

MINUTES
Regular Meeting of the College Park City Council
Tuesday, April 14, 2020
7:30 p.m. – 11:25 p.m.

Due to the COVID-19 Pandemic, this was a WebEx Virtual Meeting

PRESENT: Mayor Wojahn; Councilmembers Kabir, Kennedy, Brennan, Dennis, Day, Rigg, Mackie, and Mitchell.

ABSENT: None.

ALSO PRESENT: Scott Somers, City Manager; Bill Gardiner, Assistant City Manager; Janeen S. Miller, City Clerk; Suellen Ferguson, City Attorney; Bob Ryan, Director of Public Services; Terry Schum, Director of Planning; Miriam Bader, Senior Planner; Robert Marsili, Director of Public Works.

Mayor Wojahn opened the virtual Regular Meeting at 7:30 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Councilmember Kabir said the County Executive is requiring everyone to wear a face mask out in public and said he has some to give away.

Councilmember Brennan discussed the free lunches provided to residents at Attick Towers and Spellman House and to a local homeless shelter and thanked the groups involved.

Mayor Wojahn and Councilmember Rigg announced ways that volunteers can sign up to help our vulnerable populations.

Councilmember Day announced the loss of Dr. Joyce Middleton, a UMD Professor, who was his sister-in-law.

Councilmember Mackie discussed an upcoming meal distribution sponsored by County Council Member Glaros.

Councilmember Mitchell requested a proclamation at the next meeting for National Volunteer Month.

CITY MANAGER'S REPORT: Mr. Somers referred to the COVID-19 page on the City website, said a mailer will go out to all households in the City referring them to the COVID webpage, reminded people about the Census, and gave updates on the Department of Public Works services.

AMENDMENTS TO AND APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA: A motion was made by Councilmember Day and seconded by Councilmember Rigg to move adoption of Ordinance 20-O-04 to the Consent Agenda after the Public Hearing; motion passed 8-0. A motion was made by Councilmember Brennan and seconded by Councilmember Mitchell to adopt the agenda as amended; motion passed 8-0.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

A. Ordinance 20-O-04, An Ordinance of the Mayor and Council of the City of College Park to Authorize the Purchase of a Parcel of Land for a Public Purpose and the Related Sale of a Parcel of Land as it is no longer needed for a City Public Purpose (Sellers property)

Ms. Ferguson said this Ordinance involves the transfer of two pieces of property between the Sellers and the City. One is in front of the Sellers' property on Navahoe Street and one is adjacent to the James Adams Park. There is no cost involved; these are like-kind exchanges. There will also be a Contract of Sale to effectuate this.

Mayor Wojahn invited public comment. There was no public comment and Mayor Wojahn declared the public hearing as having been held.

CONSENT AGENDA: A motion was made by Councilmember Rigg and seconded by Councilmember Mitchell to adopt the Consent Agenda, which consisted of:

20-R-05	Resolution Of The Mayor And Council Of The City Of College Park Adopting The Recommendation Of The Advisory Planning Commission Regarding Variance Application Number CPV-2020-01, 4715 Norwich Road, College Park, Maryland, Recommending Approval Of A Variance From The Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance Sec. 27-442(E) Table IV, Footnote 5, Which Specifies A Minimum Side Yard Setback Of 15-Foot In The R-55 Zone In Order To Enlarge A Dormer Window.
20-R-06	Resolution Of The Mayor And Council Of The City Of College Park Adopting The Recommendation Of The Advisory Planning Commission Regarding Variance Application Number CPV-2020-02, 5010 Erie Street, College Park, Maryland, Recommending Approval Of A Front Yard Setback Variance From The Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance Sec. 27-442(E) Table IV Which Specifies A Minimum Front Yard Setback Of 25-Foot In The R-55 Zone To Construct A Roof Over A Front Stoop
20-R-07	Resolution Of The Mayor And Council Of The City Of College Park Adopting The Recommendation Of The Advisory Planning Commission Regarding Variance Application Number CEO-2020-01, 5003 Eutaw Place, College Park, Maryland, Recommending Approval Of Variances From The Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance, Section 27-420(A) And City Code §87-23 C To Permit The Construction Of A 6-Foot High Fence.
20-G-71	Approval of Minutes: January 28, 2020 Regular Meeting, March 28, 2020 Budget Worksession.
20-G-77	Approve the recommendation from the College Park Ethics Commission for Independent Legal Counsel, and authorize the City to enter into a professional services contract, with Victoria M. Shearer of Eccleston and Wolf.

20-O-04	Adoption of Ordinance 20-O-04, An Ordinance of the Mayor and Council of the City of College Park to Authorize the Purchase of a Parcel of Land for a Public Purpose and the Related Sale of a Parcel of Land as it is no longer needed for a City Public Purpose (Sellers property)
----------------	--

The motion carried 8-0.

ACTION ITEMS:

20-G-74 Approval, with conditions, of Detailed Site Plan 19037 for the Greystar/Knox Road development, and approval of a Declaration of Covenants

Ms. Bader said revised conditions developed after the Worksession have been circulated to everyone, but we haven't heard back from the applicant. Ms. Schum provided an update on discussions since the Worksession. She said the major change from last week was elimination of conditions related to the building form and architecture. The recommendation is to support the building as currently designed and to let the Park and Planning Commission be the interpreter of the standards and make the final decision. She believes this is acceptable to the applicant because it will allow the project to move forward as proposed. The Park and Planning report will be released on Thursday. She believes County Planning staff will support a taller building but may ask that it be stepped back above the fifth floor to minimize the impact. She added that the DCPMA has provided comments to the Mayor.

Ms. Ferguson said the Declaration of Covenants contains standard City provisions with the exception of conditions about the eastern and western loading docks which are specific to this project. She said she was informed that the TDC does not yet have board approval of the DOC, and that Greystar will have another entity sign the DOC.

For the applicant: Tom Haller, attorney; John Beinert; Greystar:

Mr. Haller said they are in agreement with all of the revised conditions in the staff report and that Greystar will be able to sign the DOC before the Planning Board. He said there is one problem with the DOC language regarding the loading docks. There are two loading docks on Knox Road – east and west. The western loading dock also serves as an entrance to the parking garage and thus cannot be restricted to 4 – 9 a.m. They believe the restrictions on the hours should only apply to the eastern loading dock.

Mr. Beinert said the Preliminary Plan of Subdivision only addressed reducing the impact of the eastern loading dock. It did not address the western loading dock.

There was discussion about revised language in the DOC regarding the loading docks. Mayor Wojahn suggested adding in the last sentence on page 4, "all loading activities in the easternmost loading dock on Knox Road shall take place between the hours of 4 a.m. and 9 a.m. At all other times that particular loading dock will be locked and unavailable for use." Mr. Haller said the applicant would agree to that new language in the DOC and confirmed that they also agree with the revised conditions.

A motion was made by Councilmember Brennan and seconded by Councilmember Dennis

that DSP-19037 and the associated Departure from Parking Standards be approved with the following conditions (Note: The page numbers are referenced in the *2010 Approved Central US 1 Corridor Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment*):

1. **SUPPORT the following alternative development district standards:**
 - a. **Building Orientation (page 231) – To allow buildings not to face the primary frontage street which is Knox Road.**
 - b. **Building Form, Character Area 5a, Walkable Nodes (page 234) - To allow an increase in the eastern side yard setback from 24 feet to 34 feet and an increase in lot coverage from a maximum of 80% to 91.4%.**
 - c. **Building Form, Character Area 4, Walkable Node (page 234) – To increase building height from 6 stories to 9 stories.**
 - d. **Building Form, Parking Spaces (page 239) - To allow a reduction of 91 parking spaces.**
 - e. **Building Form, Parking Access (page 241) – To allow the maximum width of the western driveway to be 24 feet rather than 22 feet and to allow primary access to parking from Knox Road.**
 - f. **Building Form, Loading and Service Areas (page 242) – To allow loading and service areas to be visible from the street and located less than 30 feet from the public sidewalk.**
 - g. **Building Form, Parking Placement (page 237) – To allow covered parking to be within 20 feet of the right-of-way.**
 - h. **Building Form, Massing (page 237) – To allow the proposed 9-story building to not have a consistent building step-back after 8 stories and not provide the required expression line above the second story on Knox Road.**
2. **The City does not support the Applicant’s request to designate Sterling Place as a primary frontage street. According to the urban design principles in the Sector Plan, Knox Road is a primary frontage street, Lehigh Road is a secondary frontage street and Sterling Place is a side street (a one-way private road, not a major thoroughfare as stated in the Applicant’s Statement of Justification). These principles provide the basis for the orientation of all new development and for the Development District Standards in the Sector Plan. The City supports additional modifications to the Standards as included in #1 above that support the proposed building (orientation of the building, loading and parking access on Knox Road and parking placement). Building orientation that faces Sterling Place is already permitted without modifications. If Sterling Place is designated as a primary frontage street, the Applicant would need to request different modifications to address streetscape standards for Sterling Place that are not being met.**
3. **Prior to certification of the Detailed Site Plan, the Applicant shall revise the Site Plan to:**
 - a. **Show a bike/scooter share parking area along Sterling Place or Lehigh Road.**
 - b. **Provide ADA-compliant curb cuts along the Lehigh Road frontage and a crosswalk at the intersection of Sterling Place and Lehigh Road.**
 - c. **Continue the sidewalk across all driveways on Knox Road.**
 - d. **Remove the two-way arrows shown on the site plan at the eastern loading dock.**

- 4. Prior to certification of the Detailed Site Plan, the Applicant shall revise the Architectural Plans to:**
 - a. Provide details of the overhead doors for the two loading docks on Knox Road. A mural or other artistic treatment shall be provided at the eastern loading dock location and wrap around the ground floor portion of the eastern façade visible from the street.**
 - b. Label storefront windows as having untinted transparent glass.**
 - c. Designate and label 72 retail-only parking spaces in the garage.**
 - d. Provide at least 1 electric car-charging station.**

- 5. Prior to certification of the Detailed Site Plan, the Applicant shall revise the Landscape Plans to:**
 - a. Show compliance with the Landscape Manual on-site and provide a landscape schedule.**
 - b. Indicate how the Tree Canopy Coverage requirements will be met on-site and off-site with a partial waiver.**
 - c. Provide details for amenities such as streetlighting, trash/recycling receptacles, bike racks and other street furniture and locate on the plan.**
 - d. Provide details about the measures to be used to protect pedestrians along Sterling Place.**
 - e. Install a “No Through Street” sign at the intersection of Lehigh and Baltimore Avenue, a “Do Not Enter” sign where Lehigh changes to one-way west of the parking garage entrance and appropriate pavement markings to designate one-and two-way traffic.**
 - f. Install two bollards at the entrance to each loading/service area along Knox Road as a safety measure.**

- 6. Prior to certification of the Detailed Site Plan:**
 - a. Provide additional details on the size and materials of proposed signage. Add a sign above the western loading/garage entrance on Knox Road indicating Resident Parking Only. Eliminate the loading zone sign above the eastern loading dock entrance.**
 - b. Submit Mandatory Referral applications for proposed off-site improvements including the Grand Stair, Lehigh Road and Southgate Park, and provide copies to the City of College Park.**

- 7. Prior to building permit, the Applicant shall provide a letter from the Maryland Aviation Administration (MAA) and/or the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) that demonstrates compliance with Zoning Ordinance Section 27-548.42 (Aviation Policy Area (APA-6) Height Restrictions-no obstruction over 198-feet Above Mean Sea Level) or obtain a variance in compliance with COMAR 11.03.05.06 with a finding that the height does not endanger the public health, safety and welfare, or revise the site plan to lower the height of the building to be compliant.**

- 8. Prior to Planning Board approval, execute a Declaration of Covenants Agreement with the City in the form substantially attached including the changes discussed earlier.**

Councilmember Brennan said this project involved the assemblage of multiple properties and businesses and is introducing the City's first underground parking facilities. He believes the new population of the property will help support our downtown businesses.

Councilmember Rigg is still concerned about the east vs. west loading dock and is reluctant to allow 24/7 access to the western loading dock. Can it be restricted except during move-in/move-out? Mr. Beinert said the western loading dock is also access to student parking so it can't be restricted. He said trucks back-in to the loading area then pull directly out into traffic.

Amendment #1: A motion was made by Councilmember Rigg and seconded by Councilmember Brennan to revise paragraph #5 of the DOC to its original construction, with the exception that both loading docks be available for student move-in and move-out only outside of those hours.

Mr. Haller said they spent a lot of time during Preliminary Plan talking about circulation and said they are removing a lot of traffic from Knox Road. Once in the loading space the trucks are completely inside the building – not blocking traffic. The only issue left to resolve at the time of Detailed Site Plan was the eastern loading dock and they thought it was resolved. This is a new issue being brought up at the last minute. They had not previously been asked to restrict the western loading dock. If Council approves this, the applicant will not agree.

Comments from the audience:

Anna Lee: (Hard to hear) There is not that much traffic on the westbound side of Knox; it is heavier on the eastbound side.

Councilmember Rigg asked questions about the traffic study. Ms. Schum said the traffic study addresses peak hours and wouldn't address loading. Councilmember Rigg believes we have an atypical rush hour.

Mr. Beinert echoed that the western loading dock had been previously vetted by staff without any concern being raised. Having this come up tonight is of concern.

Mr. Haller suggested limiting 18-wheel truck access to the western loading dock to between the hours of 4 a.m.– 9 a.m.

Vote on Amendment #1: Failed 0-8.

Amendment #2: A motion was made by Councilmember Rigg and seconded by Councilmember Day to revise paragraph #5 of the DOC to say that access by 18-wheelers to both loading docks is restricted to the hours of 4 a.m. – 9 a.m.

No comments from the audience or the Council.

Vote on amendment #2 passed 8-0.

Main motion as amended passed 8-0.

20-G-75 Approval of a letter to the County Council recommending a waiver of the County School Facilities Surcharge for the Greystar Knox Road student housing development

Mr. Gardiner reviewed the staff report. The surcharge would go to the County. Certain exemptions are allowed by law. The City Council can recommend to the County Council to exempt some or all of the school facilities surcharge for undergraduate student housing projects in a certain area. This project meets the criteria for being a student housing project and the developer has provided a letter requesting a waiver.

A motion was made by Councilmember Brennan and seconded by Councilmember Dennis to send a letter to the County Council recommending a partial waiver of the school facilities surcharge for the Greystar project.

Councilmember Brennan agrees that this applicant has made a significant investment with a challenging site and building the first underground parking garage. He supports a partial exemption for this project: he is conflicted about whether additional luxury student housing should be part of the strategy for the University District Vision and he believes all development has a large impact on the ecosystem of our City and that all participants should be paying into the system equitably. As these fees are being generated by the City's ability to attract development and create new revenues, we should be asking what new investment we are seeing in our county facilities.

Comments from the audience:

Tom Haller, Attorney for the Applicant: This project advances the University District Vision: it is proximate to campus; it changes the interface between campus and downtown; it provides many benefits-the retail festival street, improvements to Southgate Park, and improvements to Lehigh Road. They are not asking for a Revitalization Tax Credit.

Ken Ullman, President, Terrapin Development Company, non-resident: They support a full waiver for the reasons Mr. Haller stated. The project will provide a significant revenue enhancement each year. No student housing project has ever paid this fee.

Councilmember Day said the legislative change in 2019 drew a very tight area around the University and we couldn't get a property closer than this one for student housing. We wanted to bring students closer to the University to take cars off the road. The tax increment is significant. We have spent a lot of time working on the District Vision 2020 and this is what we were looking for.

Amendment #1: A motion was made by Councilmember Day and seconded by Councilmember Mitchell to amend the motion to change the request in the letter from a partial waiver to full waiver.

Councilmember Rigg supports the amendment. He thinks it is a good project and is not sure about the availability of capital in this time of COVID.

Mayor Wojahn asked about the prospects of the project vis-à-vis COVID. Mr. Ullman agreed it is an uncertain time and that they are having active conversations with their partners about moving the project forward. It is helpful to have a full waiver. They hope to deliver in Fall of 2023. Mr. Haller agreed about the uncertainty of construction financing, but this project has a higher chance of moving forward.

Councilmember Kennedy supports the partial waiver and thinks we should leave the decision up to the County because it is their budget.

Councilmember Kabir also supports a partial waiver and said “partial” could have many meanings. We hear that there will be a large County budget shortfall. He appreciates that they are not applying for a Revitalization Tax Credit.

Councilmember Brennan said in the past we have supported these waivers as an economic development incentive, and that those projects that got subsidies subsequently transacted at record breaking prices. He thinks about the optics of giving subsidies to projects that turn significant profits. He wants to know how the fee actually impacts our schools.

Vote on Amendment #1 (for the full waiver):

Yes: Dennis, Rigg, Day, Mitchell

No: Kennedy, Brennan, Mackie, Kabir

4 – 4 Tie

Mayor Wojahn votes Yes.

Amendment #1 passes 5-4.

Vote on main motion as amended (full waiver):

Yes: Brennan, Dennis, Rigg, Day, Kennedy, Mitchell

No: Kabir, Mackie

Main motion as amended passed 6-2.

20-G-76 Approval of comments to the Maryland Department of Planning State Clearinghouse for Intergovernmental Review for University of Maryland, College Park proposal to demolish six apartment-style residence halls known as Old Leonardtown, located at 4608, 4610, 4624, 4642, 4644, and 4646 Norwich Road in College Park

Ms. Schum reviewed the staff report and the comments raised at last week’s Worksession. Staff will forward comments to the Clearinghouse through their on-line portal; no letter is required.

A motion was made by Councilmember Rigg and seconded by Councilmember Mitchell that staff forward comments to the State Clearinghouse that indicate support from the City of College Park for Project # MD202003112-0208 for the demolition of Old Leonardtown student housing. Comments should reflect the expectation of the City Council that the cleared property be maintained as a green area with grass and trees and not be surrounded by fencing. The City requests that plans for the future development of the property be submitted

to the City for review. The City would also like to be informed of the number of student housing beds that will be lost due to this project.

Councilmember Rigg said there is a lot of interest in what will be put on this strategically-located parcel in the future.

Comments from the audience:

Carlo Colella, UMD Vice President for Administration and Finance, non-resident: In response to an earlier question, he reported that 225 beds will be lost.

Ken Ullman, President, Terrapin Development Company, non-resident: He agrees with Mr. Rigg that there should be robust community discussion about this property in the future.

Councilmember Day looks forward to the community working with the University to find the right fit for this property.

The motion passed 8-0.

20-G-62 Approval of a Contract Amendment (scope, design and price) subject to review by City Attorney for College Park Woods Clubhouse based on updated design and cost estimates.

Mr. Marsili said this is regarding the design/build contract that was awarded last August for the new College Park Woods Clubhouse. The initial bid was based on a simple design as described in the RFP. During the Design Phase there were two community meetings with residents to get feedback on the design and to ensure the building would meet community needs. As a result, a change in the project and scope of work is being proposed for consideration: increased footprint, changes to roofline, additional storefront-type glass, and architectural beams on the interior to increase the structural capacity. Mr. Marsili described the changes and reviewed the slides and pictures.

Councilmember Mitchell discussed the community meetings and the importance of this clubhouse to the community. Councilmember Mackie said the community is excited about the new design and the change in capacity and various activities the new design would enable.

Councilmember Brennan asked if the original design prescribed in the RFP for just under \$500,000 was ever priced out. Mr. Marsili said that design was part of the assessment that was done to determine the feasibility for demolition or renovation, and was more of a placeholder. The contractor bid on the project thinking it was a cookie-cutter structure for 75 people. There was some misunderstanding about the final product because we wanted to get community input. If we built the original building for that price, the residents would be disappointed; it was just a meeting room. There is more structural integrity to the new design, more space, more rooms, a large lobby; it is more of a complex.

Councilmember Brennan asked about the two design choices that were in the packet. Mayor Wojahn said that is up to the Council to decide tonight.

Councilmember Kabir asked why we didn't go with the original design. Mr. Marsili said when we issued the RFP, we didn't have a design. We hadn't had the community meetings yet and didn't have any input. The drawing that was put out for bid was taken from the feasibility assessment. With the community meetings, the project expanded. Councilmember Kabir asked how many bidders responded to the RFP. Mr. Marsili said there was one bidder. Councilmember Kabir asked if we could rebid the new design now and get a better cost? Mr. Marsili said that's a possibility, but he doesn't know for sure.

[At 10:29 p.m. a motion was made to extend the meeting by 30 minutes. Rigg/Mitchell. 8-0.]

Councilmember Rigg is struck by the magnitude of the increase – almost doubling the cost – and asked about the all-in cost for the project. He wondered if there is an opportunity for value engineering. Mr. Somers said the land acquisition, which was Program Open Space money, was approximately \$260,000, plus architectural costs and staff time. This was a design/build contract and the scope of work included building design and community meetings. The original building was a model/placeholder, but we were asked to go to the community for their input. He added that Council can move in a different direction if they choose, and that he understands how the placeholder of \$500,000 could have set the wrong expectations.

Councilmembers Mitchell and Mackie described the community feedback: The original Clubhouse had been there since 1962 and was a small schoolhouse type of building. Residents are excited about the elegance of the new design; we should be able to host a variety of events, and will be a great amenity to the whole City. The increase in costs are warranted because the new design includes a lot of natural light, a lounge, a kitchen, a room that can be divided into two rooms. This is for the entire City to use, not just District 4.

Councilmember Day supports having a facility like this in the City and says if we are going to do it, we should do it right.

Councilmember Brennan asked if the \$999,000 includes demolition. Mr. Marsili said yes, the demolition and pool infill is \$80,000. He added that he will look for opportunities for value engineering.

A motion was made by Councilmember Mitchell and seconded by Councilmember Mackie to approve an amendment to the contract with Broughton Construction Company for the scope and design of the College Park Woods Clubhouse, subject to review and approval of the City Attorney, for an increase of \$424,106, bringing the total for the updated design to \$999,776. This includes the additions of the dormer roof and the windows.

There were no comments from the audience.

Councilmember Brennan said he thinks the project is over-designed for its use, but that he highly values public input. There are projects that warrant a certain level of design, such as a City Hall, but this project is more utilitarian. He favors the less expensive options in the packet. He hopes staff will continue to value engineer.

Roll Call Vote:

Yes: Kabir, Kennedy, Brennan, Dennis, Day, Rigg, Mackie and Mitchell.

No: None

Motion passed 8-0.

20-G-73 Consider approval of MOU with UMPD for live-monitoring of certain security cameras in the City

Mr. Ryan said the current MOU with the University expires on July 1. The question is whether to continue live-monitoring, or to go with the record-only option.

Mr. Somers said last time this was discussed a majority of Council was interested in amending the MOU to move toward data collection rather than live monitoring. For the savings, 5 additional cameras could be installed, or approximately 1 FTE contract officer could be added.

Councilmember Kennedy asked if staff has any concern if we eliminate live-monitoring? Mr. Ryan said he wouldn't want to speculate.

Councilmember Kabir asked about suspending the contract since students aren't on campus right now. Mr. Ryan said in the past we have seen an increase in break-ins in that area during times the students are away. Councilmember Kabir would like to explore other ways to invest in public safety.

A motion was made by Councilmember Brennan and seconded by Councilmember Kabir to approve and authorize the City Manager to sign an agreement with the direction to switch to record-only camera data services with UMPD.

Councilmember Brennan said we all want the public in this part of the City to be safe. He has not seen the data to show that what we are paying toward live-monitoring is working; we have seen only assumption and anecdotes. He would like to do a year of record-only to understand the impact, then we can go back to live-only or stay with the record-only scenario. Until we take this action, we are going to continue to operate on assumption.

Comments from the audience:

Carol Macknis: She would like to see the Council consider static cameras at Gateway Park and the new College Park Woods Clubhouse.

[At 11:04 p.m. a motion was made by Councilmember Rigg and seconded by Councilmember Brennan to suspend the rules. Motion passed 8-0.]

Councilmember Day is disappointed by this direction. We should be expanding what we are doing, not pulling it back. Campuses across the country are going with safe campus initiatives.

Amendment #1: An amendment was made by Councilmember Day and seconded by Councilmember Rigg to approve and authorize the City Manager to sign an agreement with the direction to continue with live-monitoring services through FY '21.

Councilmember Day does not think we should be looking at saving money over saving lives. Students are often preyed upon and live-monitoring can be used to solve problems going on at the time.

Councilmember Rigg spoke in support of the amendment; he is frustrated by the lack of data.

Councilmember Brennan does not characterize this as a degradation in service; he hopes we can create an alternate strategy having to do with boots on the ground and placing people in certain strategic locations.

Councilmember Kennedy said we are not ready for the conversation tonight of where we should be putting the money/defining the strategy: is it an investment in equipment, the number of cameras, etc...?

Councilmember Mitchell asked if we can change our mind next fiscal year? Mr. Ryan said we haven't posed that question, but we can.

Vote on Amendment #1 (for live-monitoring):

Yes: Dennis, Rigg, Day, Mackie

No: Kabir, Kennedy, Brennan, Mitchell

4-4 Tie.

Mayor votes no; amendment fails 4-5.

Vote on the original motion (for record-only):

Yes: Kabir, Kennedy, Brennan, Rigg, Mackie, Mitchell

No: Dennis, Day

Motion passed 6-2.

20-G-78 Appointment of members to the Student Liaison Selection Subcommittee

A motion was made by Councilmember Kennedy and seconded by Councilmember Rigg to appoint the Mayor, Councilmember Mitchell and Councilmember Day to the Student Liaison Selection Committee. The motion passed 8-0.

ADJOURN: A motion was made by Councilmember Mackie and seconded by Councilmember Brennan to adjourn the Regular Meeting, and with a vote of 8-0, the meeting was adjourned at 11:25 p.m.

Janeen S. Miller, CMC
City Clerk

Date
Approved