

**CITY COUNCIL**

May 15, 2006

**ROLL CALL - PRESENT:**

.	Alderman Tisdahl	Alderman Wynne
.	Alderman Rainey	Alderman Bernstein
A quorum was present	Alderman Wollin	Alderman Holmes
		Alderman Moran

**ABSENT:** Aldermen Hansen, Jean-Baptiste

**PRESIDING:** Mayor Lorraine H. Morton

A SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL meeting was called to order by Mayor Morton on Monday, May 15, 2006, at 6:20 p.m. in the Council Chamber for the purpose having a presentation on the 2006-07 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) and a report of findings and recommendations for the City's Development Review Process.

**Citizen Comment**

Mark Metz, 2125 Sherman Ave., Parks & Recreation Board member, outlined three items the board thinks are vitally important for the CIP. (1) Currently the department maintains 76 neighborhood parks, 54 of which have playgrounds and/or other substantial features that need to be refurbished on a regular basis. The remaining 22 parks require maintenance of a more passive nature such as mowing the grass, painting benches, but have no major recreation facilities. Since 1998, 23 of the 54 parks with facilities have had substantial work done with 4 additional sites under construction this spring. This equates to about three parks per year (27 over the last 9 years), which puts the City on an 18-year cycle to redo each park. Replacing equipment as it wears out or falls out of compliance is necessary to keep neighborhood parks active and in good order. Well appointed and well maintained parks are important to keep neighborhoods vibrant and desirable. The board believes a 12 or 13-year cycle for replacement/renovation of park facilities is a more appropriate cycle than 18 years. To achieve this, they need to begin to schedule a minimum of four neighborhood park projects per year. (2) The board is pleased that a consultant was hired to start work on a master plan for the City's lakefront. It would include redesign of the pathways and beach entrances, replacement of old restrooms, park buildings and lighting systems. All environmental issues would be addressed as well. (3) Some time ago, City Council asked the board to hire a consultant to develop concepts for the renovation/replacement of Robert Crown Center. Public meetings were held to assess community needs with regard to Crown facilities. Parks & Recreation staff developed concepts for renovation or replacement, but the project was put on hold pending the resolution of legal actions against the City. The board understood that those cases remain unresolved and thought it's time to address the needs of the community with respect to indoor recreation facilities. Times have changed since Evanston built its last indoor facility. Participation in sports and fitness is on the rise and demand for state-of-the art facilities is great. The board believes that Evanston is not where it should be to meet those demands for its residents. It will consider a series of public meetings and, perhaps a survey, to help qualify and quantify the needs for indoor recreation facilities. He noted that Crown Center is only part of the solution and decisions on Crown should be part of an over-all strategy to improve indoor facilities. The board looked forward to working with Council to provide facilities that are at least on par with those of neighboring communities.

Lyn Delli Quadri, 2321 Thayer St., co-chair of the Public Art Committee, noted it was established in 1991 as a standing committee of the Arts Council. The committee's mission is to encourage the creative vitality of this city. The ordinance that set up the committee recognized that public art can enhance the City's reputation, economy and public pride. She reported that Evanston now has more than 100 works of art in the public sphere. In the past year, the committee began to inventory these community assets, assess their value and seek expert advice on their maintenance. She stated that the committee has commissioned some art works and those funds come from the City's Percent-for-Public Art Program. It provides up to one percent of every City of Evanston building project valued at more than \$1 million dollars. Using these funds, the committee is now reviewing proposals from 114 artists for the plaza in front of the Sherman Avenue project.

Gerry Macsai, 1501 Hinman Ave., co-chair of the Public Art Committee, cited some examples of how art could improve the community: a bike path where the benches, water fountains and even trash containers are pieces of art. A wall that a neighborhood has always seen as dull or an eyesore has become a town mural done by that neighborhood group working

with a good artist. She suggested that Deborah Butterfield's wonderful horse sculpture (Oldberg Park) could have company with other quality artwork in a mini sculpture park. Perhaps a neighborhood business district could get together with an artist to design and install wonderful bike racks and kiosks. She stated that art can make it happen, art can unify and it can make a statement about the creative core and character of a city and each of its communities. She pointed out that this is the direction that public art is taking nationally—art for every aspect of city life. She referred to photographs in the Public Art Future folder (distributed to City Council) and said they were examples of what can be done with public art and was sponsored by the Chicago Public Art Group, which is a non-profit, non-affiliated group. She asked that Council extend for Evanston what many communities have done—set aside one percent of CIP funds annually in a Public Art Fund. Whenever possible, the committee will ask the community to raise a portion of funds required for a specific project. She noted that they are not talking about art that is expensive; the ones in the packet range from \$5,000-\$20,000. If art is everywhere, it need not be costly. It must be good and represent what each neighborhood respects.

Lois Roewade, 933 Maple Ave., represented the Evanston Arts Council, pointed out that Evanston is “out there” in its way of thinking, new ideas, innovative programming and attention to issues that affect the quality of life in our communities. She remarked, when it comes to community art in neighborhoods, Evanston was not in the game yet and she thought it needs to be. She agreed with Gerry Macsai that allocating one percent of CIP funds for Public Art was necessary. She noted that Evanston could put its own “spin” on it with the wealth of creativity and diversity here, not only in people, but also in artistic vision and ideas. City spaces could be adorned with everything from traditional cultural art to the most contemporary thinking in art circles today. She reiterated that their purpose that evening was for Council to please consider putting in “A Percent for Public Art” when approving the Capital Improvement Plan.

### **Capital Improvement Program**

City Manager Julia Carroll announced that Management & Budget Director Pat Casey would present the CIP for 2006-2007 and that a few policy questions would be discussed at the end.

Mr. Casey stated that this was the first Capital Improvement Plan (2006-07) under the new schedule. He would review each of the proposed projects briefly and invited Council to ask questions. They would approve the first year of the plan in the next few weeks, along with the remaining four years of the plan that are basically policy direction.

The PowerPoint® presentation of the 2006-07 CIP was divided into these eight sections:

Environment	Public Buildings
Information Technology	Parks & Recreation
Economic Development	Transportation
Other Improvements	Police Needs

Mayor Morton asked if there was a large amount of money in the Water Fund. Assistant Superintendent Administration/Water Regina Lookis responded that the Water Fund has reserves of about \$10 million.

Alderman Rainey stated that her question was not about the CIP, it related to the City's software and online capabilities and interaction with the community. She said that many residents have signed up to pay water bill electronically and noted the reason was to eliminate paper. She wanted to know why, after paying a water bill online, a paper invoice is received in the mail and termed it “a waste of money.” Ms. Lookis responded that there is a box to check online to stop receiving paper invoices. Alderman Rainey suggested that they send confirmation emails rather than mail notices.

Alderman Rainey noted that there are streetscapes all over town. She asked, once the work on the streetscape is done, did the City include in the Capital Plan funds for the maintenance of those streetscapes? Mr. Casey responded that maintenance was not included in the CIP. Streetscape maintenance would be handled by Public Works or, if there is a special service district, it would be handled there. He reported it is typically a small amount and put in the operating budget of whichever entity does the maintenance.

Alderman Holmes commented that most of the projects for Fleetwood-Jourdain were listed to be funded by Community

Development Block Grants (CDBG) and asked why? Mr. Casey replied it is up to the department that requests the funds to determine the best funding sources. He stated that the facility is located in a good place to qualify for CDBG funds. Alderman Holmes stated she was concerned because those funds are not a given and a lot of projects come before CDBG. She pointed out that people in CDBG area pay taxes like everyone else and other funding sources should be considered.

Alderman Tisdahl expressed thanks to the family who will donate funds to help create Evanston's first Special Needs Playground at Lawson Park (Sheridan Rd/Clinton Pl).

Mayor Morton acknowledged that the Parks/Forestry & Recreation Department has gotten a lot of grants over the years and she thought it was commendable and good for the City. She asked if other departments seek grants as aggressively as Recreation did. Ms. Carroll responded that the Public Works Department seeks federal and state funds for street projects. Last week the City was awarded a \$7,800 grant for traffic sign LED lighting, which lasts about 15 years in contrast to 2 years for the bulbs. She pointed out that they look at everything from \$7-8,000 grants up to \$1 million grants. Ms. Carroll reported that Police, Fire and Health departments have gotten grants in past year as well.

Alderman Rainey asked for clarification regarding brick repair in the TIF fund. Mr. Casey stated that they had asked for \$50,000 to re-set or replace bricks in the downtown. Alderman Rainey said the bricks are part of the streetscape and noted that there is the same problem on Howard St. with bricks collapsing. When walking on the concrete surface, because of unevenness, people could fall and break their ankle. She reiterated an earlier inquiry about funds for streetscape repair being in the CIP. Mr. Casey pointed out that funds for the downtown streetscape were from the TIF. Alderman Rainey stated that streetscape updating and repair ought to be included in the CIP, noting that it is a major investment in the City's infrastructure. Alderman Wollin said that it adds to the City's liability and noted that her elderly constituents complain about the unevenness. Mr. Casey said they would work on a solution.

Alderman Tisdahl asked if they had determined bird screening under viaducts works before the contract expires. Assistant to the City Manager Vincent Jones responded that Public Works had checked the viaducts between Central and Simpson streets and would check those in the 7<sup>th</sup> Ward. Alderman Tisdahl offered to give a tour of her ward.

Mr. Casey summarized the Capital Improvement Program projects and funding and stated they hoped to get it passed in May or early June. The City needed to begin the planning stages for these projects and be ready to get bids in December or January.

Alderman Rainey stated it should be on the June 12 agenda, as there was not enough time to debate and discuss this as a committee on May 22. She thought a special meeting was needed. Ms. Carroll agreed that they needed to spend more time on the CIP and noted there were some important policy issues that need to be debated. She asked if Council wanted to schedule another meeting. Alderman Wynne agreed that they need to have a separate meeting. Alderman Rainey thought they needed to consult with Alderman Hansen, who chairs the Administration & Public Works Committee before they set a date for a special meeting.

Alderman Wollin asked if it needed to be another special meeting of the whole City Council as opposed to just the A&PW Committee. She also wanted to know if they would deal with the proposal from the Public Art Committee, which would certainly have an impact on the CIP. Alderman Rainey stated that Capital Improvements, for the last 20 years, has always come out of A&PW with the final decision made by the full Council. There was further discussion about where the CIP would be discussed.

Alderman Wynne wanted to see some analysis of the suggestion from the arts community about the one-percent for public art and at reducing the park renovation cycle. She wanted to know the City cost to renovate four parks per year.

Alderman Rainey wanted an analysis of the street resurfacing program with a comparison of this year's method of funding to the last five years--include GO bonds versus Motor Fuel Tax and the percentage of each and the amount. Alderman Moran referred to the packet they had received and the section on page 11, "Objectives & Priorities," he wanted someone to explain how those had been established. Had it been done this year? Mr. Casey responded that the

last time there was a Budget Policy Committee (about four years ago) this was passed as part of the committee's work. Alderman Moran called attention to page 12, "give priority to projects that further the objectives of the *Comprehensive General Plan*." He said it would be helpful to see how the budget preparation and implementation is related to the *Comprehensive General Plan*. Alderman Moran thought that having funds earmarked in relation to the objectives of the *CGP* could help with the implementation of the Strategic Plan as well. He cited on page 14, "plan and implement expanded public parking inventory." He saw nothing in the Capital Improvement Plan that addressed the issue and pointed out that in the tabulation of website hits, parking was far and away the leader. He felt that parking was an issue that dominated many people's thinking and that the CIP should not be approved without addressing it. The item below that was, "improve Evanston's remaining unpaved streets and alleys," which he was pleased to see. However, the alley grading program was a source of frustration to him and many constituents and he termed it a "colossal waste of money." He hoped to find creative ways to get more alleys paved.

Alderman Rainey claimed there is a project in a neighborhood where the developer did not meet the parking needs by more than 50 percent. She was unsure that taxpayers should spend large amounts of GO Bonds on parking studies in neighborhoods where developers are not required to meet the legal requirements of the Zoning Ordinance for parking.

Mayor Morton asked the City Manager to bring back to the Council some ideas about the land where the Recycling Center is located. She noted there is quite a bit of land and perhaps the City could sell it or do something else with it. Mayor Morton stated that she looks at the statistics in the Fire Department's reports and noticed that the largest number of calls are for ambulance service. She asked Chief Berkowsky about creative thinking on how seniors in the community could be better served because there is so much demand for ambulance service. Chief Berkowsky responded that they get about 63% ambulance calls or 5,000 per year. He said that six months ago the Administration & Public Works Committee gave permission for a consultant's study, which is due shortly, that would give an overview of the department with a number of recommendations to provide vision and focus for the next decade.

Alderman Rainey pointed out that there are four subsidized senior housing buildings in town—Noyes Court, Primm Towers, Jacob Blake and 1900 Sherman—does Property Standards conduct code compliance inspections in those buildings? Community Development Director James Wolinski responded that they do. They are inspected for compliance with the Property Standards Code and are on a three-to-four year cycle (for inspections). Mr. Wolinski pointed out that if there are complaints, inspectors will make a visit.

Alderman Wollin spoke of issues at those buildings, such as painted electrical outlets and outlets over sinks. She stated they worked with the Cook County Housing Authority to get those things corrected.

At 7:55 p.m. Council recessed for 15 minutes.

### **Development Review Process Study Results**

The meeting resumed at 8:05 p.m.

City Manager Carroll stated they would hear the results of a study that took several months and the consultants had prepared a very thorough analysis. She introduced Michael Ley, partner with Virchow Krause.

Mr. Ley acknowledged that Christine Smith was the project manager for the report before them that evening. They would spend about 20-30 minutes on the study's high spots, and then take questions from the Council.

#### **Issues Facing Evanston**

- Less than desired public/stakeholder perception of planning and development process
- Potential link between perception and community development realization
- Wasted time responding to unverified or non-priority issues
- Lack of clarity regarding expectations and performance measures
- Departments "work hard" to collaborate and coordinate linked development, regulation and land use planning activities

*A Vision for Evanston Development Review*

- Clear understanding of customer concerns and verification of specific processes/problems to be addressed
- Elimination of gap between current process/approach and best practices (e.g. workflow, staffing levels, service delivery model, use of technology, accountabilities)
- Improvement in the level of responsiveness to all customer types
- Clear articulation of department and individual performance expectations
- Improved public perception of the process

*Our Vision for Evanston Development Review*

- Improved responsiveness
- Lower service delivery costs
- Enhanced political position

*Study Objectives*

1. Recommend improvements related to the efficiency of the development review process
2. Recommend enhancements to customer responsiveness
3. Develop a framework for evaluation of City performance relative to the effectiveness of the development review process
4. Provide an implementation plan for use in executing governance, process or system changes

At this point Christine Smith took over the presentation.

*Project Approach/Methodology*

- Understanding of City of Evanston's situation (reviewed budget, Zoning Ordinance, *Comprehensive General Plan*, website, forms)
- Extensive staff interviews (29 conducted)
- Comprehensive input from various stakeholder groups
  - Survey (195 responses)
  - Interviews/Focus Groups (22 external stakeholders)
  - Interviews (nine Council member and Mayor)
- Process mapping sessions
- Comparison to best practices (industry based)
- Comparison to other Illinois municipalities
- Assessment of key supports and tools

*Key Considerations*

- New construction has a substantial impact on the City's economy – average of more than \$100 million/year
- Evanston is currently experiencing a “high growth” period and is a “desirable” environment for developers
- The efficiency and effectiveness of the City's development review process has a significant impact on the City's ability to manage this growth in a manner that protects City standards and public expectations

*Key Recommendations*

- Create a development vision
  - Focus Council's role on achieving that vision
  - Balance need for public input with expertise/direction provided by staff and advisory bodies
- Capitalize on investment in staff technical expertise
- Realign the public input process to be cumulative rather than redundant
  - Eliminate overlapping responsibilities of advisory and approval bodies
  - Ensure Plan Commission role is intentional

Consistently apply rules to public testimony  
 Determine the appropriate role for the Planning & Development Committee

- Effectively use technology
  - Key monitoring information
  - Reduce paper/manual processing
  - Customer self-help
- Adopt a more proactive and coordinated approach to development
  - Clearly defined vision
  - Neighborhood plans
  - Seamless City-wide response
  - Ensure that process expectations and standards are clearly defined and articulated for all stakeholders
- Ensure continued feedback from stakeholders relative to processes is received and reviewed
- Agree to an implementation plan and execute it

<b>Key Steps to Ensure Success in Implementation of Study Results</b>	
<u>Administration Role</u>	<u>Council Role</u>
Ensure Department engagement for implementing solutions	Assist administration to prioritize efforts
Prioritize improvement initiatives and assign a Champion	Provide necessary resources
Create key performance metrics and hold staff accountable	Consider and “respect” intended role of staff and advisory bodies
Recommend necessary resource (i.e. system, staff, training) needs	Hold department accountable to report on implementation progress
Proactive/ongoing discussion with key stakeholders	Ongoing discussion with constituents relative to big picture and not individual projects

Alderman Rainey asked them to elaborate on the role of the Planning & Development Committee. She thought the report implied that the plan/design review process is nearly completed by the time it gets to Council and that they should “rubber stamp” the project and move on. Alderman Rainey felt that P&D was one of the most critical steps in the process, all nine aldermen serve on that committee, and she felt each member’s input was extremely important. Mr. Ley responded that staff ought to be clear and speak up to help Council with the decision-making process. He gave the example of staff clarifying issues, such as a project meets this criterion, but doesn’t meet that criterion. Alderman Rainey agreed that this would be helpful.

Alderman Wynne stated that this was one of the best-written consultant reports she had ever read. She agreed with Alderman Rainey regarding the role of Planning & Development, has served on it for nine years, and noted that there are questions the Plan Commission does not consider within its jurisdictional scope to ask about that Council raises when it comes before them. She reiterated that the role of P&D is critically important to the development process.

Alderman Wynne felt that many of the issues with developers and the community comes from the fact that the Zoning Ordinance does not reflect what residents’ view development should be in Evanston. She noted that developers read the Zoning Ordinance and don’t understand why there is so much flak when they arrive in Evanston, while citizens read the ZO and find it is not in tune with what they would like. Alderman Wynne thought the Zoning Ordinance needs to be rewritten and have a clear vision that is vertical within the City’s system. She remarked there is a disconnect among the Plan Commission, ZBA and the Planning & Development Committee.

Alderman Wynne wanted to know about the focus groups the consultants had talked to—were there people who had been legal objectors in the Plan Commission process or before the ZBA? Ms. Smith replied that they had spoken with neighborhood associations and others who are known to have an interest in development in the community. She noted

they worked with administrators to identify people who were “engaged participants” in many development proposals. Alderman Bernstein cited the Village of Northbrook, where a preliminary examination of development plans is done before the Council to get a sense of whether the plan will move forward. He pointed out that the consultant’s report told Council that the City’s professional staff is not utilized and often functions as minutes takers or facilitators. Alderman Bernstein thought that Council and staff needed meet to create a vision. Then there should be a staff report that is the basis for discussion in the Plan Commission.

Alderman Bernstein also noted that the City works with an antiquated document (*Zoning Ordinance*). He pointed out that in 1993 (when the *ZO* was adopted) no one thought there would be three-story buildings in Evanston and that was no longer the case. He said they have to work with the reality that is consistent with Council’s vision. Alderman Bernstein loved the verticality concept. He stressed the need for a person to oversee a development project through all of the approval levels. He complimented the consultants on a well-done report.

Alderman Wollin agreed that development does begin with the Council, so a clear vision is needed of where they want to go with development. She liked the concept of one-stop shopping and the project manager concept. Similarly, there needs to be a single contact with the applicant—she cited often they see the applicant, property owner, architect and lawyer throughout the process.

Alderman Moran thought that the notion of Planning & Development “doing less, but doing more better” sprang from the vision concept that needs to be communicated in a vertical fashion through the boards and commissions staff. He cited an observation someone made that, “People like the *Comprehensive General Plan*, but are not sure what it means when one tries to reduce it to a specific situation.” Alderman Moran felt they could derive a vision, in part, from the *Zoning Ordinance*, but the noted the real “vision” document is the *Comprehensive General Plan*. He added that linkages between the *CGP* and the *Zoning Ordinance* were part of the vision. If there are a shared set of values that work bottom up, then Council will get better recommendations so they can move forward faster.

Alderman Rainey has difficulty interpreting the *Comprehensive General Plan* and felt one or two others on the Council would have a difficult time as well. She thought an informal presentation to Council on the current *CGP* was needed. That would be followed by Council’s consideration to appoint a Blue Ribbon Panel to take a critical look at that plan and see how it relates to life today in Evanston and for the future.

Alderman Wynne had worked on the 2000 update of the *Comprehensive General Plan* and called it “a wonderful utopian document” and thought it needed to be better linked to “facts on the ground.” She added that it needs to be tied into the *Zoning Ordinance*. Alderman Rainey stated that she wasn’t criticizing the *CGP* and stressed the need for Council to reacquaint themselves with the document. Alderman Wynne reiterated that the zoning book from 1993 does not reflect the vision the City had in 2000 (when the *Comprehensive General Plan* was updated).

Alderman Holmes wanted to follow up on the *Comprehensive General Plan* update in 2000 and asked Alderman Wynne if there was no consideration given at that time to the *Zoning Ordinance*, which was done in 1993? Alderman Wynne responded that there were certain sections they did change—for instance, Chicago Avenue and parking requirements. She indicated that there was no strong will to rewrite the *Zoning Ordinance* at that time.

Alderman Bernstein stated they need to create a vision and the *Comprehensive General Plan* and the *Zoning Ordinance* are the codification of that vision. He noted that, up to nine years ago, there was no development in Evanston and Council was glad to “react” to anyone who brought a project. To prepare a vision, he stated, means that Council now needs to be “proactive” and say what is wanted and wait until that comes in. Alderman Bernstein said they must say there is a vision of what this neighborhood will look like and tell developers not to come in with plans that don’t fulfill that vision. He asked if they create a vision, do they wait for developers to bring in what they want—does that happen? Mr. Ley responded yes; it’s a wrenching process and the transition is most difficult. He noted that some clients would state they were ceasing to see PUDs that come in until they had it sorted out, which doesn’t make the developers happy.

Alderman Wollin stated that it would be a difficult transition period and Council should prepare for a bumpy road ahead. She noted that there are projects in the pipeline and those need to be completed. She cited an instance at a Plan

Commission meeting at which a project got on to present at 10:50 p.m., knowing that the court reporter would leave at 11:00 p.m. and residents had been waiting since 7:00 p.m. to testify. She termed it “unconscionable” to keep people waiting for four hours and pointed out that the time constraints are a known factor—they are no surprise. Citizens were told a special meeting of the Plan Commission would be held and to return then. Alderman Wollin said they would need to manage the projects they have started or those that are in the process. After that, they may wish to set a moratorium on PUDs while they restructure the process. In the meantime, she stressed, they must be more sensitive to citizens.

Alderman Tisdahl noted that the *Comprehensive General Plan* can be used by either side of an issue to prove a point. She gave an example of someone wanting to put in a fast-food place in her ward and indicated there was no neighborhood plan for that particular neighborhood. She wanted to know if they followed through with the consultant’s suggestion for a vision, would there be something specific about the kind of development that a neighborhood ought to have.

Ms. Smith responded it would be two-tiered with an overall citywide vision and each neighborhood would have its own individual plan that builds off of that vision. Neighborhood plans would accommodate some of the unique demographics and situations in each community.

Alderman Wynne wanted to know about the consultants’ experience in “how to turn the ship around.” She found it interesting that communities would say, “We’re not accepting any more PUDs,” and, economically they are going to withstand the freeze that happens. She wanted more information. Mr. Ley answered that Virchow Krause has provided a third-party viewpoint for communities as they review huge PUDs. They prepare an independent fiscal impact analysis for the community. He cautioned that the time period (for turn around) be limited and not indefinite—what he has often seen is six months to no more than a year.

Alderman Wynne reported that the last rewrite of the Zoning Ordinance took 3½ years to complete and the City doesn’t have that kind of time. She thought Council had the political will to do it, but realized it needed to fast-track to achieve the basic steps. Ms. Smith commented that perhaps Council could prioritize and not attempt to rewrite the whole ZO.

Alderman Rainey thought they should begin a critique of the planned development process and, out of that, will come issues in the ZO that they can identify and work on those issues. She said to undertake a complete rewrite of the Zoning Ordinance was unnecessary and beyond their capability given everything else Council has on their plate.

City Manager Julia Carroll thanked Virchow Krause and thought they did an excellent job. She assured the Council that comments related to the P&D Committee did not intend to take away any power, rather to see how staff can more effectively prepare Council for the process so they can make a good decision. She referred to a memo on areas that staff feels are policy and administrative and staff will go ahead and work on the administrative areas. Ms. Carroll reiterated that Council wanted some linkage between the *Comprehensive General Plan* and the Zoning Ordinance. She agreed that that the whole thing (ZO) doesn’t need to be redone, but there are some areas where there is difficulty. She wanted to set up meetings to talk further with Council about how they could move forward together.

Alderman Rainey requested a memo from the city manager that details how Council and staff will move forward on this. Ms. Carroll understood that Council wants a presentation on the *Comprehensive General Plan*, what are the disconnects between the Zoning Ordinance and the *CGP* and for Council/staff to critique the planned development process.

There being no further business to come before Council, Mayor Morton asked for a motion to adjourn. The Council so moved at 9:30 p.m.

Mayre Press,  
Deputy 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.