

ROLL CALL – PRESENT:

| | |
|--------------------|-------------------|
| Alderman Drummer | Alderman Moran |
| Alderman Bernstein | Alderman Engelman |
| Alderman Kent | Alderman Rainey |

A Quorum was present.

**NOT PRESENT AT
ROLL CALL:**

Aldermen Newman, Wynne and Feldman

PRESIDING:

Mayor Lorraine H. Morton

A SPECIAL MEETING of the City Council was called to order by Mayor Morton at 7:09 p.m. on April 16, 2001 in the Council Chamber. The Council voted to hold the special meeting at the April 10, 2001 City Council meeting for the purpose of considering 24-O-01 - Zoning Ordinance text amendment, Ordinance 34-O-01 - Special Use for 1900 Dempster St. and a contract amendment with Harza Engineering.

Aldermen Feldman and Newman came into the meeting at this time.

Mayor Morton explained that citizens would each speak for three minutes due to time constraints and the need to conduct a Human Services Committee meeting that evening.

CITIZEN COMMENT:

W. Michael Green, 1631 McDaniel Ave., stated that he was still looking for the benefit of the proposed administration/childcare center on his neighborhood. If the district implied benefits are for pre-school African-American children with the same educational philosophy that has produced the test scores that people see today, he was not excited about this facility and did not think they were starting a pilot program. The center will reflect the population breakdown of the City and African-Americans represent 15-20% but the district implies 50% of the students will be African-American. It seems that the neighbors have to give up more than everyone else does and property values may decrease by 15%. He stated African-Americans gave up a lot when they allowed their children to be bussed to other neighborhoods. A “yes” vote means that the City wants this neighborhood to subsidize this facility even more than others. They have suffered damage from the deep tunnel/drop shaft project and now will be subjected to more damage to their homes. He asked Council to vote “no.”

Alderman Wynne came into the meeting at this time.

Greg Klaiber, 2329 Hartrey Ave., District 65 board member, said 15 months ago the board voted to have a referendum to address and fund some urgent needs. One was to construct an early childhood education/administration building on part of the nine-acre property the district owns north of King Lab School. On March 21, 2000 the referendum passed in every precinct and overall by a margin of 3-1. The board and the Citizens Referendum Committee clearly demonstrated why such a facility is needed and how it would benefit all of Evanston. The rationale as to why the community needs the center, why this site was chosen, alternative sites that were explored and why the district seeks a text amendment to what is currently allowed under the Zoning Ordinance

was presented to the Plan Commission, where it passed 7-1, and to the Planning & Development Committee, where it passed 3-1. He stated the district has sought to explain how this site was chosen and to respond to neighbors' concerns about traffic and busses. The decision to go to referendum and build an early childhood education and administration center evolved over several years. Community input was involved prior to the referendum and the district will continue to involve the community. The (board) priority from the beginning has been to keep open communication with residents who live near this site, King Lab parents, city officials and aldermen. It was stated that the community did not know the planned location of this facility when it voted for the referendum. He recalled at least 16 articles in the local newspapers, prior to the referendum vote, which stated the board's intent to construct this facility on district-owned property north of King Lab School. Mailings were sent to every postal address prior to the referendum that included the proposed site and announcements were sent to neighborhood residents prior to the first community forums held before the referendum vote. A 2,000-piece mailing was sent to 2nd Ward residents listing the schedule of the four community forums after the referendum vote and the ten building sub-committee meetings. He acknowledged this building will impact this neighborhood and the board was sensitive to the concerns articulated. As a result, over \$600,000 was added to the project to include a roadway to divert auto and bus traffic off of McDaniel for the new building and King Lab School. They believe this will address traffic concerns and enhance the current traffic situation there. The board recognizes that it will need to continue to work with residents, City officials and the 2nd Ward alderman.

Mary Erickson, 1214 Greenleaf St., District 65 board member and chair of the Building Committee, stated the issue was narrow -- changing the definition in the text of the ordinance to include offices in a public education institution, which she thought a logical inclusion of what schools need to deliver public education. Seventy percent of the building for the early childhood center is allowed under law and is the portion that has raised the most public comment about bus and parental traffic. Adding the administrators was a minor part of the project. They added administrators to this building because the district had two major building needs. One is for an early childhood center, now at Haven School and it is critical that the children be moved out of that building. The district needs to do something about the administration building at 1314 Ridge Avenue, which is falling apart. The board wanted to meld these needs together to get the most economic use of district dollars and it is economics that put administrators with the early childhood educational center. If they cannot put administrators in this building, she could not predict the scenario; thought they would have to deal with 1314 Ridge and probably there was no chance that property would go back on the tax rolls. They would be in a position of renovating a building, spending millions and still have a building that is not efficient for a modern office. She asked them to keep those issues in mind; stated the board respects the neighbors on McDaniel.

Ben Jackson, 2417 Lake St., stated both prior speakers spoke about the school and no one has dealt with the sidewalks, traffic, alley or parkways in the neighborhood. Senior citizens, children and everybody that goes to this school is in jeopardy for their life by speeding cars. He referred to the plan drawn up by a traffic engineer, which he had passed out. He said traffic was not mentioned. He asked how District 65 could do a traffic count and not even leave the building? He stated if the amendment passed, the neighbors would have to take out an injunction, go to the federal courts and have an investigation as to why this is being put in their neighborhood.

Tana McDonald, 1330 South Blvd., was struck by two things as she re-read testimony before the Planning & Development Committee: that proponents say traffic won't be a problem and that this new building might improve traffic because defects would be corrected. The area is already an educational district and has adapted to the by-products that come from modern educational activity. More traffic in a densely populated area with limited roadways to circulate it impacts adversely on people living, working and going to school there. According to Wendell Cox, Senior Fellow in Urban Policy at Independence Institute in Colorado, air pollution rises as urban automobile speeds decline. She noted this would be a slow traffic area and stop/start operations would increase. The result is greater air pollution. The problem of so-called "smart growth" policies, where districts and developments are created away from downtown centers, is it forces more cars and traffic into smaller areas. According to the EPA, although hazardous air pollution emissions from automobiles has declined due to tailpipe and evaporative emission standards, the improvements from emissions controls for cars have been eroded by the fact that more people drive more miles each year and the number of cars in urban areas keeps increasing. Carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide, sulfur dioxide, benzene (a carcinogen), formaldehyde, polycyclic hydrocarbons and lead are the emissions that go up in the air. Studies have shown repeated exposure to this kind of pollution impacts the health system of humans. The most obvious impact is on the respiratory system. It is estimated that air pollution, of which vehicle emissions are the biggest contributor, is responsible for thousands of premature deaths annually. A 1999 Dutch study found that

children's respiratory disorders worsened as air pollution increased. She noted Schaumburg had dealt with the problem of re-zoning and traffic. She passed out material that indicated 54% of air pollution cancer is from vehicle emissions. Illinois is considered one of the ten worst states for air hazard emissions.

Betty Ester, 2100 Lake St., stated that it was clear that the district decided in 1999 to build this building on the south side of King Lab School. She read from a document published by the district, "The \$27.5 million bond issue is designed to keep the lid on taxes for increasing the investment of our children's future. New bonds will be issued to replace bonds that are being retired. The refinancing process would extend the period of bond indebtedness without increasing the annual cost to taxpayers." She said that was the only thing the district said that was true. The district signed the bond for this referendum in December 1999 and at that point the rate was 00.47, which was down 1%. The district did not tell the public that the bonds issued in 1992, 1994 and 1997 are part of this extension. The 1992 bond cannot be retired, is supposed to be retired in 2005 and has a \$6 million balance. If that is not paid off in 2005, that bond has to be extended. Tonight a gentleman stated \$6 million was added. She asked is the cost now \$31.5 million or \$27.5 million or is this the \$6 million from the 1992 bond issue? These are questions that taxpayers need to ask. She gave figures on tax bills; stated that citizens pay high taxes and that information given out was not clear.

Terri Shepard, 150 Barton Ave., past District 65 board member, served on the board that began researching sites and the feasibility of combining the administration and early childhood facilities. She and Don Tarkington chaired the referendum committee. A member of the NAACP Education Committee, the chair Judith Treadway, spoke to the P&D Committee in support of the combined facility at the proposed location. Ms. Shepard was chair of the YMCA Committee to explore childcare needs in Southeast Evanston. Her purpose in speaking was to challenge the assertion that the choice of location was racist in intent. This was not true. She said everybody wanted a building the community could be proud of, yet not be a burden to taxpayers. They explored the Builder's Square facility (chemical cleanup was prohibitive, plus it would have to be purchased), Foster School would cost nearly as much to upgrade as to build a new building and is too small; Dominick's on Chicago Avenue would have to be purchased; no space at ETHS or property owned by District 202. The citizen who charged racism suggested placing this facility at Lincolnwood School, where there is no space. She urged Council to disregard the charge of racism and vote for the zoning change, based on its merits and the needs of the Evanston/Skokie community.

Sue Carlson, 2679 Stewart Ave., represented the Evanston Interreligious Sustainability Circle and Public Transportation Committee. Their group represents 14 congregations and is working toward reduced automobile emissions in Evanston; where quality-of-life issues feature green space in active community life rather than the number of parking spaces and citizens can participate in civic life without the necessity of owning an automobile. She stated putting the administration and early childhood center at this site is poor planning from a community life and environmental view. She pointed out by removing the administration from this site, staff could be more centrally located and thereby make fewer or no automobile trips to meet their business, shopping and restaurant needs. If located near public transit, citizens needing to do business with District 65 could do so without using an automobile. The congestion and air pollution on local streets could be reduced by 75-95 auto trips per day. A smaller parking lot at the site might save the soccer field. The costs of bio filtrating and storing polluted water from the parking lot would be reduced. If this were a federal project spending \$27 million, by law, the above environmental concerns, air and water pollution, effect upon the community and loss of parkland would have to have been considered in detail. Yet, in an area where residents are complaining about air pollution caused by heavy traffic and idling cars, they are unaware of any air pollution studies done as part of the board's planning process. They have heard of traffic studies, but no studies on what increased bus and automobile traffic would do to air quality in the area. The MWRD requires that no pollutants be discharged into the Sanitary Channel. Runoff from the 165-car parking lot requires an underground piping system to store the water. The gasoline, oil and other pollutants from that lot must be cleaned up using some bio-filtration method. As of February 14, 2001 the design of such a system was not in place. One of the main reasons given for putting these two facilities together is cost savings, but nobody has heard what the cost of cleaning up the parking lot will be.

Ann Blythe, 1513 McDaniel Ave., said neighborhood residents do not believe this zoning amendment will benefit this area. She asked a Realtor from Prairie Shore Properties for an appraisal of her home now and a projected appraisal when the open space is built on. The agent told her that her home would be devalued from 10-15% if the facility is built and she would incur a potential loss of \$30-40,000. Taking into account 12 residences on McDaniel between Davis and Grove, the financial loss would be \$300-500,000. She asked Council if this financial setback would be acceptable to constituents in their wards?

Rose Cannon, 745 Brummel St., represented the Martin Luther King Neighborhood Association, the Respect our Community Coalition and is secretary to the NAACP in Evanston. She termed this an economic and civil rights issue and asked Council to vote "no" on District 65's request to allow the combined administration/early childhood center. She asked Council, by changing the Zoning Ordinance, did they mean to give District 65 the power to put an administrative structure on any district property? If this passes, District 65 could change their minds and put the administrative facility at any educational facility in Evanston and did they realize how much authority this gives to the district? She said the district has a responsibility to citizens and they have entrusted the education of their children with them. They need to be accountable to somebody. The change in this ordinance would mean that even the City would no longer be able to control where the district wants to build or change. District 65 told residents that this change in the Zoning Ordinance and the building would have no adverse effect on the taxes of residents. A bond issue was supposed to be retired fairly soon, which would have given taxpayers some tax relief. However, as the result of this \$27.5 million project, this bond issue will be extended a number of years. While true that tax bills won't change, they won't go down. She thought taxpayers were duped by this and would've liked to know the tax implications of the referendum.

Nancy Brown, 1501 McDaniel Ave., said Evanston is the home of Northwestern University and asked if they are paying their fair share? Evanston is a Tree City USA and how will this be paid for? Evanston is suburban, known as the bedroom of Chicago with its Talmadge lights and has been a sleepy city. She said it was time for City Council to wake up. Their vote will determine the direction of Evanston as a business. This issue is not about school but about big business. A \$27.5 million referendum was passed about which many voters knew little. Northwestern University is a part of this and major part of the big picture. The architect for District 65 gave a presentation to neighbors saying they were excited about this project. The project NU has an interest in is Project Excite. It was presented to the neighbors as excite/administration offices and that it was going to happen whether neighbors liked it or not. District 65's big business attorney from Bell, Boyd & Lloyd said at the zoning meeting that it was appropriate to have a business office in this building because most schools have a business office in their building. A "yes" vote will say that traffic and safety are not an issue and that they don't care how peace of mind and property values are affected. The board has not spent the time that neighbors have over a lifetime of caring for their homes.

Carl Bova, 1322 Rosalie St., spoke on behalf of the Evanston Region, American Youth Soccer Organization, which was concerned about elimination of open space as proposed. The damage will be loss of one soccer field where upwards of 200 children play Sundays and used for recreation by neighbors. AYSO recognizes the need to have an early childhood center and a new administration center. They do not agree that the open space be sacrificed for the development of 165 parking spaces as in the current configuration. AYSO does not believe the large parking area is an appropriate use of this open space. A more thoughtful and functionally more useful approach is feasible and he offered the following suggestions: If they assume half of the soccer fields are remaining after building this facility, it is logical to assume a more conservative footprint of the building would save space, perhaps 10%. Further assuming an average parking stall occupies 30 square yards and the lost area of the soccer field is about 2,250 square yards, the number of stalls equivalent to half of a soccer field is approximately 75. Relocation of 75 parking spaces is appropriate for preservation for that part of open space. This would be a superior arrangement for King Lab School if those spaces could be located to the south of King Lab. A greater number of spaces would be available to King Lab users, especially for special events. The looping roads and drives may be reduced as well, especially if drop-off areas could be combined and parking drives and smaller one-way drives are used. Shorter rather than longer drives may be designed also. AYSO supports this type of development. He asked support for a revised proposed development plan that facilitates the retention of more open space.

Marla Israel, District 65, director, Early Childhood Center at Haven School said the issue is narrow and about zoning and not about whether the district could build an educational facility on this land. It was not about politics or business but about children. It is whether this site can accommodate a second floor use. The first floor use is permitted on that site and they are asking for a zoning variance to move ahead so the children can have an inclusive and appropriate early childhood center.

Peggy Tarr, 907 Sherman Ave., held up a brochure (not sent to everyone) that included information about building on District 65 property adjacent to King Lab School. In reference to racism, she said when people talk about "community" they would like to think that they are talking about a community that includes everyone. Unfortunately there are some community members who feel some people are disposable. She pointed out there was a choice of looking at land at Lincolnwood School and this site. The residents around King Lab are people of color and working

class. In the transcript of the February 14 meeting, Judith Treadway identifies herself, not as a member of the NAACP Education Committee, but as having been a member of the referendum committee. She pointed out a difference in Family Focus – Our Place in the old Foster School and District 65 Family Focus Center on Dempster. Delores Holmes would accommodate as many people at Family Focus (Foster School) as possible but never has said that should be considered “the” place for early childhood education. District 65 had an early childhood center at Miller School in 1976, then sold the property. The center has been moved and there were concerns about putting it at Haven because of the junior high kids. She believed that the district is focusing more on administration. Ms. Tarr alleged the concern is not so much for early childhood as it is using those students to get new administration offices.

Karl Gromelski, 2727 Broadway Ave., did not want to talk about whether District 65 could build a school at the McDaniel site because they can. He theorized that residents want a building with an administration/childcare, because all know they voted “yes” in the referendum. The question before them was -- is this right for Evanston? They needed to ask if the school board has Evanston’s best interest at heart with this proposed site. He did not think they did. He stated the district has repeatedly shown they don’t care about residents. One example was when the district wanted to pave over green space by Orrington School for a parking lot. Where are the impact studies for this proposed site? He asked Alderman Newman, how is District 65’s desire to build at this site any different than Northwestern University expanding across Sheridan Road? To Council members who believe in “fair share” he asked why does Evanston have to give up limited green space, when District 65 also includes Skokie? How is Skokie contributing their “fair share” to the educational needs of children? He stated this proposed site is wrong for this neighborhood, the children and for Evanston. He asked them to learn from the cube of bricks they have to live with on Chicago Avenue and Central Street and Central Park Avenue. Once the bricks have been laid, there is no turning back. Just because an organization is following the letter of the zoning law does mean they are following the spirit of the law. The District has a great site at Dempster/Ridge – an ideal location next to two major arterial streets. Throughout the evening he heard how District 65 wants this building here. It is not that they have to have it here but a wish. The issue before them is not really a zoning issue or legal matter. It is a moral issue. They must ask, is this the right decision for Evanston? He urged them to send a message to District 65 and say “yes” the building is wanted, but they have not done their homework. He asked Council to listen to taxpayers and citizens and vote “no.”

Sid Zwick, 1720 Washington St., stated he had already spoken about residual racism. He said a serious flaw that is a basic premise of this whole project, is that it is desirable to bring all early childhood centers together in one location. He asked Ms. Israel if she proposed setting up a central first grade/early childhood center, second grade/early childhood center, etc. He said it is ridiculous to bring all pre-school programs together in one place which will require more bussing instead of leaving them de-centralized as they are now where it is convenient for parents who can come to the school without going across town. He saw that as its greatest flaw. He suggested perhaps it would be convenient for Ms. Israel to have a central intake center where she could administer all programs around the city but that does not require a new building and could be done quickly in a section of the Family Focus building (Foster School). The second flaw is where does the district put the administration staff if they do not build this building? He suggested District 65 stay where they are until the school districts are combined which would eliminate duplicate positions, especially two costly superintendents. Alderman Drummer who suggested looking at the other side of the canal to see how Skokie is beautifying their side while Evanston is destroying their side by building, another flaw of this project. They should think of the canal, not as a drainage ditch, but as a river flowing through the town, whose banks could be beautified with increased recreational opportunities and not destroyed. He pointed out the wide gap in economic diversity of Evanston residents and that different people look at things differently.

Alderman Kent announced that he would abstain from voting because he is employed by District 65.

Ordinance 24-O-01 – Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment – Consideration of proposed Ordinance 24-O-01, introduced March 12, 2001, by which City Council would approve the recommendation of the Plan Commission to amend Chapter 18 “Definitions” of the Zoning Ordinance to be explicit in including within the definition the offices and support facilities of a public school district when these are on a zoning lot substantially used for classrooms. A vote of six (6) aldermen is required for approval.

Alderman Wynne moved approval of Ordinance 24-O-01. Seconded by Alderman Engelman.

Alderman Drummer asked to speak beyond the allotted five minutes. Alderman Moran moved to permit Alderman Drummer to speak beyond that time limitation. Seconded by Alderman Bernstein. Motion carried. No nays.

Alderman Drummer asked all who had concerns about this building to stand. Many people stood. He commended District 65 for trying to address all the issues relevant to the project and the neighbors for their fine work. He said it was time to vote and put the issue behind them; argued that the 2nd Ward has carried the burden for the entire City and it was possible that many do not realize that this is a citywide zoning issue. It is not site specific to the 2nd Ward and involves every district in the City where there is a school. He had passed out a memorandum showing schools in each ward and zoning classification. Alderman Drummer confirmed with Community Development Director Jim Wolinski, that this ordinance is citywide because it changes the definition so it would affect every district with a public school. Alderman Drummer confirmed that administrative buildings could be built in any district at any time and maintenance vehicles could be parked there as well. Mr. Wolinski agreed, but said the question of maintenance vehicles had not come up and was not examined. Alderman Drummer stated that neighbors on McDaniel want to know what will happen regarding truck traffic. Assistant Corporation Counsel Ellen Szymanski asked if he was speaking about a car barn? Alderman Drummer's reference was to any equipment that goes with administration. Ms. Szymanski stated the text amendment authorizes office space and does not authorize vehicle maintenance or storage facilities. The new language says, "a facility owned by a public school district containing classrooms, libraries, offices or similar support facilities." Alderman Drummer clarified that the district cannot place maintenance vehicles at such a site. Ms. Szymanski stated they cannot repair or store vehicles. Alderman Drummer noted that District 65 has maintenance vehicles at 1314 Ridge Avenue, which is an issue with neighbors.

Alderman Newman confirmed that the amendment to the zoning ordinance must be passed by Council and signed by the Mayor and asked if subject to a Mayoral veto when would that have to occur? Ms. Szymanski stated at the next Council meeting.

Alderman Drummer noted 2nd Ward residents were notified of the proposed amendment and asked if notice was sent to residents in other zoning districts that would be affected? No. Was that required? No. Alderman Drummer asked why 2nd Ward residents were given notice and no one else? Mr. Wolinski stated because the plan was site specific for the canal bank land. Alderman Drummer pointed out that once this is passed, tomorrow morning the district could change its mind on where to put the administration facility and possibly affect everybody. Mr. Wolinski stated it could affect any place within a certain distance of a public school. Alderman Drummer said District 65 could put the administration facility, say, at Willard School. Mr. Wolinski acknowledged from a zoning standpoint they could do that. Alderman Drummer noted that citizens would wake up and ask how they got zoned into this. Mr. Wolinski pointed out that when a definition is changed in the text of the ordinance, it affects all uses of that type. Alderman Drummer was correct about the impact on the entire community. Alderman Drummer understood that this amendment would permit District 65 to put administrative facilities in any district including R1-R7 and open space. Ms. Szymanski referred to a chart in the back of the Zoning Ordinance which lists where public educational institutions are allowed: R1 through R6, B1 through B3, C1, C1a, C2, D1 through D4, MU and MUE. Alderman Drummer's concern was about districts that have public educational institutions now. These by right are not allowed in any R1 or R2, except would be allowed now by the district. Alderman Drummer stated that no one other than the school district could go into an R1 and build an administrative building. Today an administrative building is not a permitted use in an R1 district. Mr. Wolinski stated that Alderman Drummer was correct. Alderman Drummer asked would it not be an advantage to the School District to be able to put an administrative building in an R1 district? Yes. Alderman Drummer stated if it is an advantage for District 65 it would seem they were regulating the use and who the user is. Ms. Szymanski stated the zoning law regulates the property, not the incumbent use. The law can regulate the use, not the user. In this case they have regulated the use in R1 to say that the administrative offices can be placed in an R1, but only by District 65. Alderman Drummer asked the difference between an administrative building owned by the school district and an administrative building owned by the Rotary Club? Ms. Szymanski stated that distinction has been before Council and it is a question of how one distinguishes the impact that a particular use such as - how is that different from an insurance management company. That distinction is very difficult to make. Alderman Drummer pointed out the school district will have an unfair advantage over all over entities in town. Ms. Szymanski could not say that it was an "unfair advantage," but would have an advantage because their use is permitted and they need not come before Council for a special use.

Alderman Drummer stated his neighborhood had been put at a tremendous disadvantage on this because they have to bear the brunt of the proposed use, had to sort through the zoning issue. He thought if the rest of the citizens knew

what was happening and were allowed the opportunity to understand this, this room would have ten times as many people present. He did not know what the reaction would be the next day when people really understand what is going on but did not think residents realized this issue affects not just the 2nd Ward but the entire City into the future. In the future the district can say they need another administrative building, build it and nobody will have anything to say about it. Somebody, sometime thought about this long and hard. He does not see how they can, in a few minutes, decide to have an administrative building in R1 districts when the City's zoning ordinance for the last 40 years has prohibited it. How has this changed all of a sudden and become so acceptable? The 1993 Zoning Ordinance laid it out that there could not be mixed uses here. Now they are making a change. Something is wrong. He thought it was not fair. Everybody had talked about open space. Where he came from it was taken for granted. They are crowding onto this is a small patch of land. In the future, children would need open space.

Roll call. Voting aye – Newman, Wynne, Bernstein, Moran, Engelman, Feldman. Voting nay – Drummer, Rainey. Motion carried (6-2-1). Alderman Kent abstained because he is a District 65 employee.

Ordinance 34-O-01 – Special Use for 1900 Dempster Street – Consideration of proposed Ordinance 34-O-01 approving a recommendation of the ZBA to grant a special use application for two Type 2 restaurants each with drive-through facility.

City Manager Crum reported this item was held for further work at the request of the developer.

Alderman Wynne moved that Council convene into Closed Session as authorized by Illinois Compiled Statutes, Paragraph 5, Sections 120/2 C (11).

(11) Litigation, when an action against, affecting or on behalf of the particular public body has been filed and is pending before a court or administrative tribunal, or when the public body finds that an action is probable or imminent, in which case the basis for the finding shall be recorded and entered into the minutes of the closing meeting.

Seconded by Alderman Engelman.

Roll call. Voting aye – Newman, Drummer, Wynne, Bernstein, Moran, Engelman, Rainey, Feldman. Voting nay – none. Motion carried (8-0).

At 8:22 p.m. the Council convened into Closed Session and reconvened into Open Session at 8:42 p.m.

Alderman Moran moved approval of Contract Amendment No. 2 with Harza Engineering for engineering construction services for Phase VI, Contract A of the City's Relief Sewer Project extending the contract duration and increasing compensation ceiling by a total of \$346,289. Seconded by Alderman Drummer.

Roll call. Voting aye – Newman, Drummer, Wynne, Bernstein, Kent, Moran, Engelman, Rainey, Feldman. Voting nay – none. Motion carried. (9-0)

There being no further business to come before Council, Mayor Morton adjourned the meeting at 8:50 p.m.

Mary P. Morris,
City Clerk

A videotape recording of this meeting has been made part of the permanent record and is available in the City Clerk's office.