



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
ROBERT J. SCHUMM

COMMISSIONERS
MICHAEL DEVER
HUGH CARTER
MIKE AMYX
ARON E. CROMWELL

January 22, 2013

The Board of Commissioners of the City of Lawrence met in regular session at 6:35 a.m., in the City Commission Chambers in City Hall with Mayor Schumm presiding and members Amyx, Carter, Cromwell and Dever present.

A. RECOGNITION/PROCLAMATION/PRESENTATION: None

B. CONSENT AGENDA

Hugh Carter asked for item number 10, traffic calming on 27th Street, to be pulled from the consent agenda for separate discussion.

It was moved by Amyx, seconded by Dever, to approve the consent agenda as below, minus item number 10. Motion carried unanimously.

1. Approved City Commission meeting minutes from 01/08/13.
2. Received minutes from various boards and commissions:

Lawrence Douglas County Bicycle Advisory Committee meeting of 11/20/12
Parks & Recreation Advisory Board meeting of 01/08/13
3. Approved claims to 212 vendors in the amount of \$1,124,270.57.
4. Approved the Drinking Establishment License for Freebirds World Burrito, 741 Massachusetts.
5. Bid and purchase items:
 - a) Authorized the City Manager to execute an Engineering Services Agreement in the amount of \$45,348 with Burns & McDonnell for Engineering Services for Project UT1211, Clinton Reservoir Water Treatment Plant Filter Media Replacement.
6. Approved an extension request for Special Use Permit, SUP-10-7-10, for Child Care, located at 345 Florida Street. Approved by Planning Commission on 12/13/10 and City



Commission on 1/11/11, Ordinance No. 8608. Submitted by CFS Engineers, for DCCCA, Inc. c/o Elizabeth Ballard Community Center, property owner of record.

7. Approved Special Event Permits, SE-12-00315, requested for seasonal garden sales at 2300 Louisiana Street from May 21st through June 30th, 2013. (Four administrative permits have been approved for this property for March 26th through May 20th.) Submitted by Kaw Valley Greenhouses, Inc. for 2300 Louisiana Co, LLC, property owner of record.
8. Received request from AllofE for economic development assistance, including a job creation incentive program and future relocation assistance. Referred to PIRC for review and recommendation.
9. Approved sign permit for a mural installation on the non-masonry portion of the north side of the Poehler Building located at 8th and Delaware Streets.
10. THIS ITEM WAS PULLED FROM THE CONSENT AGENDA FOR SEPARATE DISCUSSION. Concurred with Traffic Safety Commission recommendation for traffic calming devices on 27th Street between Iowa Street and Louisiana Street (TSC Item No. 2; approved 5-0 on 12/3/12). No funding is currently available for this project.

Regarding item number 10, traffic calming on 27th, David Woosley, Traffic Engineer, presented the staff report.

Schumm asked how it was ranked.

Woosley said by volume, speed, pedestrian facilities, sidewalks, and number of reported crashes in the past 3 years.

Schumm asked how many currently were on the waiting list.

Woosley said 17.

Schumm said staff thought this was the most important?

Woosley said based on the criteria, yes.

Landra Fair said she had gone door to door on part of 27th and most people shared her concerns with speed on that street.

Carter said the public comment said the most popular options were a raised crosswalk at the trail crossing. He asked why that was the top option.

Fair said Bonnie Johnson had asked her students to define a project for the street. The ideas they generated were presented to the neighborhood. That was where the neighbors got their ideas. She said she understood it was a collector street and some options weren't available. A raised crosswalk was a popular option and they hoped it would help people understand to yield to pedestrians.

Carter said he grew up in the neighborhood and it had always been a collector. Had anything changed? He said he had seen some dissenting points of view and thought he would see more people speaking in opposition.

Bonnie Johnson said it was a collector street but it was also a cut through street. Geography and the width of the street made it a fun street to drive for some people. There were particular places, like the intersection with Missouri, where people didn't hardly slow down to make the turn because the curve radius was so wide. It was a residential area.

Amyx said he had lived in the area before. He agreed that over time people had been using it to access South Iowa at a greater rate.

Carter said he just wanted to give the public a chance to comment. He thought there would be people wanting to speak in opposition to this.

Moved by Carter, seconded by Amyx, to concur with Traffic Safety Commission recommendation for traffic calming devices on 27th Street between Iowa Street and Louisiana Street (TSC Item No. 2; approved 5-0 on 12/3/12). No funding is currently available for this project. Motion carried unanimously.

C. CITY MANAGER'S REPORT:

David L. Corliss, City Manager, presented the report.

D. REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS:

1. **Consider adopting Resolution No. 7002, indicating the intent to issue up to \$40 million in industrial revenue bonds for the Kansas Athletic facility at Rock Chalk Park.**

Diane Stoddard, Assistant City Manager, presented the staff report.

Gary Anderson, Gilmore and Bell, said the resolution allowed the city to apply for the sales tax exemption certificate. This would come back later for approval of the bond ordinance and the tax abatement. The statutory process would include published notice and notice to the school district and county after going through the PIRC process.

Schumm asked Anderson to explain how the bonds were sold.

Anderson said they were conduit bonds. The city had no liability. It was anticipated that one of the parties involved in the transaction, probably Bliss Sports, would purchase the bonds.

Amyx said Section 8 in the Resolution talked about authorization to proceed. He asked what happened if during this project there was something the Commission didn't like and the ordinance wasn't approved. He asked if the City was under a contract with this resolution.

Anderson said no. If they began buying construction materials they would be tax exempt, but if the IRB's weren't issued they would need to pay back the exemption.

Amyx said he understood this only covered the KU portion of the project.

Anderson said yes.

Schumm said that was a good point, it didn't cover the city portion.

Mayor Schumm called for public comment.

Curt Peterson, representing Bliss Sports LC, said they were very enthusiastic. A lot of progress had been made. He wanted to share their enthusiasm for the prospect of a co-located city rec center also. This was a little different than a typical project because of the involvement of Bliss Sports LC, which meant the benefits of tax exemption weren't automatically available without the IRBs. These were conduit bonds which will be bought by the developer. This was not a financing transaction in this case, but a statutory scheme that allowed you to buy the bonds yourself. In a month or so they hoped to come back and discuss the property tax

abatement portion of this request. The benefits of these two elements are completely enjoyed by Kansas Athletics and the University, not the developer. They flow through to the university.

Amyx asked if the total cost was \$40 million.

Peterson said yes.

Laura Routh said in 2009 the city adopted an overarching economic development policy. In reviewing the application for the request tonight she said she was disturbed to note no commitment to energy efficiency or LEED certification. She would ask that the city make sure we maximize public dollars to make sure this was as green as could be.

Carter said they were having conversations about the rec center being LEED eligible, but he wasn't sure about KU's portion.

Corliss said we have asked the architects to make sure the city's center was LEED certifiable even if we didn't go through the cost of certifying. He didn't know about the KU portion.

Carter said it would be good to find out and be able to speak to that.

Schumm said most of the facilities were outdoors.

Cromwell said there might be aspects of the construction, such as runoff or a variety of green aspects that could be incorporated into the project. An update would be nice.

Amyx said he hadn't had a problem with the KU portion of this. As they were looking at payments being made via sales taxes for our rec center, this exemption might be a concern.

Schumm said if KU wasn't doing it, it wouldn't be an issue.

Moved by Carter, seconded by Dever, to adopt Resolution No. 7002, indicating the intent to issue up to \$40 million in industrial revenue bonds for the Kansas Athletic facility at Rock Chalk Park. Motion carried unanimously.

2. **Consider concurring with Traffic Safety Commission recommendation to approve the request to establish no parking along the south side of Dakota**

Street from Louisiana Street, east to the sidewalk and adopt on first reading, Ordinance No. 8812, establishing no parking along the south side of Dakota Street from Louisiana Street, east 80 feet (TSC Item No. 5, approved 9-0 on 10/01/12).

David Woosley, Transportation/Traffic Engineer, presented the staff report

Schumm asked on Dakota, how far back from the intersection were you allowed to park now.

Woosley said by state law you have to be 20 feet back from the crosswalk.

Schumm said more than the length of a car.

Woosley said yes.

Schumm asked how often that street was loaded with cars parked on both sides.

Woosley said he didn't think it was consistent, but intermittent.

Mayor Schumm called for public comment.

Carol Bowen said she lived one block east of the area. It was an issue because a major topic of discussion by the neighborhood was traffic issues. The board identified where the problems were and signs were placed in the area. One possibility was placing a traffic circle at Ohio Street, but people didn't want the kind with the yellow posts. She asked that the request tonight be denied. It was a local street and traffic had to negotiate sometimes. There just wasn't a problem. If a few people wanted to go faster and they accommodated that, they were creating more of a problem.

Carter said from what he could see, it was really the first residents on each side of Dakota who had driveways on Louisiana. If one side was designated no parking, then only one neighbor had an issue. If the one neighbor parked on the other side of the street, versus their side, whichever side of the street you park on, your driver's door was on the side facing the street. It was not a big street and he thought they both could park on the street and one

would need to walk ten feet further. He said Bowen's comments were the opposite of what he expected from the neighborhood.

Schumm asked if the issue came to Traffic Safety to remove parking on both sides of the street.

Woosley said one side of the street, but for the whole length.

Schumm said he had three emails against it and two for it. People who wanted to leave it alone say that the parking kept fast driving from occurring. A couple emails suggested that removing parking would encourage more cut-through. He said he was surprised that at the Traffic Safety meeting, no one else spoke to this issue.

Amyx asked where the request came from, First Student?

Woosley said it came from a person that worked at that organization, but not from First Student itself.

Carter asked if there were documented crashes.

Woosley said no.

Amyx said he saw no reason to change. There might or might not be the vision problem but you just take your time and you look. He said leave it alone.

Cromwell said unless there was a problem with emergency vehicles, which he didn't see.

Moved by Dever, seconded by Amxy, to deny adoption of Ordinance No. 8812, which would have established no parking along the south side of Dakota Street from Louisiana Street, east 80 feet. Motion carried unanimously.

3. **Receive report regarding the curbside recycling proposals.**

David Corliss, City Manager, introduced the item.

Ed Mullins, Finance Director, representing the curb side recycling committee, presented the staff report.

Cromwell said he appreciated the work of staff and the committee. He said his memo outlined the reasons for curbside recycling. When the Solid Waste Task Force was active, a lot of the feedback was that the idea was great as long as it didn't cost too much. Of course he agreed with that. Over the past couple months, he said he had been thinking he would like to do weekly collection, but looking at everything a bi-weekly collection made the most sense. We probably would capture a little more by collecting every week. We would have to manage the communication to make sure people knew which weeks were collection. He said he could fit everything in a 95 gallon cart if he started breaking things down, if he tried a little harder. Hamm was talking about raising our landfill rates if we didn't use their service. That would probably happen anyway. They need a certain amount of volume to make their business work. We would save more on the diversion than those extra costs. He was anxious to hear what the proposers had to add. Having the city collect gave us more options in the future. He wanted to hear from the proposers before making any decisions. Hamm might have more to say about the minimum amount of materials they needed collected. We're not sure what those numbers were going to be right off the bat, and they might have the ability to work around that.

Schumm said it was apparent we were not talking about glass being recycled.

Corliss said their proposals differed regarding glass.

Schumm asked about the city.

Corliss said we would not collect curbside but would continue with Ripple Glass.

Schumm said he looked at the Ripple containers and it seemed like a lot of heavy materials. To move forward without a glass option seemed short sighted.

Cromwell said Waste Management included glass. The problem industry wide was that the glass gets contaminated and more materials were thrown away. Some communities require glass in a separate container.

Schumm asked how it worked on the trucks picking it up.

Cromwell said it was different trucks. The Ripple model worked pretty well.

Mayor Schumm called for public comment.

Carol Bowen said she wanted to compliment the city. As far as the glass, if you look around the house there wasn't as much glass. Everything is plastic. Her biggest concerns were local control and local businesses. She would hate to force some businesses out. We hear that small businesses were the backbone of the economy and she would like to keep them going.

Laura Routh thanked the commission. Recycling had been her number one priority when she moved to the community 10 years ago. As a person who had worked in solid waste for a long time she knew that put or pay contracts were problematic. If that was something you wanted to go for, be very careful. Glass was a challenge. She said she was confident that staff and the vendor could work it out. Don't let the issue of glass keep you from moving forward.

Brian Neppl, Waste Management of Kansas, said the committee did a great job laying out what was in the RFP and adhering to the timelines. Waste Management of Kansas had been working for the last couple of months working toward what the city wanted. In their world that included glass. They had a solution for handling the glass problem. There were third party providers who could solve the contaminated glass problem. They asked the Commission to not make a decision based on the information tonight. The city had the right to negotiate with all haulers and get the best rate possible. The lowest rate wasn't always the best option, getting the best rate for all the services were the best option and they could provide all those services. They would like to offer a 4 day collection proposal. He said they didn't know the city was going that direction at the time of the RFP.

Schumm asked if Neppl was saying that not everyone had laid down their cards, and let people negotiate.

Neppl said yes.

Schumm said if he put glass out at his curb, he asked how that glass would be handled.

Neppl said all of the recycling materials collected in that one bin were taken to their recycling facility where it was sorted. The materials would go through a series of sorting machines and ultimately hand sorting of the end product as well.

Schumm said one bin, one truck, and everything went away from his house in one truck.

Neppl said yes. He said 20% of your residents were currently signed up with haulers. The rest of the population was probably throwing away their glass, and we could capture that.

Carter asked if Mullins breakdowns were accurate in Neppl's mind. He also thought everyone should be able to propose a 4 day collection week.

Neppl said he thought the breakdown was accurate.

Cromwell said everyone in the industry was saying that glass in single stream was not good because a lot more of the material ends up landfilled.

Neppl said transparency was important, having the city come out and audit and see how much residuals were taken out of the recycling stream. He said they collect glass at almost every one of their facilities.

Jim Mullins said he was not a member of the Solid Waste Task Force but he attended a lot of the meetings and he did a lot of research on cities and counties across the country. What Waste Management did, single stream, was what the City should be doing. If you had vendors that couldn't handle the glass, they needed to get with the program. The main thing that was objectionable was that it was mandatory pay voluntary participation. It should be voluntary-voluntary. He disagreed wholeheartedly that he should have to pay if he didn't recycle. Individual rights were paramount.

Scott White said he was glad the City was considering curbside recycling. It was long overdue. Over 15 years in Lawrence it had gotten easier but there was a lot of recyclables that ended up in the waste stream. He encouraged moving forward, regardless of the vendor choice.

Mike Claggett, Deffenbaugh Industries, said he wanted to address a couple of issues. One issue was the rebate cap which was really not a cap. If they were to provide the weekly collection service, the rebate would be provided to the City in the amount of \$10,000 a month. That amount was not capped. On an every other week collection basis, there was no limit on the amount that would be rebated to the City. He said the City was probably looking at the amount of \$22,000 and \$25,000 a month for rebate on today's values. Obviously, those were commodities and as such, they moved around quite a bit. There were times when it could be greater or lesser than that amount. If they were going to be doing the collection piece whether every other week or weekly they would provide the carts, assembly and distribution of the carts, and maintenance of the carts. The other issue was glass. He said he did not know if he wanted to address the issue of cross contamination because there were two sides to that discussion. He said they had been a partner with Ripple Glass program since its inception and had committed to work with Ripple not only in the Kansas City market place, but in the Lawrence market place, in an effort to not only collect glass that was delivered by the residents to the various drop-off locations, but implemented programs for bars and restaurants and made the commitment with Ripple Glass to continue those efforts in the City of Lawrence.

Schumm said in the areas you work, you don't pick up glass curbside?

Claggett said correct. It was still single stream, everything was collected in one container, but glass wasn't included.

Dever asked what the cost for carts and rolling out the program was.

Claggett said about 1.5 million dollars.

Dever said when you talked about the relationships you had heard already, especially with Ripple, could Deffenbaugh offer glass or was your MRF not set up for that?

Claggett said it was not set up for that but it could be one day. The issue now was cross contamination. Our buyers prefer that we don't have glass in the mix because small pieces of glass get in the fibers. So far we have decided not to go that route.

Dever said he knew Deffenbaugh provided dumpsters at schools and other places. If we went another direction would those programs change?

Claggett said the more curbside becomes available, the easier it was not to take materials to those locations. They might see some decrease in volumes but a lot of people would still take materials at those locations.

Dever said especially with collection every other week.

Claggett said in KC they went to bi-weekly with an 18 gallon cart and it didn't work. Olathe uses bi-weekly with a 95 gallon bin and it worked quite well. There were ways to communicate with the community the pickup dates, but he understood weekly was easier.

Charlie Sedlock, Hamm, thanked staff and the community. He wanted to address how they would handle glass. Their base proposal did not include it, but it could be added at a cost. Their proposal was repurposing an older facility with all new equipment. If glass was important to the city, they could do that, if not, Ripple was still an option. On the glass side right now you have a landing zone/transfer site at Farmland. They could do that and free up Farmland for other things. They were proposing a minimize tonnage because you were starting an arc where you would eventually have single stream for residential and commercial, you'll coordinate with KU and KU athletics, and all of sudden the 1150 tons a month was no big deal. They could change that requirement and scale their plans. Having a local option was the way the community ultimately wanted to go. They could offer C&D, and had room for e-Waste, food

waste processing. A local option was needed to make it all happen and not have the facility 30-40 miles away. Our proposal met the goals of SAB, the Peak Oil Task Force. In terms of small businesses, Hamm had always worked with everyone. They were open to all those folks to offer high rebates. They had talked with all of them and they were interested. C&D – they would work with Restore. For web outreach they would work with KU. They had been partners with the city for a long time and wanted to continue to help the City continue to meet their goals.

Carter asked what he meant about repurposing a building.

Sedlock said the building they were proposing was the old Lacy Steel Building. They would repurpose and create a bright spot at that location along with value for the community. There would be public interaction in terms of field trips, kids, and teachers.

Carter said everyone would need to tweak the proposals to have the rates without minimum tonnage. About how long would it take to get back with that information and the 3 day versus 4 day week?

Sedlock said they could turn things back quickly.

Schumm asked if he knew what percentage of an average family's waste was glass.

Sedlock said he did not. Studies showed a few percent by air space but a little more by weight.

Amyx said there was discussion about having the RFPs reviewed by staff and others. He said if glass was a requirement, would Deffenbaugh choose not to go forward?

Clagett said that was one of those things they would have to take another look at. He wouldn't say tonight that they wouldn't do that, but it would probably affect how a second proposal was submitted. Regarding the percentages of glass, glass would represent approximately 11% by weight, but that was trending down.

Schumm said Lawrence had a lot of drinking establishments and liquor stores. That was a lot of glass. Other areas might be trending down, but he was not sure Lawrence was.

Claggett said glass reduced the composite value of the materials.

Corliss said in his conversations with Ripple Glass, one of the things they wanted to say was that if you wanted glass recycled, keep it separate. That was what they advised.

Cromwell said as far as their ability to use it, they needed a very clean product.

Daniel Poull said the city's solid waste division had great approval ratings. In that light, if the city becomes the collection agent, they would do a great job too. He said they were well within the numbers shown in a survey of participation rates compared to the fees. They were also 18 months away. One of the private haulers in the city was Deffenbaugh already, and they wouldn't have to wait 18 months. Another thing that jumped out was that Hamm had kept rates so low that they had saved the city thousands of dollars over the years. Having a MRF close by would save money.

Corliss said his understanding was that if the City selected a third party, there was still an 18 month waiting period.

Schumm asked if the City would have to continue to retain the current haulers too?

Corliss said yes.

Carter asked if staff knew what survey it was that was cited.

Corliss said it was the citizen survey.

The Commission recessed for a short break at 8:28 p.m.

The Commission resumed the regular session at 8:41 p.m.

Cromwell said at this point it was pretty clear the Commission would like additional information. If the City had a little more time to negotiate and refine this proposal a little more, he proposed that they focus on a 4 day, bi-weekly schedule. Narrow it down to a more refined,

tightened up proposal. Take a look at the MRF proposals as well and make some further refinements and have some more glass discussions. He suggested directing staff to have those discussions and bring it back in a couple of weeks.

Schumm said one of the gentlemen asked to be able to come back with some more options now that they know what was proposed. He said he would like to see two options, with and without glass. If it could work it was worth looking into. They haven't had a discussion tonight about what to do with the existing recyclers and that needed to happen at some point.

Amyx said the existing recyclers really stepped up when the city didn't have a program. The City needed to find a way for those recyclers to continue serving. Not being able to expand would be difficult for those recyclers. He suggested either allowing the recyclers to continue operating or fold them in somehow.

Schumm said the point Commission Amyx made was true. At any rate, those existing in business were owed something for their business. In some way they ought to be compensated if they weren't continued in the mix somehow.

Dever said he noticed that some of the proposals indicated that the private haulers would be part of the mix. He asked if Deffenbaugh reiterated that point in their letter.

Cromwell said there were different approaches. The City approach indicated that they would allow those private businesses to continue serving their customers and those businesses would receive whatever they were getting already. Other proposals indicated that private businesses could keep their current customers. All of the different options had challenges from a billing point of view because the City would be doing the billing. There was some concern that they might want there to be some sort of end date.

Schumm said a corollary route was if someone had a route, did they have a right to sell it out when they retired or was there some sunset?

Dever said all of our proposals should include how they would work that out.

Cromwell said they had taken that out in the table that compared prices.

Ed Mullins said Public Works included in their monthly fee \$135,000 on an annual basis for the existing haulers. Right now, most of the proposals indicated that you could continue having the small haulers and they would get the same rebates the city would receive. The question was how the city would bill, whether there would be a subsidy or not.

Dever asked if the amount of purchasing the additional carts was included in our proposal.

Mullins said that was required in the responses.

Dever said the City had bought similar quantity of carts recently for approximately 1.5 million.

Mullins said they were anticipating purely single family residential of about 28,500 and another 5,000 multi-family.

Dever asked what the cost to the city was up front. That was something that needed to be clear. One was a loan per month and the other was an upfront cost. Those costs were in their estimate, but the City wouldn't have those costs if they had a third party providing the service. It was kind of unclear where that number was and where that money came from.

Mullins said the City had an equipment reserve fund and also had 18 months to prepare for it.

Tammy Bennett, Assistant Public Works Director, said the city proposal included the carts and any equipment the City had to buy and assumed a seven year capitalization of the costs over the course of the contract.

Cromwell asked if the proposal from the city included any bond and interest costs for that money.

Bennett said yes.

Schumm said in a perfect world, if the City needed to offer the existing vendors an opportunity to discontinue their service, the City could make them an offer and allow them to choose whether to sell out their business to the city. They could accept an offer and not be forced to quit.

Cromwell said that was a good way to do it, but legally they didn't have to do anything. There was an 18 month period for the private vendor to adjust, but we value doing something more. A one-time payment, the opportunity to get rid of the billing hassles later, that might be something to have staff look at. They knew who those folk were.

Schumm asked about the number of vendors.

Kathy Richardson, Waste Reduction and Recycling, said there were 6 companies. There was one company registered through the city that strictly provided services to apartments.

Schumm asked if we knew much about those businesses.

Richardson said staff had some of that information. She said there was a range of 70-350 customers.

Cromwell said the easiest and best fair ending for them would be a one-time offer.

Amyx asked if it was a one time-offer or would they be given an opportunity to stay in businesses if they wanted to.

Cromwell said he didn't see any reason why a business couldn't continue their service they were offering, but the customer would be paying two dollars a month for this service.

Mullins said you might want to consider addressing the liability issues with workers compensation and other insurance.

Corliss said staff would communicate with the vendors that had offered responses and ask them to give us their pricing at 4 day bi-weekly pickup, no minimum tonnage, quotes and business plans for glass and no glass options, and how they would propose handling existing haulers. Staff would communicate that information to the vendors and give them 7-10 days. Staff would also talk to existing haulers and different options, and ask for position statements.

Schumm said that was pretty much what they talked about.

Carter said he wasn't sure to what extent staff wanted to handle the current providers. He didn't see from a liability or service standpoint how the City would have people that they didn't hire and pay, collect for the City. He said this was a commission item.

Schumm said it became confusing with multiple haulers leapfrogging each other's routes.

Dever asked if we had access to how many people those haulers serve.

Cromwell said yes.

Dever asked if it was current.

Mullins said from October.

Schumm said it could be figured out what a person grosses with the number of customers and their rates.

Corliss said he thought staff could look at the best way to look at some kind of severance or buyout and what was the appropriate arrangement.

Cromwell said it was really exciting. How exactly this would be structured, regardless of where it went, there was an opportunity to have curbside recycling citywide and it was an amazing opportunity. As time has gone on, the projected price dropped substantially and it was exciting.

Schumm thanked all the companies who had provided quotes, and the City would get back to those companies soon.

E. PUBLIC COMMENT:

None.

F. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS:

David Corliss, City Manager, outlined potential future agenda items.

G: COMMISSION ITEMS:

None.

H: CALENDAR:

David Corliss, City Manager, reviewed calendar items.

I: CURRENT VACANCIES – BOARDS/COMMISSIONS:

Existing and upcoming vacancies on City of Lawrence Boards and Commissions were listed on the agenda.

Moved by Cromwell, seconded by Amyx, to adjourn at 9:09 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.

MINUTES APPROVED BY THE CITY COMMISSION ON FEBRUARY 12, 2013.



Jonathan M. Douglass, City Clerk