



DAVID L. CORLISS
CITY MANAGER

City of Lawrence

CITY MANAGER'S OFFICE

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 DEVER

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

July 8, 2008

The Board of Commissioners of the City of Lawrence met in regular session at 5:30 p.m., in the City Commission Chambers in City Hall with Mayor Dever presiding and members Amyx, Chestnut, Hack, and Highberger present.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

It was then moved by Amyx, seconded by Chestnut, to recess into executive session for 45 minutes for the purpose of a discussion of matters relating to employer-employee negotiations. The justification for the executive session is to keep negotiation matters confidential at this time. The Commission will conclude the executive session at approximately 6:15 p.m. and resume the open meeting at 6:35 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.

The Commission returned to regular session at 6:15 and recessed the open meeting until 6:35.

The Commission returned to regular session at 6:35 p.m.

CONSENT AGENDA

As part of the consent agenda, **it was moved by Hack, seconded by Amyx,** to approve the City Commission meeting minutes of June 24, 2008. Motion carried unanimously.

As part of the consent agenda, **it was moved by Hack, seconded by Amyx,** to approve the Planning Commission meeting of May 19 and May 21, 2008. Motion carried unanimously.



As part of the consent agenda, **it was moved by Hack, seconded by Amyx**, to approve claims to 418 vendors in the amount of \$2,439,114.08 and payroll from June 22, 2008 to July 5, 2008 in the amount of \$1,856,033.67. Motion carried unanimously.

As part of the consent agenda, **it was moved by Hack, seconded by Amyx**, to approve Drinking Establishment License for Panda Garden, 1500 West 6th; the Hotel/Caterer License for Holiday Inn Lawrence, 200 McDonald Drive; and the Retail Liquor License to Ray's Wine & Spirits, 721 Wakarusa Ste: 107; and Ray's Liquor Warehouse, 1215 West 6th Street. Motion carried unanimously.

The City Commission reviewed the bids for the Kaw Water Treatment Plant Building Envelope Repairs Year 2A for the Utilities Department. The bids were:

BIDDER	BID AMOUNT
MTS Contracting	\$326,150.00
Mid-Continental Restoration	\$269,221.52
Restoration & Waterproofing	\$320,976.00
Engineer's Estimate	\$397,000.00

As part of the consent agenda, **it was moved by Hack, seconded by Amyx**, to award the bid to Mid-Continental Restoration Company, Inc., in the amount of \$269,221.52. Motion carried unanimously. **(1)**

The City Commission reviewed the bids for two (2) one-ton trucks with dump beds and tommy lifts with options for the Parks and Recreation Department. The bids were:

Bidder	Price each	Total Bid	Option Package	Total w/Options
Laird Noller/ Kranz	\$27253.00	\$54506.00	\$2298.00	\$56804.00
Laird Noller/ Knapheide	\$28691.00	\$57382.00	\$2306.00	\$59688.00
Shawnee Mission Ford	\$28935.00	\$57870.00	\$2390.00.	\$60260.00
Olathe Ford	\$29193.00	\$58386.00	\$2390.00	\$60776.00
Westfall GMC	\$29275.00	\$58550.00	\$1626.00	\$60176.00

As part of the consent agenda, **it was moved by Hack, seconded by Amyx**, to award the bid to Laird Noller Automotive, in the amount of \$59,688. Motion carried unanimously. (2)

As part of the consent agenda, **it was moved by Hack, seconded by Amyx**, to set bid date of July 22, 2008, for the 18th and Maine Street, Traffic Diverter. Motion carried unanimously (3)

Ordinance No. 8287, amending Chapter V, Articles 3 and 6 of the Code of the City of Lawrence, Kansas, 2008 Edition, and amendments thereto, concerning domestic clothes dryer venting, was read a second time. As part of the consent agenda, **it was moved by Hack, seconded by Amyx**, to adopt the ordinance. Aye: Hack, Dever, Amyx, Highberger, and Chestnut. Nay: None. Motion carried unanimously. (4)

As part of the consent agenda, **it was moved by Hack, seconded by Amyx**, to authorize the Mayor to sign application for KLINK funding (fiscal year – 2011) for 23rd Street, Haskell Avenue to the east city limit, resurfacing project. Motion carried unanimously. (5)

As part of the consent agenda, **it was moved by Hack, seconded by Amyx**, to approve as signs of community interest, a request from First Southern Baptist Church for a sign in the right-of-way in front of the Church at 4300 W. 6th Street, promoting a Churchwide/Neighborhood Carnival event. The sign would be in place for two weeks, beginning August 3rd and would be removed after the event on August 17, 2008. Motion carried unanimously. (6)

As part of the consent agenda, **it was moved by Hack, seconded by Amyx**, to authorize the Mayor to sign a Release of Mortgage for Mary Kring, 933 Missouri Street and a Subordination Agreement for Jill Jevens, 1301 Prospect. Motion carried unanimously. (7)

As part of the consent agenda, **it was moved by Hack, seconded by Amyx**, to approve SE-07-23-08, a Temporary Special Event Permit request for a patio sale at Jayhawk Bookstore, 1420 Crescent Road, from July 14th through July 26th during regular business hours of 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., subject to the following conditions:

1. Temporary sign permit must be obtained from Neighborhood Resources Office, if temporary signs are used;
2. If signs are displayed in conjunction with this use they shall comply with City sign regulations and shall not be located on public right of way. Signs for this activity can only be displayed during hours of operation;
3. The sale must be contained within the area delineated by the patio wall to prevent interference with pedestrian traffic.

Motion carried unanimously.

(8)

CITY MANAGER'S REPORT:

During the City Manager's Report, David Corliss said staff had a good meeting with members of KDHE and special counsel Bill Ford. The City submitted a bid that was under consideration of the bankruptcy trust. Staff had discussions with the trust which led to discussions with environmental regulators as to what was required for cleanup of that property. He said Ford drafted a letter that summarized the general understanding of those discussions and identified a number of the next steps regarding that property. KDHE provided their current estimate of those costs over a thirty year period. It was also important to recognize those costs had gone up from what staff understood earlier would be the remediation costs on that property. He said staff was continuing to analyze those costs and looking at whether or not there were further opportunities to follow through on the City Commission's goals which had been to acquire the property, use the available funds for remediation, and not have any City costs for remediation. Staff was also preparing an estimate for infrastructure costs for that property. The City had adopted a land use plan on the property and the City Commission would be considering annexation of that property later this year.

Mayor Dever asked if there was a total on the anticipated cost for the Farmland cleanup.

Corliss said just the remediation costs, the report indicated the total for the estimated costs for cleanup and a then a higher amount pointed to for financial assurance. There were items that were not necessarily required, but recommended.

Commissioner Amyx asked if the remediation and the financial assurance requirements were combined.

Corliss said they needed to be able to show how there was going to be money to meet the financial assurance requirements which totaled approximately ten million dollars. There were additional recommended actions as well. He said the minimum requirements were a little bit over eight million dollars which staff needed to show how they would fund that amount. There was also recommended additional remedial actions of about 2.2 million and recommended long-term remedial actions which when different people looked at that property, they indicated that some of the pond decommissioning did not need to be done and it could stay for a long period of time. If going back to the minimum requirements for remediation, eight million, they added a contingency and that totaled the ten million.

Mayor Dever asked if Corliss received a letter indicating the current trust level.

Corliss said staff had not seen a recent update, but staff would provide that amount to the City Commission. He said those remediation costs were in excess to what was in the trust fund for remediation. There was also an administrative fund to administer the property itself. He said the Commission had not made any commitment and only a bid was submitted that could serve as an initial starting point for the bidding process. He said staff was concerned about some of those cost escalations from a number of points in the City's ability to purchase that property. He said staff was also concerned about what it might mean for other purchasers as well. Staff's goal was to get the property cleaned up and actively used as an employment center. The private sector had not stepped forward so the City stepped forward to see if they would be able to clean it up to some extent. If the costs continue to escalate the private sector was going to see those same numbers as well and wonder about the possible return on the property and was worthy of their pursuit.

He said the EPA had responsibilities for the corrective part of the hazard waste portion of this property. He said when getting into the property and a level of definitiveness that there was value and also a number of cost estimates that were coming on board. (9)

REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS:

Conduct public hearing on proposed budget amendment providing authority to spend reserve money for Transit expenditures.

David Corliss, City Manager, presented the staff report. She said last year the City Commission authorized the transfer of funds from the City's equipment reserve fund that had come from the Transit Fund for acquisition of future busses. The City Commission authorized the expenditure of those reserve funds for the operation of the City's transit system. Now, there was the formality of conducting the public hearing regarding this issue and adopt on first reading, the ordinance amending the 2008 Budget.

Mayor Dever opened the public hearing.

After receiving no public comment, **it was moved by Hack, seconded by Highberger,** to close the public hearing. Motion carried unanimously.

Moved by Chestnut, seconded by Hack, to place on first reading, Ordinance No. 8296, amending its 2008 adopted budget. Motion carried unanimously. (10)

Consider request from Lawrence –Douglas County Biosciences Authority for support of the Lawrence Life Sciences incubator in the amount of \$75,000 annually for ten years.

Laverne Epp, representing the Lawrence-Douglas County Biosciences Authority, presented the report. He said their request was for the City Commission to consider an investment in the Lawrence Regional Life Sciences Incubator Project of \$75,000 for ten years.

He said for about the last six or seven months the Authority had taken the lead in planning for this Life Sciences Incubator Project and taken a collaborative approach in engaging the partners of their authority which included the City, County, Lawrence Chamber of

Commerce, and Kansas University. There was a fairly comprehensive planning process which included looking at the market and some financial consideration, competition, and the need.

He said they were very enthusiastic about this project not only for what it could do for Kansas University, but also City, County and the broader region in the area of life sciences economic development.

He said one of the first things noticed was the rather significant resources that were at their disposal in this community and began with the rather extensive research capability and capacity of Kansas University and it also involved private companies that had taken the lead. Lawrence Regional Technology Center had been in the incubating businesses in the last five to seven years and tried to cobble all those various assets and resources together to come up with this plan which was reflected in their presentation.

He said there were three or four people that were important in this effort. He said the Authority had no official paid staff and drew from the resources from the community taking people who had economic development expertise, He said the work at Kansas University brought together a development team who was Beth Johnson, Economic Development Director for the Lawrence Chamber of Commerce and to this effort Johnson brought a broad view of economic development setting that represented the broader community; Carrie Novak, Director, Business Relations Development, KU Center for Research Inc, who had provided important information giving access to Kansas University's research capabilities and capacities and also economic development being in this type of situation and position before; Matt McClorey, President, Lawrence Regional Technology Center, was already in the incubation business in Lawrence and one of the key components was the management of this incubator being delegated to the Lawrence Regional Technology Center. He said LRTC was a unique and very important to this community.

Matt McClorey, President and Chief Executive Officer of the Lawrence Regional Technology Center, said when they began working through this process, the first thing they dealt with was focusing on the issue of if there was a need for this type of facility and resource for this community. In that process, they looked at the need over the past few years for this type of space. They did a bottom up approach and looked at specific companies in the community. Some of those companies have left and some have stayed, but they looked at the number of employees, their need for space, what was available to those companies and what was not available to them. He said in looking over five years, they were able to identify several companies that could use this space that needed over 20,000 square feet initially. There were half a dozen companies they were able to identify that would have a serious interest in this type of space.

They also took a little bit different look from the project from a top down approach which was looking at economic development as a whole in attracting quality companies to the community, retaining the good companies, and growing companies within. When looking at economic development efforts across the country, there was a lot of focus on the attraction and retention. He said sometimes the small businesses were lost in that mix because there was a great focus in trying to attract large companies to town. That was why he thought there was a real benefit in having a facility like this in supporting the entrepreneurial efforts of small businesses in the area of life sciences that were in the community and to recruit them. This facility was seen as taking care of the needs of the community spinning out from the University of Kansas, satisfying the needs of early stage life sciences companies like Deciphera and CitiTech, being able to be an asset to recruit early stage life sciences companies and existing companies to the community.

When looking longer term, the incubator could be successful and a pipeline or source of companies that could begin to build a business or technology park in the community. It was not

the efforts of the incubator itself, but what could come out of that long term in terms of growing businesses, growing jobs, and creating high quality jobs in the community.

The last thing looked at was if Lawrence was in a position to compete with other communities. He said in working with companies, he often heard that if a company came to Lawrence, where could a facility be located and did the community have wet lab space to accommodate businesses, but there was no good answer.

Also, when looking at key components of an incubator of this facility, they wanted to make sure it was a multi-tenant facility. They wanted to make sure the facility could satisfy the needs of KU spin off companies, early stage life sciences companies, like Deciphera and CritiTech, existing companies that could be recruited to the community, and space that could be used for collaborative research between University researchers and industry.

He said they also wanted to make sure the space was flexible to be able to place a range of companies at that location. It could be pharmaceutical companies developing drugs, medical device companies, or companies providing analytical services and testing services for the farm industry. They also wanted to make sure the space was expandable. They were initially looking at a 20,000 square foot facility but wanted the ability to add on square footage and the ability for land to grow if the demand was present.

The other key component was to make sure that it was not just facility based. When looking at incubator programs across the country, one thing seemed to pop out, which was the more successful incubator programs and programs that were associated with successful companies, high salaries, and job creation were the companies combining development services, support services for the companies, plus the facilities. The business development expertise and business development resources that existed at LRTC with this facility would put them in a much stronger position to assist those companies.

He said location was also a key component that would make sense for all the stakeholders and location that was desirable for the spin out companies and attracting communities.

Lastly, they wanted to make sure there was a project and facility that would garner the support of the City and County and they wanted the University as a partner as well and as seen later, a significant partner in this project.

Once they were able to put together a plan in the community and get all the stakeholders to commit to the project, they would have a plan that would leverage investment from outside the community.

Their recommendation and plan was to build an initial 20,000 square feet wet lab incubator on the campus of the University of Kansas, to have the facility expandable, up to 40,000 square feet, and located on the west campus of the University of Kansas, right in the heart of the life sciences research.

He said from an operations standpoint, they planned to have the incubator owned by the local authority and LRTC manage the facility. They thought it made a lot of sense for LRTC to be in the building, managing the facility, and providing its business development services to the tenants of the building. LRTC worked with numerous life sciences companies in the past. A lot of their assistance had been valuable to those companies in obtaining capital and growing their businesses. Companies they had worked with in the last five and a half years have earned \$20 million in early stage capital. It was quite an accomplishment for those companies. It was an outgrowth of the partnership between the entrepreneurs and LRTC getting together to put the best plan forward for raising capital and building those companies.

Another thing the companies were able to produce over the years was the number of jobs and not all the jobs were in Lawrence or Douglas County. It was the regional technology center and some of those jobs were outside Lawrence and Douglas County. Nevertheless,

companies they worked with created 111 net jobs and the salaries were about \$64,000, which was double the private sector wage in Lawrence. This idea of providing support to high technology companies and high technology entrepreneurs created high paying jobs was playing out. The National Business Incubator Association reported that high tech wages paid 85% to 95% more than the average private sector wage which was seen with the results of their companies over the last 5 years.

The total project was budgeted at \$8 million. The City and the County were being asked to contribute \$1.5 million in total, or \$750,000 each, \$75,000 a year for a period of 10 years. Lawrence Douglas County Bioscience Authority has also committed \$500,000 to the project and the University of Kansas had committed \$2 million to the project; \$1.5 million in cash and a credit of \$500,000 in land contributing and gifting for purposes of the incubator. The plan was to put together the \$4 million for the community; bring all the stakeholders together and approach the Kansas Bioscience Authority and ask them to match the community commitment, dollar for dollar.

He said from a use of funds standpoint, about \$5 million of the \$8 million was going to go towards building the facility. One million would go towards management and services. That money would go to LRTC to provide management of the building and basically help them provide more services than they were capable of providing today. There was \$1 million going into shared equipment and building improvements. They wanted the ability to help companies finish out space, if needed, and the ability to buy equipment for the facility. Many times life sciences companies could share equipment because of similar needs, and it made no sense for multiple companies, in the same building, to buy the same equipment. There was also \$1 million for product development and lease assistance. If a company needed some capital for some promising research to help them get a prototype completed, or help them get to a major

milestone, some money would be available. If there were companies that were in a tough position, help them through a couple of months on their lease.

Epp said they were hoping to move forward this month with local governmental approvals and take this incubator project to the Kansas Bioscience Authority which would not be a surprise to KBA because they had been discussing the project with KBA. He said late fall, they hoped to execute legal documents and if this project came together, a groundbreaking mid to late winter with the project under construction in the spring. The construction period was estimated at 10 – 12 months during which time they intended to do comprehensive marketing and get the programming set up in the facility and invite their first tenant in the spring of 2010.

Diane Stoddard, Assistant City Manager, said the Manhattan/K-State project was dedicated last year by their City and its partners. It was in response to an identified need regarding quality wet lab space similar to what McClorey indicated was a need in Lawrence. She said it would be helpful to point out a couple of similarities and a couple of differences between the projects.

As far as similarities, Manhattan had a very similar entity to LRTC in NISTAC (National Institute for Strategic Technology Acquisition and Commercialization). NISTAC had a very strong track record in economic development and working with the City, had proven themselves similar to LRTC in terms of their ability to create jobs and generate capital investment.

Some of the differences in the Manhattan project were the City ended up owning the building and built the building. There was an interesting relationship in the management agreement in managing the building with NISTAC, similar to what was being contemplated with LRTC. The building was on K-State property, but the investment by the City was much larger because the City had a dedicated sales tax for economic development and the City's investment in the incubator in Manhattan was approximately \$6 million.

Mayor Dever asked what other type of financial investment K-State made, other than the land.

Stoddard said K-State was also a major partner in working with the two major entities that occupied the building, which was NISTAC and the Manhattan Chamber, the City of Manhattan, and K-State were key partners in that endeavor. There was also an entity, Manhattan Holdings, which also occupied the facility. Their primary contribution on the building was the land.

Mayor Dever asked when the building was completed in Manhattan.

Stoddard said the authorization began in 2004 and NISTAC moved in March 2007 and the building was dedicated in late June 2007.

Commissioner Amyx said the ownership of the facility would be held by Lawrence-Douglas County BioScience Authority, and asked if the Bioscience Authority would receive a return on this investment.

Epp said no.

Commissioner Amyx asked if the Bioscience Authority would own this facility fee simple.

Epp said yes, but expected the ground would be owned by KU or the Endowment Association. The building itself would be owned by the Authority.

Commissioner Amyx asked if the \$75,000 a year request would be in addition to the \$200,000 a year the City was already paying.

Epp said correct. The \$75,000 per year request the Authority was making was specifically for this project. The \$200,000 a year contribution the City made to the Lawrence-Douglas County BioSciences Authority would be used in part for this project, but other initiatives and other things the authority was working on.

Commissioner Amyx asked how the \$200,000 a year contribution would be used on this facility.

Epp said the authority had committed \$500,000 of its revenue stream to this project and expected the authority's money would come in early, up front, rather than over a period of time.

Commissioner Amyx asked if 25% of the current allocation would be placed in that facility.

Epp said correct.

Vice Mayor Chestnut said in the presentation regarding the spin off and merging and existing companies, he assumed there was some concern, that since it would be a tax exempt building and would be in perpetuity, about companies and how to define the terms "incubator" "emerging" and then "ready to leave". From the stand point of the local taxing authorities, the biggest concern was creating taxable entities in the community and did not know if there had been any discussion on that issue.

McClore said they had already begun putting together detailed operating guidelines for this facility. There would be entrance criteria, graduation criteria, and criteria for terminating residency. There were going to be clear expectations set with the tenants that when coming into the incubator, the community was making an investment and in exchange, expected certain performance in those companies. He said they wanted to provide this resource to help those companies get to where those companies needed to go. Meetings would be conducted with those companies to make sure those companies were meeting their milestones, hitting their financial milestone, their employment growth milestones. They did not have all the details figured out, but were on the way in putting this all together and already had one draft together. Those expectations were clear with everyone on the team and if those companies were not performing, they would be asked to vacate, especially in the case where there was a promising company waiting to get in.

Mayor Dever said Vice Mayor Chestnut brought up taxpaying entities and the number of jobs that would be located in this community. He said although there was the devaluation

because the facility was not paying taxes, the City would receive the benefit of higher paying jobs and the opportunity to keep a business as it grew. He said it was discussed that 80% of businesses that incubate in a community stay in that community.

Epp said the National Incubator Business Association had scads of statistics on this type of issue. The one cited most often was that 87% of companies that go through this incubation process were still in business after five years which compared to all businesses, was 50 – 60%. The second statistic that jumped out was 84% of companies that were incubated stayed home when graduating. They wanted those companies to graduate and if this was going to be a successful program, they wanted those companies to move through the incubator and move out. If they could accomplish a return of 84%, it would be what the national statistics indicated.

Mayor Dever said the other thing he found interesting was the amount of money anticipated in receiving as a contribution from the University of Kansas, which he thought was tremendous and sizeable and relative to what happened in Manhattan. He said most remarkably was the KBA kicking in \$1 million in Manhattan and up to \$4 million. Anytime they could get more money from the outside, it was a great opportunity so the City did not need to take on that burden of having to pay and build for this type of facility. Overall he was comfortable with the concept, but needed to sell the public on spending money to gain the opportunity to collect money as taxpaying citizens. For him that was not a leap of faith, but most people needed to understand and be convinced that it was a good investment and thought they tried to do so in their presentation.

Mayor Dever called for public comment.

There was no public comment.

Commissioner Highberger said he had the opportunity to be involved in the early discussions, starting in 2003. Early on they identified a facility like this as something that was critical to a bioscience effort. He said if he had not asked as many critical questions as usual, it

was because he had his chance to be convinced. He thought this project was something the Commission needed to move forward on. The opportunity of leveraging those funds from the Kansas Bioscience Authority would be hard to turn down. The participation with KU was historic and something that was not believed to be legally possible when this started. KU's resources with this type of public cooperation had a potential to make this a hub for bioscience research. Once the project got off the ground, future public subsidies might not be necessary. This particular investment could play a key role and looked forward to the community's success.

Vice Mayor Chestnut said he agreed with Commissioner Highberger. The one thing that he continued to harp on was the understanding of cost benefit in this situation. It was less tangible and harder to quantify. In this case, one of the compelling situations was the City was leveraging a significant amount of funding. He said it looked like the local funding for the Manhattan project was 85% of the total cost and with this project if including the City, County and KU, it was more 50/50. It was significant leveraging of funds.

In looking at the jobs created and the way the City did tax abatements, the City could quantify what that meant for the community. The more work done on that end, a more compelling story could be told of what was being done and thought some of those things were achievable. The City would provide some assistance in putting some numbers around that. He thought there was also a potential for a huge win and would be a tremendous project.

Commissioner Hack said she wanted to congratulate the bioscience authority for their work and all they did to get to this point and also thanked Commissioner Highberger for his endeavors with so many others. The partnership was the best and had the potential for expansion of this partnership in future partnerships. It was unusual for a community to take advantage of all those components and have those components work together. They hoped those companies would go through the process quickly and move out for the next group that was lining up to be in better shape as a community.

Commissioner Amyx said when looking at economic development, the City was involved in putting in streets, sewers, sidewalks and did not get an opportunity to look at a brick and mortar project that people could participate in at a rate that was affordable for the community.

He said investing in a life science facility in the community along with the University of Kansas and the Kansas Bioscience Authority in leveraging funds was an important part of this entire project. He said the presentation from McClorey made him realize the need for this type of facility and the partnership that made it happen. He said he understood the City's commitment was on an annual basis and staff would continue to work with the bioscience authority and the list of agencies and governing bodies that were involved in making sure this project came to fruition.

Corliss said staff would put together a letter for the Mayor's signature to Epp indicating the City's plan to budget this money for expenditure in the first quarter of 2009. He said he and Epp discussed what forum this needed to take as far as a commitment and was essentially a political commitment of the City Commission to fund this project and was not a debt to the City for \$750,000.

Commissioner Amyx said Corliss had talked about in future years that a budget would be built around this project.

Corliss said staff would try to build a budget that could accommodate this project. He said there had been times when the City had not been able to make the \$200,000 a year commitment not long ago when the City had to make a reduction to all outside agencies, including the local bioscience authority. He said Epp indicated this level of commitment was appropriate in order to proceed. He said how he saw it envisioned was that Epp could point to the letter, when going to the KBA, stating the City had made this political commitment of \$75,000 a year for ten years.

Commissioner Amyx said in building that piece of financial commitment under the budget, if there were pieces of the budget that had to change, that Epp understood the City's position.

Moved by Hack, seconded by Amyx, to direct staff to prepare a letter indicating the City's political commitment to support a request from the Lawrence-Douglas County Biosciences Authority for support of the Lawrence Life Sciences incubator in the amount of \$75,000 annually for ten years and authorize the Mayor to sign the letter. Motion carried unanimously. (11)

Receive City Commission comments/questions regarding the City Manager's Recommended Budget in preparation for July 14, 2008 study session.

David Corliss, City Manager, presented the recommended budget. He said City staff worked hard to finalize the recommended budget last week and posted the budget on the City's website. A study session was scheduled next Monday which was in anticipation of the City Commission's questions and comments regarding the budget. Vice Mayor Chestnut provided staff with a memo and staff had started a response to that memo.

Commissioner Amyx said the proposed budget was very easy to follow along and thanked staff for drafting the proposed budget. He said regarding the water and wastewater utility fund, staff indicated an overall increase of 5% with 12% in water rates and no increase in sewer rates. Also mentioned was the anticipated growth in the area along with specific projects outlined from the Four Seasons project that were recommended in the master plan. He asked if the Commission chose to only do some of those projects, he asked what type of effect it would have on the system and the City's rates.

Corliss said there were moving parts, but staff could show those moving parts because staff was performing analysis. The list of projects was not what was started off with. A number of different projects were removed because they were not able to proceed at this point. Staff

was anticipating that discussion next Monday to talk about the City's Capital Improvement Project budget and utilities.

Commissioner Amyx said he had been supportive of the Carnegie Library and the affect of not doing that project for next year. Another question was about the tennis relocation center, and asked if staff had a response from the school district.

Corliss said the communication he had was with Randy Weseman, School Superintendent, where he indicated that it was a likely request for the school district to ask the City to financially participate in the tennis courts. The City originally participated in the financing of the tennis courts on 21st Street and the City had maintained and programmed the courts when they were not needed for schools. The estimate that had been placed was \$2 million and heard that estimate was high. The City had not made any form of commitment and Weseman knew that commitment needed to be formalized at some point in time. He said he would ask Weseman when he would ask for that level of commitment and what happened if the City said "no."

Commissioner Hack said regarding rental registration discussions with Oread Neighborhood, they talked about a trial area as opposed to current proposal. She had several e-mails from concerned apartment owners about inspecting or not inspecting those rentals. She asked if that decision needed to be made during the budget discussion.

Corliss said the rental registration ordinance decision did not have to be made during the budget. If rental registration was chosen outside the City's budget season and decided the authority for expenditures needed to be increased, as long as the City was pointing to a revenue source that was not property taxes, the City could amend the budget to give them additional expenditure authority and point to the new revenue source, which he was recommending be based on fees and do it at that time. As staff was looking at opportunities to respond to community needs as part of the City's charge in developing the budget, staff saw that as

something worthwhile to pursue. The Commission would not be adopting the rental registration ordinance, if there was a majority support for that program, this month or next month and needed to spend more time working on the details of that ordinance. It would give the City the expenditure authority to proceed with the program in 2009.

He said regarding a pilot program, that was worthy of discussion. It was difficult to craft an ordinance to indicate why a certain area of the community was more necessary for life safety protection than elsewhere. He said it was done successfully with single family residential units. It was litigated and held to have a good, solid rational basis for that distinction. He said he believed a distinction could be made based on age, given the information staff had on the history of complaints and structures. The fact that it was legally allowed did not mean it was good policy, which was the City Commission's decision. The Commission might say it was not fair or appropriate to make that decision and there was not much conversation about it, but he saw the opportunity to provide expenditure authority for something he thought was more prominent and important areas to enhance the community as far as service levels. The ability for the City to protect tenants in older structures and to protect the older structures was compromised given the current set of laws. Staff did not have the ability to inspect unless on a complaint basis and the City did not have the staffing to do the concentrated inspection and right now it was driven by complaint basis. Staff never had done concentrated code enforcement going block to block looking for problems. If they wanted to get to the issue of safety and integrity of those structures, the City needed some type of licensing and inspection system. This might not be the right time or vehicle, but it was the best staff had been able to put forward to date.

Commissioner Hack said it was not that she was opposed to those inspections, but she needed more time to digest the information received and thought it was important to have multiple people at the table before approving the item.

Corliss said staff asked the Kansas Ethics Commission for an opinion letter for the authority of an elected official to vote on a rental registration ordinance when owning property that would be subject to the law. He said he thought they had that ability given the large scope of the law. Half of the people in town lived in rental units and if there were laws that pertained to rentals and a Commissioner had ownership interest in a rental or rentals, it would be appropriate to disclose those rentals in the Commission's Statement of Substantial Interest. He said he believed the Commission had that authority. If he was wrong, the City Commission would be the first to know about it and would make sure that was part of their future deliberations, but he thought the Commission had that ability. They were not voting on the ordinance at this point.

Commissioner Amyx said under economic development, it discussed the 2009 CIP budget with included funding for future economic development and infrastructure products. In addition, the water and wastewater funds included \$200,000 for any related infrastructure projects. He asked Corliss to list what projects were under water and wastewater and the debt funding.

Corliss said on page P4, Economic Development A had \$1 million and that was the proposed City share of the fill work on the 87 acres at East Hills. One of the things not done as a group was not spending time on the capital budget. He said the Commission would want to see what would happen with mill levy and other projects. The capital budget was relatively thin in new projects. Most of the projects had been seen for a while, which was in recognition that they had done a lot and they were going to have to watch some of the projects in the future and the Commission might want some additional flexibility and might wait on Carnegie or economic development or find another way to do tennis courts.

Commissioner Amyx said in keeping sewer rates at the same rates in 2008 by not proceeding in several other sanitary sewer projects in 2009, including the Wakarusa facility and

sewer improvements to the airport and airport area, he asked if they were not taking on those projects next year.

Corliss said that was correct. They were basically following through on the sewer side with projects staff thought they were committed to, which was the Four Seasons Project which was necessary to continue to allow western growth in the community, the Anaerobic Digester Project at the current Wastewater Treatment Plant, which was the last project that was necessary to complete the last phase of the expansion. It gave additional capacity at that facility up to the 110,000 population that was essentially rated for now. The City was also committed to a project that was under design for a pump station out at East Hills Business Park to provide additional capacity at that facility that responded to the project that was already being built south of K-10 that the County was debt financing to provide sewer capacity at that location and also provided additional sewer capacity at East Hills Business Park. It provided additional capacity for future development on the former Farmland property. Those were the sewer projects staff felt the City was committed to in the master plan and actual engineering design.

Commissioner Amyx asked about the raw water intake on the Kansas River, and if the City was being placed in a position of picking and choosing between all of those projects.

Corliss said they were unless they wanted to raise rates accordingly. He felt the overall 5% increase to water and wastewater side of the bill was pretty substantial given that it was a 12% increase on water. That 12% increase on water was primarily driven by two facets; the Clinton Water Treatment Facility paying that debt for that facility and operating it, and also the capital project and one of them was the raw water intake. It was the only one and had been a good, sturdy piece of machinery for a long time, but it outlived its usefulness. There were alternatives if something happened to it. The other large project was what they called the Noreaster which continued to provide a new water supply to North Lawrence and eventually it would go again under the Kansas River and get to the southeast part of town. If the southeast

part of town was going to grow beyond its current boundaries, it would need additional water supply. They were going to have to choose between those two. Just as they had seen a slow down in assessed valuation growth and other revenue sources, they were seeing a slow down in what was previously planned in the Master Plan for growth in the community for water and wastewater customers. He said he wanted to point out a lot of things had been done in the community to provide good water and sewer infrastructure.

Commissioner Amyx said that was one of his questions the Vice Mayor brought up about revenue and not meeting estimates in 2008, but actually at the 2007 level.

He asked about additional positions in City Hall for 2009, and if there was a listing for the number of positions anticipated. He said the City Commission needed to have discussion about whether or not to fund those positions.

Corliss said there were no additional positions, unless the City Commission added the rental program.

Commissioner Amyx said as long as the City did not have new programs that required employees, Corliss' recommendation was to remain with the current level of employees they had to date with those 15 positions that were not funded for 2009.

Corliss said those 15 current vacant positions that were not public safety were not being funded next year and was not adding any new funds to any positions in the City organization unless adding the rental registration. Staff was working to get the City Commission a very detailed FTE comparison through a number of different departments and funds to show how that was tracked in the past.

Mayor Dever said those were discussions about where Lawrence stood relative to peer communities, but more importantly where the community stood and how many people the City was serving. It was important the Commission receive a summary with the base load of employment versus what the City planned on adding, what was added, and what the City was

not going to continue to staff through attrition. He thought those were important numbers to receive because those were the only way the City could cut services. The Fire/Medical and Police budget was over 40% of their budget. The Commission needed to find where they stood with the employees. He appreciated doing more with less, but wanted to convey that to the public on what was being done. Those numbers were broken down, but not in one place and would like to see those numbers in one place.

Mayor Dever asked if Michal Eglinski, City Auditor, was going to audit the street light fund.

Corliss said street lights were on the City Auditor's list. He said there was news from Westar about a rate increase pending before the Kansas Corporation Commission that would be double digit increases as well for next year. He said the budget did not include any specific adjustments, but staff included increases for the electricity line item. He said the City needed to look at its energy costs. It was not only the right thing to do environmentally, but the right thing to do budget wise. Staff had done a lot of work, but staff had not done a good job of telling their story about staff positions in a systematic way.

Commissioner Hack said the City had not been faced with this kind of a situation, as grim as it was since she had been on the Commission. The fact the City was not replacing people did not indicate those jobs were not valuable or that those tasks were not being done, but had other staff members who were absorbing those additional tasks and had huge tasks in front of them.

Commissioner Highberger said he noted somewhere in the budget document that they were looking at performance contracting.

Corliss said the City already had presentations by vendors. Performance contracting was a situation where someone would do an analysis, for example energy costs for free and then the idea they would be able to point to savings if the City would implement and join in

sharing some of the cost reductions. He said Diane Stoddard, Assistant City Manager, attended the recent Kansas Energy Summit hosted by the League of Kansas Municipalities and learned some good information about new programs and programs with the Kansas Corporation Commission where they would help do some of that performance auditing or at least help scope some of that work. It was not as though staff did not pay attention to those issues, but it was not done systematically which meant there were probably places that were not caught and needed to focus on those areas.

Mayor Dever said he wanted to receive a summary of the impact on the technology upgrades with wastewater upgrades, metering and how those technology improvements were going to have a benefit on the City's operating costs in the future and an idea if any labor costs could be saved as well. Energy was one of the most important things. They talked about switching over from certain types of chlorine to another from a safety standpoint, but there was also a cost standpoint and hopefully there were health and safety issues and guidelines that might be lessened. By showing the public improvement and making the improvements now, the City saved on maintenance in the future. The Commission needed to see the benefit of the investment and liked summaries at the back of the budget discussion accomplishments and the money that had been spent and hopefully what that meant to the community down the road for long-term operating costs. A lot of money was spent on those upgrades, especially on Wakarusa.

He said Solid Waste seemed like a large budget. He would like to make sure the City was maximizing their efficiency in that area. He said there was a huge cost to the City for the Sanitation Department. He said that department provided a great service, but was costly. He said staff needed to look at opportunities to streamline that department's costs in the future. He said maybe the City could gain efficiencies through reducing the amount of trash people threw

away reduce the amount of people in providing that service, use technology to help with those costs.

Corliss said he thought staff followed a good philosophy to reduce the waste stream in recognition that it would save money in this division and in the environment and community. The City paid a tonnage fee at the quarry.

Commissioner Highberger asked if there was an analysis for incineration of garbage to cut down on the tonnage dumped and generate income. It was his understanding that it was a norm in Europe.

Corliss said he had not done any analysis on that idea, but the idea could be added to the list. It would be good to have a report.

Vice Mayor Chestnut said when he was asking about the CIP, it seemed there was a scored list of a plethora of projects and that was not presented in the materials.

Corliss said the City Commission needed to receive the capital improvement plan from the Planning Commission. He said that plan was not scored.

Casey Toomay said they had scores from prior years but not this year. Rather than call their committee back together to rescore everything, they were holding firm on those scores.

Corliss said when discussing the CIP, staff would get the Commission an update. He said given the City's budget situation as far as staff's ability to recommend new capital improvement projects, staff did not spend a lot of time going through that list.

Mayor Dever said regarding the golf course, there had been discourse about whether or not the City should be in the business of operating a public golf course. He said the City had made a long term commitment and asked if Corliss could comment on the bonds, the actual ownership of the land, operation of the facility, and what choices there were in discontinuing that operation.

Corliss said the City leased that property from the United States Corps of Engineers on a lease that was either 20 or 40 years. With any project at that location, the City had to have the Corps permission so staff had the received permission for the golf course. The City hired a consultant to help with the design and construction of the facility and issued 20 year bonds to pay for the debt of that facility. The debt would be paid off in 2016 and it was a little short of \$300,000 a year which was paid out of the sales tax funds the City received. The operation of the facility brought in enough revenue to pay for its operating expenditures. It did not pay for City water or contribute to any City employee salaries. It paid for its onsite operations and showed a surplus that would stay in that fund. The City Commission would decide how to spend that and there might be capital needs at that facility because it was now over 10 years old. The City could transfer some of that money to pay for some of its debt, but first they had to have money in the fund balance and were projecting a surplus. It went to the credit to the wise management as paying attention to the expenditures and revenues. When they had bad weather they found ways to cut expenditures and do things necessary to cut expenditures. As far as the issue of whether the City should operate the golf course, that issue was decided by a former Commission. If the City wanted to get rid of the golf course, they had to ask what the costs would be. The City would still have the debt and might have someone assume that debt, but would need to find out if the Corps would allow that to happen. He thought given the fact that it was bringing in enough money to pay for its current operating costs, staff had not further explored the issue, but had conversations with other Commissioner's about options to consider at the golf course.

Mayor Dever said the City was paying the ancillary costs outside of the costs associated with the loan the City had against the construction of the property. In other words, the City's fees paid for the operation of that course outside of the debt.

Corliss said correct. He said just like any other Parks and Recreation function, the golf course did not pay for the water. There were probably overhead costs, but staff did not try to go through all those funds and allocate those things. He thought the golf course provided just like other recreational facility which was a service to the community.

Mayor Dever said the City would have those costs regardless and would owe that \$300,000 a year until the bond were paid off.

Corliss said correct, unless the City Commission wanted to try to find someone who would want to take the facility and the debt burden, commit to pay for that and operate in the parameters they wanted. One of the comments about privatization of a course was if it would continue to meet community needs. He said he was very pleased with the operation of the course and the golf course received a lot of good comments on how the course looked and played.

Commissioner Amyx said regarding the sales tax initiative, the creation of the Commission appointed sales tax audit committee was included and was a very good point. People needed to understand that if the City was going to ask people to approve a sales tax initiative, friends and neighbors should go over the books to make sure the money was being spent the way it was intended.

Corliss said Sedgwick County had a very similar sales tax audit committee. They had a 1% sales tax in Sedgwick County that sunset as soon as they collected the amount of money that was necessary to build the new arena in Wichita. They tracked the revenue and now were going to track the expenditures and thought it was appropriate.

Mayor Dever called for public comment.

Candice Davis, Oread Neighborhood Association and the Lawrence Association of Neighborhoods, said she wanted to thank the City Commission for their serious consideration of the rental registration program and was something they worked hard for at least 2 years to have

the City Commission understand how important rental registration was in older neighborhoods for the residents and neighbors to assure their safety and the stability of those neighborhoods. She noticed that Mayor Dever had mentioned about saving money in looking at the long term gains. She said when working to improve an older neighborhood and maintain the neighborhood, the City would be saving a lot of money in the long term in terms of addressing deterioration and additional police work in the neighborhood. She said she hoped the Commission would continue to have some serious discussions when pursuing and examining the City's budget.

James Dunn, Lawrence, said the Landlord Association members questioned this registration program as an excessive burden for housing providers. He appreciated Commissioner Hack's comments that the rental registration program might need to be looked at closely to make sure it was doing its overall intent, particularly just focusing on older properties.

Commissioner Highberger asked Dunn as an officer of the Oread Neighborhood Association, how he felt about the proposal.

Dunn said he sat on the neighborhood association's board and it was a majority oriented body and was not a unanimous vote to bring this issue to the City Commission.

Mayor Dever asked if staff could talk the Fire Department about what it would take to utilize staff from the fire department in doing this type of inspections and what would be the burden and ramifications.

Corliss said staff would provide information on what other communities did currently and information about the registration.

Vice Mayor Chestnut said there was a lot of discussion in the budget about rental registration. One thing he was interested in understanding was since the City had a program implemented in 2001 and take them through that anthology to what was seen as the benefits. In his opinion, it was not what everyone desired, the desire was to get higher level of

compliance and avoid demolition by neglect. Everyone had the same intentions, but as public comment noted, there was a contrast of opinion about how to get there. He said he had discussions with Corliss about the costs and at least in 2009, it was slightly revenue deficient and would have a deficit early on which was a concern.

Commissioner Hack said as a testimonial, it was not just a question of demolition by neglect but also a question of public safety. She said one of her properties was inspected and there were issues they were unaware of such as people living in a basement with only one egress. Unless a person was in a property on a daily basis, they would not know those things and could be found out through an inspection process. While demolition by neglect and preservation of older neighborhoods was critical, the issue of safety for the citizens of Lawrence was also critical. They had not found it to be a burden financially or from a logistics situation but she was interested to get more information about the 50 year cut. She said that would hit many of the multi-family rental homes the City was concerned about.

Vice Mayor Chestnut said also within that 50 year plus, he asked how many structures had already been identified that had citations. Part of the issue was installing a registration program but compliance was another thing. (12)

PUBLIC COMMENT:

James Dunn, Lawrence, said he wanted to comment on the street resurfacing in front of his house. He said they were resurfacing on Kentucky but wished they had done it later because every day large trucks go by from the Oread Inn Project. With the weight of those trucks on the new street, he wished they would have waited longer.

Chuck Soules, Public Works Director, said he would talk to the developers tomorrow to see if the developers could find another route. They would talk about getting repairs done and work together. Kentucky Street was planned to be done this year and the contractor was awarded the bid and wanted to get it done before the sidewalk sale.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS:

- 07/15/08 . Possible consideration of Z-04-09-08, a request to rezone approximately 155 acres from A (Agricultural) to IG (General Industrial). The property is located on the NW Corner of N 1800 Rd & E 900 Rd; I70/K10 Business Park. Submitted by Steven Schwada, agent for Stonewall Farms LLC; JDS Kansas LC; Pert LC; Penny J Tuckel; Axrom LLC; Venture Realty Corporation; Arco Sales Corporation; Venture Properties Inc; Industrial Square Corp; JDSS Limited Company; Radol LC; Tuckel Russell L JR; Northland Ventures LC; and Oread LC, property owners of record. Adopt on first reading, Ordinance No. 8293, rezoning approximately 155 acres from A to IG. (PC Item 13; approved 6-2 on 6/25/08)

ACTION: Approve Z-04-09-08, a request to rezone approximately 155 acres from A (Agricultural) to IG (General Industrial), and adopt on first reading Ordinance No. 8293 rezoning approximately 155 acres from A to IG, if appropriate.

This item is planned for 07/15/08 if the draft Planning Commission minutes are prepared in time.

- 07/29/08 . No City Commission meeting.
- 08/05/08 . Public hearing on 2009 Budget.
- 08/12/08 . Receive presentation on Peak Oil from the Sustainability Advisory Board.
- 08/19/08 . Consideration of airport industrial park annexation and rezoning items.
- 09/16/08 . Receive presentation of results of Recycling Survey.
- TBD . Receive staff memo regarding green burials.
- . Consider a request for a marked crosswalk together with pedestrian refuge islands on Louisiana Street adjacent to Dakota Street (Considered by the City Commission and referred back to the Traffic Safety Commission on 05/06/08).
- . Receive request for changes to the definition of "street vendor" in city code to allow art services and provide for the granting of a street vendor license for said services.
- . Consider city laws regarding the keeping of live fowl and domesticated hedgehogs in the city limits.
- . Consideration of airport industrial park annexation and rezoning items.
- . ***This item was deferred from June 3, 2008.*** Consider approval of 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 north of 6th Street between Stoneridge Drive and Queens Road. (PC Item 6D; approved 7-0 on 4/21/08)

ACTION: Approve Z-02-07D-08, a request to rezone approximately 5.669 acres from UR (Urban Reserve) to CO (Office Commercial), and authorize staff to draft ordinance for placement on a future agenda, if appropriate.

· ***This item deferred from June 10, 2008.*** Consider approving CPA-2004-02, a Comprehensive Plan Amendment to Horizon 2020, Chapter 7: Industrial and Employment Related Land Use and consider adopting on first reading, [Ordinance No. 8283](#), for Comprehensive Plan Amendment (CPA-2004-02) to Horizon 2020, Chapter 7. (PC Item 11; approved 7-2 on 5/21/08)

ACTION: Approve CPA-2004-02, amending Horizon 2020, Chapter 7, and adopt on first reading ordinance 8283, if appropriate.

· Consider adopting revised sidewalk dining ordinance and compliance procedures. Staff will meet with interested stakeholders prior to placement of this item on a City Commission agenda.

· Consider the following items related to Lawrence SmartCode:

a) Consider approval of CPA-2007-6, a Comprehensive Plan Amendment to Horizon 2020 by creating Chapter 15 – Place Making to ensure proper comprehensive plan language is in place for the proposed Lawrence SmartCode in the City of Lawrence. (PC Item 13; approved 8-0 on 5/21/08)

ACTION: Approve CPA-2007-6, an amendment to Horizon 2020 by creating Chapter 15 - Place Making, if appropriate.

b) Consider approval of CPA-2007-7, a Comprehensive Plan Amendment to Horizon 2020, Chapter 14 Specific Plans, to add a reference to the Lawrence SmartCode Infill Plan. (PC Item 14; approved 8-0 on 5/21/08)

ACTION: Approve CPA-2007-7, an amendment to Horizon 2020, Chapter 14 Specific Plans, if appropriate.

c) Consider adopting Text Amendment TA-11-24-07 regarding the Lawrence SmartCode and, Pursuant to the provisions of K.S.A. Chapter 12, Article 7, enacting a new Chapter 21 of the Code of the City of Lawrence, Kansas, establishing comprehensive zoning regulations and other land use regulations. The “Lawrence SmartCode” is an optional development code that is parallel to the City’s existing zoning and subdivision regulations and affects all property within the corporate limits of the City of Lawrence, Kansas. Copies of the “Lawrence SmartCode” are available for review at the Office of the Lawrence-Douglas County Planning Department, City Hall, 6 E. 6th Street, Lawrence, Kansas. The “Lawrence SmartCode” is also available at www.lawrenceplanning.org. Adopt Ordinance No. 8286 on first reading regarding TA-11-24-07 for

the Lawrence SmartCode. (PC Item 15; approved 8-0 on 5/21/08)

ACTION: Approve TA-11-24-07 regarding the Lawrence SmartCode and adopt Ordinance No. 8286, if appropriate.

- Farmer's Turnpike sector plan.
- Consider approving Text Amendment, TA-03-01-08, to amend Article 4 of the Development Code relating to uses permitted in the GPI District. Initiated by Planning Commission on 3/24/08. (PC Item 4; approved 8-0 on 6/23/08)

ACTION: Approve TA-03-01-08, if appropriate.

- Consider making a determination based on a consideration of all relevant factors that there is/is not a feasible and prudent alternative to the proposed demolition of the structure located at 1232 Louisiana Street and that the proposed demolition includes/does not include all possible planning to minimize harm to the listed property. The Historic Resources Commission determined on April 17, 2008 that this project will encroach upon, damage or destroy the listed historic properties and their environs. *(Deferred by City Commission on June 10, 2008, pending receipt of additional information from staff and applicant)*

COMMISSION ITEMS:

Moved by Hack, seconded by Highberger, to adjourn at 8:20 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.

APPROVED:

Michael H. Dever, Mayor

ATTEST:

Frank S. Reeb, City Clerk

CITY COMMISSION MEETING OF JULY 8, 2008

1. Bid – Kaw Water Treatment Plant Building Envelope Repairs Year 2A to Mid-Continental Co, Inc., for \$269,221.52.
2. Bid – 2 one-ton trucks with dump beds & tommy lifts to lair Noller for \$59,688.
3. Bid Date – July 22, 2008 for 18th & Maine St traffic diverter.
4. Ordinance No. 8287 – 2nd & Final Read, amend Ch 5, Art 3 & 6 of the City Code, 2008 Edition, concerning domestic clothes dryer venting.
5. Application for KLINK funding for 23rd St resurfacing project.
6. Approve signs in ROW in from of First Southern Baptist Church, 4300 W. 6th St.
7. Release of Mortgage- Mary Kring, 933 Missouri; Subordination Agreement- Jill Jevens, 1301 Prospect.
8. Temporary Special Even Permit – Patio Sale Jayhawk Bookstore, 1420 Crescent.
9. City Manager's Report.
10. Ordinance No. 8296 – 1st Read, Public hearing on proposed 2008 budget amendment.
11. Request from Lawrence-Douglas County Biosciences Authority for support of Lawrence Life Sciences Incubator.
12. Receive City Commission comments/questions regarding City Manager's Recommended Budget.