

MINUTES OF REGULAR
CITY COUNCIL MEETING HELD
NOVEMBER 19, 2015

The City Council of Olmos Park, Texas held a regular meeting on November 19, 2015 commencing at 6:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers at City Hall. Mayor Kenneth Farrimond presided and Council members present were Casey Fry, Kenyon McDonald, Juliana Dusek, Deb Prost and Ronald Hornberger. Staff present was City Manager, Celia M DeLeon; City Secretary, Diane Gonzales; Fire Chief, John Surber; Police Chief, Rene Valenciano; and Public Works Director, Gilbert DeLeon. Also present were City Attorney, Frank Garza; Pat Meier, 140 Stanford, Sharon Plant, 131 E. Mandalay, Melissa Parsons, 484 East Olmos Drive, Merribell Parsons, 486 East Olmos Drive, Ross Wilson of PSW, Judy and Charles White, 630 E. Mandalay, Kari Englehart, 330 East Olmos Drive, Dorothy Jo Weiss, 701 W. El Prado, Andrew Craig, 512 Thelma and Barry Sturrock, 210 Stanford.

Mayor Farrimond called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. and determined a quorum was present.

Citizens to be heard: This time is provided for citizens to address the Council on issues and concerns. No action can or will be taken on issues raised under this portion of the meeting. Please state your name and address for the record and limit your remarks to a period not to exceed three minutes.

Dorothy Jo Weiss stated I happened to be by Olmos Drive where they are doing construction and apparently they are putting in a 10 foot sidewalk to go all the way to Shook and they are some lovely trees along the way and they are going to be damaged by that sidewalk and putting concrete at the base of a tree is going to kill the tree and I would like for you to consider a policy so this does not happen in the future. Another concern I have is on the Feral cats which I have multiple cats because my neighbor is now deceased and the property was sold and the cats were left and I started feeding these animals because I can't see an animal starving and I really need help, I don't want them and I hope that somebody would take some of these cats and I am asking you to see if you know of anybody that can help me and take these cats.

Melissa Parsons stated I live at 484 East Olmos Drive and we have one of the properties that have a 4 foot sidewalk and what we are asking is if they are going to do the minimum where it can be a 3 foot sidewalk that comes from the curb and as far away for the trunk of the tree.

Merribell Parsons stated I live at 486 East Olmos Drive and my home was built in 1979 to be used as a single family residence although it is a two unit duplex and one of those is for my sister. The large tree that is there now could be jeopardized and is over 35 years of age and is very tall and limbs that go across the street that gives shade. When PSW proposed the 4 foot sidewalks that is deemed to start at the edge of the driveway and the sidewalk comes less than a foot of the trunk of that tree. My sister and myself have talked to the City Manager, the Mayor and PSW to see if there could be an amendment to the design for the tree and PSW has come back with some beautiful plans that can allow that to happen. It's a 3 foot sidewalk that comes from the curb rather than the apron of the driveway and PSW has been terrific in helping us with this as everybody else has.

Sharon Plant stated a few months ago I requested that Councilwoman Prost forward to me all the communications of the EDC that was sent to the residents and businesses of Olmos Park over the past four years regarding the McCullough Corridor Project. When I started organizing these documents prior to the November meeting I noticed a document entitled the Olmos Park

Revitalization Fund which I just handed to you and you will notice on the second page giving opportunities include paver blocks, paver bricks, pedestrian lights and trees none of which have received approval by City Council in respect to the McCullough Corridor Project. I asked the City Manager last week to contact the San Antonio Area Foundation to see if a fund had been set up for this project and Mrs. DeLeon spoke with Martin Acevedo at the foundation and heard there was a fund being established by Deb Prost and there have been some contributions to the fund but he would not disclose who the contributors were. After six phone calls to Mark I received a phone call last night confirming that the agreement was signed by Deb Prost on the 16th and the President and CEO of the San Antonio Area Foundation approved this document yesterday the 17th. I informed Mark that the EDC had been charged legal fees in connection with this fund on July 30th and I would like to know as President of the EDC who the names are of the residents that have contributed and what the amounts were and Mark was unable to give me that information and I would have to get with Deb Prost on this matter who obviously Mark was giving you a heads up on which I am glad. In the past there have been two funds from reading through the minutes that have been established at the San Antonio Area Foundation, one was the Railroad Quite Zone set up by Jeff Judson and the other was a fund that former Council person, P&Z members Sean McNeilus and Roxy Hayne a former P&Z member that was called OPTIC that was for donations for the fountain that used to be at the circle and maintenance and beautification throughout the City. These funds were established by these elected appointed officials with the full knowledge and consent of the City Council so I don't understand why we have secrecy on this fund. It is legal for a private citizen such as Deb Prost to set up a fund as long as those funds are going to a 501C3 nonprofit or to a governmental entity for a project that is approved by the San Antonio Area Foundation. Ms. Prost as a private citizen will create a committee for this fund as you will see in the document comprised of herself and two Olmos Park residents and these residents are not named in the agreement so you would have to ask Deb Prost who these individuals are. Council, just because it's legal does not make it right and Ms. Prost's behavior is unacceptable, in fact what information she has distributed to residents that produced a donation prior to the November 9th meeting was not a project even approved by the City Council and if you recall I spoke at the August 20th Council meeting and informed you that former Mayor Dubinski had contacted me and told me Ms. Prost's has approached him and asked him if he would her help raise a million dollars for the McCullough Corridor Project and informed him that Council would be doing a bond issue for the remaining funds. Due to the fact that private citizen Prost is soliciting funds from residents I would think that the Council would want to know what is being communicated to these donors especially given the history of not factual information that Councilwoman Prost gave to Dubinski. In addition, Prost's is an elected official not a regular citizen. I have informed the City Manager and the EDC Attorney that I will deduct the \$80.00 that was billed to the EDC in July for discussions regarding this private fund established by citizen Prost. I will be instructing the EDC Treasurer for that bill and any other charges incurred over the last two weeks investigating this situation to Ms. Prost's as this is her private fund that she has created. I am requesting that Council get with Councilwoman Prost's in a public forum as soon as possible to get the additional information so that those people that have donated to this fund can know what they are donating to. As of today the only thing Council has approved is a stripping plan so I think it would be in everyone's best interest to know of what is being communicated out there.

Judy White stated myself and my husband Charles White were here last month to apply for a variance from the Board of Adjustment for a carport and I wanted to share with you the poor treatment that we received. When we first started there was confusion among the Committee on our property and nearly an argument of the details of the property and we lost confidence in the whole proceedings and the tone of the conversation was extremely rude to us and was judgmental and at one point we thought it was hostile. There is a carport across the street from us that directly touches the neighbor's property line and the beautiful structure that we were

building which we were denied and having to take it down. Our builder never mentioned a permit to us and we were told to stop and apply for a variance and during this meeting there was joking and mockery to me and my injury and laughter and I was so offended. I am an old nurse and I can't turn or twist my back thus this is why we wanted the carport to the front of the house. Our neighbors have been impressed with the structure we were putting up and they are shocked because there are carports everywhere and that we have to take this down and they were not surprised of how we were treated and this was very un-neighborly the way we were treated.

Mayor Farrimond asked City Attorney what is a process of how they can appeal this?

Frank Garza stated under State Law there is an opportunity to appeal to District Court

Charles White stated the problem with going to the court is the court is going to be oriented to the process and our allegation is that we were treated badly and not necessary unfairly and we are here to point out to you that we were treated badly and our neighbors were not surprised that we were treated badly and that is a message.

Kari Englehardt stated I own the property at 330 E. Olmos Drive and the corner of Judson and PSW has been great to work with. I have hedges that define that property and create an aesthetic barrier between the residential work PSW is doing and the commercial area to my right and I feel if we are not able to amend the sidewalk to 3 feet then I lose the hedge and my property level would be right at Olmos Drive and then there would be no buffer and lose established greenery. I hope that you consider allowing PSW's cooperation and their consideration and compromise to go from a 4 foot sidewalk to a 3 foot sidewalk.

Receive introductions from the Economic Development Corporation Board applicants and the Planning and Zoning Commission applicant

Andrew Craig stated I wanted to introduce myself and have met some of you when I attended an EDC meeting a few weeks ago. I grew up in Olmos Park and live in the townhomes on Thelma and I am a Commercial Real Estate Appraiser and have an undergraduate MBA and would like to be on the EDC Board and serve the City.

Sharon Plant stated Andrew Craig attended our EDC Workshop that was on a Saturday and was able to hear about all the items at the workshop.

Barry Sturrock stated I live on Stanford and I have lived in Olmos Park for 16 years and my kids are raised so I have time to devote on other things. I am an architect and have been working with regulations for 35 years and I am interested to do what I can for the City and offer my expertise.

Councilman Fry stated what we have found is that the role is very time consuming so we need someone to be fully engaged.

City Manager stated the third applicant Mari Tamez has withdrew her name for consideration.

Discussion on possible Amendments to PSW Homes Special Use Permit regarding sidewalk width amendments; take possible action

Mayor Farrimond stated it seems that the narrowest of a sidewalk allowed by ADA is 3 feet so rather than put in a 4 foot sidewalk which was in the plan the two residents on Olmos have asked for 3 foot sidewalks.

City Manager stated there was a question about the decorative light that is on the corner; if we approve this, how will that affect the light and the cost for relocating?

Mayor Farrimond stated the street light that is there on the corner, if we put in a 3 foot sidewalk, ADA requires a ramp and the light pole would be sitting in the middle of that ramp and it will be necessary to move that lamp 3 feet or so and doesn't appear that it will affect the hedges.

Kari Englehardt stated I may have to remove the first piece of hedge and I am ok with that because this is all about compromise. I need to be notified of when that work will be done so I can be present. When Ryan with PSW and I were measuring, it is my understanding that the 3 feet can include the curb material because the curb material will be flushed to the sidewalk surface so I am hoping the 3 feet will be taken from the face of the curb out and the first 6 inches will be curb material and then the next 30 inches are sidewalk material.

Ross Wilson gave a presentation and stated as we approach the end of our property and come towards Ms. Englehardt's property where in the middle of the sidewalk back to the back of the curb is 4 feet and as we come in front of the hedge and the curb starts to come back towards the corner that sidewalk will narrow down to 3 feet to keep as much of the hedge as possible. At the corner you have the ADA ramp which is hatched and crossed hatched and there are two light locations also there the one that is closer to the corner will be moved by a 45 degree angle back away from the curb about 3 feet so that it is in the center of that hedge. For the next property of sidewalk in between the two curb cuts we will reduce the width of sidewalk to 3 feet and move as far away from the tree as possible. The construction will start on Monday.

Kari Englehardt asked is it true that the 6 inches of curb material can be considered part of the 36 inches?

Ross Wilson stated we will have to get with Gilver Engineering to approve that.

Councilman Fry asked is PSW paying for the relocation of the light pole?

Ross Wilson stated that is to be determined, we have asked CPS to look into who owns the light poles and were initially told by CPS that Olmos Park owned the light pole and now they aren't owned by Olmos Park and we aren't allowed to take it down.

Councilman Fry asked Ms. Englehardt what does the 6 inches do and I think being there when construction starts to protect the hedges is the best thing?

Kari Englehardt stated the 6 inches does two things, one is at the 3 feet of the trunk for each hedge the feet goes right to it and there is 42 inches from the street side of the curb to touching the trunks. The 3 feet could work except you still have to form it and they form it with 2X4 boards. The sidewalk runs flush to the curb and then the 6 inches roles down.

Ross Wilson stated they can use some alternative methods to put around the base of the bush.

Councilman Hornberger moved to reduce the 4 foot requirement to the minimum to allow for ADA and in order to save the tree and save the bushes for the addresses being 330 E. Olmos Drive and 484 E. Olmos Drive that we approve the change in the sidewalk as indicated to be the minimum allowed by ADA.

Councilwoman Prost seconded the motion.

The vote in favor of the motion was unanimous.

Public Hearing to receive public comment regarding possible adding to the Code of Ordinances of City of Olmos Park, Texas Chapter 40 zoning, Article IV. local retail district section 40-113 limited use of right-of-way, section 40-114 driveway cuts, section 40-115 shared driveways and cross-access drives; Article V. mixed retail commercial district 40-141 limited use of right-of-way, section 40-142 driveway cuts, section 40-143 shared driveways and cross-access drives; declaring a public purpose; incorporating recitals; providing a repealer and savings clause; providing for severability and setting an effective date

Mayor Farrimond opened the public meeting at 6:47 p.m.

Mayor Farrimond closed the public meeting at 6:48 p.m.

Discuss and take possible action by adding to the Code of Ordinances of City of Olmos Park, Texas adding Chapter 40 zoning, Article IV. local retail district section 40-113 limited use of right-of-way, section 40-114 driveway cuts, section 40-115 shared driveways and cross-access drives; Article V. mixed retail commercial district 40-141 limited use of right-of-way, section 40-142 driveway cuts, section 40-143 shared driveways and cross-access drives; declaring a public purpose; incorporating recitals; providing a repealer and savings clause; providing for severability and setting an effective date

Pat Meier stated both of the proposed ordinances were part of Planning & Zoning's tasks.

Councilman Hornberger asked where is the local retail district and the where is commercial retail district?

Pat Meier stated it is all local retail except for Cowboy Kennels who is the mixed retail.

Councilman Hornberger asked on section 40-114 - Driveway Cuts which speaks in terms of a lot width of 50 feet or less can have one driveway cut then it goes to 51 feet or more can have two driveway cuts. Is there any reason why you did not go to 60 feet for two driveway cuts because there is only a one foot difference? How wide is a driveway cut?

Councilwoman Prost stated a driveway cut is 12 to 14 feet.

Councilman Hornberger asked what is a lot size?

Pat Meier stated they are all 50 foot wide lots in the area of Tribeca down to the animal clinic.

Councilman Hornberger asked so if you went to 60 feet you would be talking about 1.2 lots. If you say a business property with a width of 60 feet or less can only have one curb cut with a property lot size with a width size of 61 feet or more you can have two curb cuts. Where are the driveway cuts going to be, at the end of the property?

Pat Meier stated 60 feet should be the number to accommodate two driveway cuts. That will be dictated by topography.

Councilman Hornberger asked on section 40-115 Part B number 2 - Driveway approaches and cross access internal driveways which speaks about cross access easements for internal driveways and it seems to lead things up to the discretion of the City Manager or designee. Is there an objection standard to guide the Building Official?

Frank Garza stated it depends on the topography, how far the other driveway cuts are and safety issues as the Building Official has to take all those things into consideration when making a determination whether it is a good place for a driveway cut.

Councilman Hornberger asked what if the property owner disagrees? There is no objection standard.

Frank Garza stated the ultimate decisions are the City's because they are going to grant the permit.

Councilwoman Prost asked does this go by business or property line?

Councilman Hornberger asked or by plat?

Pat Meier stated it goes by plat.

Councilman Hornberger stated in section 40-115 B number 1 states a cross access easement(s) for an internal driveway(s) may be required between adjacent lots. Such easement shall be required between adjacent properties within the same plat; shouldn't that read "adjacent lots within the same plat"?

Chief Surber stated in observing the Building Official trying to interrupt the intention of the code as he is trying to make these decisions and the difficulty he has run into on a common basis is the way the words are in the ordinances and his advice is if we could always use the word "property" it helps to understand the intent better because so many properties have multiple lots within them and creates all kinds of issues with people that mistakenly use the word lot and when the ordinance says lot then he has to apply it to a lot.

Councilman Hornberger stated it is very important to distinguish between the word "lot" and "properties." What is the difference between a plat and a phase of a plat?

Frank Garza stated the purpose is to identify rules for driveway cuts, shared access drives for the commercial district. Planning & Zoning brought this proposed ordinance forward trying to make it easier for property owners along the commercial corridor to understand the requirements especially for future development in the retail and mixed retail areas.

Pat Meier stated we looked at other cities ordinances and came up with these and seemed reasonable. Our Attorney could interrupt it, a contractor could interrupt it and I think our City Engineer could interrupt it.

Frank Garza stated I don't know if our City Engineer has reviewed this document to see if he could interrupt the intent.

Mayor Farrimond stated my suggestion would be to table this ordinance and have our City Engineer tell us what he thinks the intent is.

Councilman Hornberger moved to table item 6.

Councilman Fry seconded the motion.

The vote in favor of the motion was unanimous.

Public Hearing to receive public comment regarding possible amending the Code of Ordinances of City of Olmos Park, Texas Chapter 40 Zoning, Article IV. local retail district section 40-110 off-street parking regulations; Article V. mixed retail commercial district section 40-138 off-street parking regulations; declaring a public purpose; incorporating recitals; providing a repealer and savings clause; providing for severability and setting an effective date

Mayor Farrimond opened the public meeting at 7:15 p.m.
Mayor Farrimond closed the public meeting at 7:16 p.m.

Discuss and take possible action amending the Code of Ordinances of City of Olmos Park, Chapter 40 Zoning, Article IV. local retail district section 40-110 off-street parking regulations; Article V. mixed retail commercial district section 40-138 off-street parking regulations; declaring a public purpose; incorporating recitals; providing a repealer and savings clause; providing for severability and setting an effective date

Councilwoman Prost stated I prepared some background information that may be helpful to meet the number of feet in each property as well as the distance between the right-of-way and sidewalks.

Pat Meier stated all we are talking about tonight is do you want to keep the 1 parking space to every 200 feet. A lot of people felt the restaurants should have more spaces to park in, there were concerns about the neighborhood and overflow of evening parking and P&Z felt that it would really hurt businesses from coming into Olmos Park and that 1 to every 200 square feet seemed to work. This mirrors to what San Antonio, Braunfels and Boerne has.

Councilman Hornberger stated what do you do about ADA compliance with handicap spaces since there is no requirement mentioned?

Pat Meier stated we don't have to state that in each ordinance so before you put in a sidewalk you check to see what the guidelines are.

Councilwoman Prost asked on the chart is shows for clinics and for doctor's you show 1 parking space per every 200 hundred feet but City of San Antonio uses 1 per every 150 feet, is there a rational?

Pat Meier stated it is unique to City of Olmos Park because of the small lots and the concern is if you give them the 150 feet and somebody comes in and puts up a restaurant. We are not classify them we are defining them. Nobody else will use that square footage it's on their property. All we did was take San Antonio's that Mayor Farrimond gave us and used that format and our businesses and the definition of those businesses and your information from the UTSA and based on that and agreed on the definition.

Councilman Hornberger moved to table item for revised document.

Councilman Fry seconded the motion.

The vote in favor of the motion was unanimous.

Pat Meier asked do you want to proceed with adding a classification of businesses by definition?

Councilwoman Prost stated we thought there were going to be more differences because when we looked at some of the first lists when the Board of Adjustment was doing some analysis of the Dabney property and San Antonio and Alamo Heights had lots of variation but it is 1 parking space for every 200 square feet.

Councilman Hornberger stated these should be sufficient because if it doesn't fit in these other boxes then it goes into other miscellaneous.

Discuss possibly implementing of a tree ordinance for the City of Olmos Park; take possible action

Councilman Fry stated we had a discussion on this about 6 months ago and what I was waiting for was the City of Alamo Heights to update their tree ordinance. The issues that Alamo Heights have had is that they have had people take down their trees and if you take down a tree the option is to re-plant based on the value of that tree in your lot or re-plant based on the value of that tree in a public space. The amendment they made to the ordinance is that in lieu of placing the tree in your lot or a public space they have set up a fund and that fund is set up for beautification of Alamo Heights and they are trying to work on their commercial corridor on Broadway and whatever changes they make to it landscaping and sidewalks are part of their plan as well. We had Mark Kroeze with the Texas A&M Forest Service come in speak to us and walked us through the process which breaks out to the tree maintenance, license and permitting for someone coming into the City of Olmos Park and this is not the landscaping crew this is more major work to have done and tree removal making sure they have a permit. With some cities they are allowing to permit with them on an annual basis and most cities are switching to one permit per lot per home. Oak wilt is at our doorstep in Olmos Park and the closest location that has experienced a severe issue is Whispering Oaks of Blanco Road who has spent hundreds of thousands of dollars to rectify the situation by trenching. I would like to craft something to review at next month's Council meeting that is based off of not only the existing tree preservation for City of Alamo Heights but with the tree litigation and their amendments and the Oak Wilt with some minor exceptions.

Pat Meier asked how do you get a homeowner to get a permit or maintain their trees and what if I wanted to remove the trees and put a pool in?

Councilman Fry stated it would be the pruning or the removal of trees. You could remove the trees but you would pay a fine and put into this fund that would go back to the beautification. The ordinance would only require you pay a fine for Heritage trees or any trees that have Oak Wilt.

Councilman Fry gave direction to Frank Garza to help craft the tree preservation ordinance that includes tree maintenance, licensing, permitting and Oak Wilt removal and tree protection ordinance with the involvement and collaboration as you see fit with Mark Kroeze from Texas A&M Forest Service.

Mayor Farrimond stated that council agrees.

Discuss possibly implementing a light illumination ordinance for the City of Olmos Park; take possible action

Councilman McDonald stated the lights are on all night long from Valero to the end of The Yard and I can see them from my house and these lights seem to be nuisance lights.

Pat Meier stated that we have a light ordinance, however all those businesses are grandfathered and everything has to be shielded and a certain wattage. The Yard has its own lighting.

Councilman McDonald asked didn't we look into and see whether commercial businesses have to reduce their lights after hours?

Pat Meier stated no we never discussed that and it did not seem to be an issue and maybe now it needs to be addressed. It is a safety issue to have their lights on and maybe the lights that back up to the residential don't need to be on all night.

Councilman McDonald stated Valero started keeping the lights on all night for the past 7 months and they close at midnight and the weekdays the lights are on all night. The type of the lights at The Yard were not there years ago and in the last few years as they renovated they changed the lights.

Pat Meier stated we have a requirement for wattage and we described that we wanted warm lights and not the halogen lights but how do you enforce this, our Building Official is a part-time person but maybe Jim can delegate the Fire and Police to go to the businesses and ask them for verification of their wattage and they should be able to produce that since they are a commercial business.

Frank Garza stated I would recommend that it be a nuisance ordinance for purposes to be able to issue citations for residential and commercial. One of the things that you have to take into consideration is this would only apply to new lights installed and the lights that are currently in place would be grandfathered. If the lights are damaged by wind or more than 50% damaged then they would have to comply with the new ordinance.

Councilman McDonald gave direction to P&Z to possibly amend the ordinance.

Pat Meier stated we have the nuisance and sign illumination requirements and standards on our December P&Z agenda to discuss.

Discuss dates and times for a City Council Strategic Planning Workshop; take possible action
City Manager DeLeon stated I would like to recommend the date of Saturday, February 20, 2016 from 10:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. and department heads will need to be attendance.

Discuss purchasing a new Patrol Vehicle within 30 days at a cost of approximately \$37,541.45 with funds to be allocated from Police Department Vehicle Reserve Fund take possible action
Councilman Fry moved to purchase and replace the 2013 Ford Explorer with a 2016 police Ford Explorer from Jordan Ford with the installation of the police equipment additions of approximately \$37,541.45.

Councilman McDonald seconded the motion.

The vote in favor of the motion was unanimous.

Consent Items:

- a. Approve Cash Disbursements for September and October 2015.
- b. Approve City Council minutes for October 15, 2015 and November 9, 2015.
- c. Excuse Councilmember Ronald Hornberger from attending today's City Council meeting.
- d. Approve 8th Annual San Antonio/Austin Vision walk to hold a run/walk through Olmos Park on April 2, 2016.
- e. Receive and discuss an Olmos Park Economic Development Corporation ("OPEDC) project. The OPEDC proposes to extend existing consultants' scope of professional services to develop, design and execute a striping plan for the McCullough business corridor in an amount not to exceed \$110,220; take possible action (second reading).

- f. Receive and discuss an Olmos Park Economic Development Corporation ("OPEDC) code project. The OPEDC proposes to engage a professional services to review and propose to P&Z code impacts to the existing OP MuniCode as it relates to the proposed McCullough Corridor improvements for an amount not to exceed \$10,000; take possible action (second reading)

City Manager stated she would like to pull item C from the Consent items.

Councilwoman Prost stated on page 3 and 4 of the November 9, 2015 minutes I want to make the following changes:

Page 3:

Councilwoman Prost stated that VIA is very supportive to the project and they just want to help us not just do stops but they are willing to put in some additional funds. The modifications are a good plan but what is not addressed is the communication of how you are going to communicate this to the residents and businesses and what we are doing because the main thrust of the McCullough Project is sidewalks and landscaping yet what is being focused on with this project is not so much the sidewalks and landscaping but what is going to happen in between on the stripping. I understand that the stripping is a controversial item but if we are going to present the McCullough Project to our constituents that we should really focus on why we are doing the McCullough Project which is 1.) have safety for all modes of transportation and 2.) to enhance the economic viability to the Corridor and just by presenting the stripping plan it would seem that we are missing the big point of what the project is which is safety, beautification and economic viability.

Page 4:

Councilwoman Prost stated I am aware there is a certain amount of limited space and part of the information that came up from our Police Chief is our largest number of wrecks right now are rear-ends because we don't have a designated left turn lane and second, there is only 3 ½ blocks between south of the roundabout and we had the traffic consultant talking about a platooning effect because we don't have a way to safely turn left and have rear ends collisions and now we are going to make it even harder because many people won't go around into the bike lane or feel uncomfortable to do so for a while.

Councilwoman Prost asked Andres Andujar was going to get back with us after he discussed the lane widths with VIA, was there any update to that?

Mayor Farrimond stated he has not heard from Andres but would check with him.

Councilman Hornberger moved to accept the consent items with the changes as presented.

Councilman Fry seconded the motion.

The vote in favor of the motion was unanimous.

Departmental Reports: (Written reports submitted to City Council, no further discussion required, unless requested by City Council.)

- a) Police:
(1.) Incidents, arrests and activity during the prior and current months.
- b) Fire:

(1.) Fire and other service calls, activity and training activities during the prior and current months.

c) Streets and Sanitation:

(1.) Monthly Report

d) Administration:

- (1.) Financial reports for October 2015;
- (2.) Monthly overtime, CT, vacation, sick leave report
- (3.) Building Department Report
- (4.) Municipal Court Report

e) Manager's report:

(1.) Discussion of written reports (if needed).

Councilman McDonald moved to accept the departmental reports as submitted.
Councilman Hornberger seconded the motion.
The vote in favor of the motion was unanimous.

There was no further business and the meeting was adjourned at 8:08 p.m.

Kenneth Farrimond
Mayor

ATTEST:

Diane Gonzales
City Secretary