th to Overland.
10. Rezone (Z-03-08-08) 140 acres, Bauer Brook Estates, A-1 to RS-40
11. Prelim Dev Plan – (PDP-03-03-08, The Oread, 618 W 12th.
12. 2008 Agreement for Use of City Funds – Lawrence Community Shelter.
13. Acquisition of City parking spaces for 123 W 8th.
14. City Manager's Report.
15. Modification sot Resolutions 5966 & 5015, Lawrence Arts Commission.
16. Lawrence Community Shelter Annual Report (SUP-01-02-07)
17. Resolution No. 6768 – 2008 CDBG and HOME Programs.
18. Landmark Designation (L-08-01-07) 805 Ohio.
19. Landmark Designation (L-09-02-07) 934 W 21st.
20. TSC – Deny marked crosswalk & pedestrian refuge islands on Louisiana adjacent to Dakota St.

21. TSC – Stop Signs at 4 traffic booth entrances, KU Campus.
22. TSC – Mid-block marked crosswalk on Naismith between 18th & 19th.
23. Federal Aid Safety Program – fiscal year 2010 & 2011.
28. Purchase Order – Power Line relocate for GWW to Westar for \$78,858.13.
29. 2007 Tax Abatement Annual Report.
30. Oread Neighborhood Study Session.
31. Text Amendment – Transient & Homeless Shelters permitted in industrial zoning.
32. 2008 Overlay & Curb Repair, bid date May 13th.
33. Concept Phase Plan for 31st to include E of O'Connell to Route 1057.
34. Future agenda items.