

MINUTES
Regular Meeting of the College Park City Council
Tuesday, September 8, 2020
7:30 p.m. – 11:33 p.m.

Due to the COVID-19 Pandemic, this was a 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; Terry Schum, Director of Planning; Robert Marsili, Director of Public Works; Bob Ryan, Director of Public Services; Jim Miller, Parking Enforcement Manager; Brenda Alexander, Assistant Director of Public Works; Adam Rosenbaum, Student Liaison; Julia Nihinson, Deputy Student Liaison.

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

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Councilmember Kabir announced the North College Park Community Association virtual meeting on Thursday and the virtual Community Police meeting next Monday.

Councilmember Rigg said the Calvert Hills and Old Town civic associations held a conversation last week about possible reestablishment of a basketball court at the Calvert Road school site and of safety measures on the Trolley Trail in that neighborhood. He announced County Council Member Dannielle Glaros' newest initiative re Census2020.

Mayor Wojahn added that Council Members Glaros and Dernoga have a meal distribution program for seniors and people with disabilities.

Councilmember Dennis announced the Coffee Club meeting schedule: the 2nd and 4th Wednesday of the month. He said the Lakeland Civic Association will meet on Thursday at 7 p.m.

Councilmember Mitchell said the D1 and D4 Councilmembers are hosting a virtual Town Hall on September 17 with Public Services staff. She asked if we are doing anything for 9/11.

Councilmember Mackie has received her form to request absentee ballot for the Presidential Election in the mail.

CITY MANAGER'S REPORT: Mr. Somers announced the District 2 Special Election on Sunday, November 8, 9 a.m. – 6 p.m., at the College Park Community Center; gave an update on

the City's COVID 19 Assistance programs; and announced the October Clean Ups at DPW yard. Councilmember Kennedy requested a list of businesses that applied for/received business assistance grants. Councilmember Kabir asked for an update about road work on Edgewood Road.

AMENDMENTS TO AND APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA: Motion by Councilmember Rigg/second by Councilmember Mitchell to approve the agenda without amendment. Motion passed 8-0.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON CONSENT AGENDA AND NON-AGENDA ITEMS:

Carlo Colella, non-resident, UMD Vice President of Administration and Finance: He expressed the University's appreciation for the City's strong partnership with the University during this public health crisis.

Mary King, resident: Expressed concern about the Scope of Work and the price tag of the Hollywood Dog Park; it is more than the price of houses in the area. We already have a Seniors Committee and senior staff; why do we need to be an AARP Livable Community? Re: Parking on Cherokee Lane – the developer has not provided the required parking. It is his responsibility; Council should not approve an interim measure.

Lisa Miller, non-resident: She has been trying to assist the people who are collecting Census data in the community; they are expressing frustration in reaching the people they need to reach to get the answers. She is concerned the City will be undercounted. Mayor Wojahn suggested she send her questions by email to our Complete Count Committee and City staff who are working on the Census.

Santosh Chelliah, resident: He expressed support for the Route 1 Communities Care grant request; they appreciate the funding. Mayor Wojahn thanked him and the committee of volunteers who have pulled this together.

Thomas Tanner, Branchville Volunteer Fire Department [by text to the Mayor]: Raised awareness about the tightness of the corners in the back of the development for ladder trucks.

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

- 20-G-144** Cancellation of prior award to WCG1, and reaward of contract for Hollywood Dog Park in substantially the form attached, to Greenbridge Construction, Inc. of Woodbine, MD in the amount of \$342,373.
- 20-G-145** Approve grant request by Route One Communities Care in the amount of \$10,000 for food service delivery.
- 20-R-21** Resolution in support of City participation in the AARP Livable Communities Program and authorization to develop plans for a Workgroup.

20-G-146 Approval of a Letter to Maryland Department of Transportation, Maryland Transit Administration (MDOT MTA) opposing proposed cuts to MARC service.

20-G-149 Consider cancellation of National Night Out.

20-G-148 Consider changes to parking regulations on Cherokee Street around the Lennar/Metropolitan Development.

The motion passed 8-0.

ACTION ITEMS

20-G-127 Approval of a recommendation to the Prince George's County Planning Board of support, with conditions, for the Detailed Site Plan 19042 for Branchville Gardens multi-family apartment building, and approval of a Declaration of Covenants.

Ms. Schum described the project. The applicant is Cruz Development Corporation and the attorney is Dan Lynch. This was previously heard by Council at the July 7 Worksession, then was continued at the Planning Board to September 24. It is coming back tonight for final action. There are two revised exhibits: the turning radius for BVFD and the relocated proposed sidewalk.

Ms. Bader reviewed the PowerPoint and the revised conditions in the staff report.

Dan Lynch for the applicant: one reason for the continuance was to ensure there was sufficient room for fire trucks to exit/enter the Branchville Volunteer Fire Department. The new exhibit shows an area 14 feet deep and 120 feet wide for the turning area. The engineers have looked at the sidewalk and believe they can provide that pedestrian connection. There were no other changes to DSP: 81 units. They agree with the staff recommendations and proposed conditions.

Councilmember Brennan asked how this plan for the turning radius compares to the design from the 1980s. Mr. Lynch said he understands it was more than the 14' provided today because it went beyond their property line. The exhibit shows the trucks can turn adequately and they are providing more pavement than what's there today. Ms. Schum reviewed the old site plan and said the radius is not exactly the same but appears to be workable. A portion of the turn-around is on private property (Open Space-zoned property) and a portion on City property. The proposed sidewalk is now mostly on private property and would need to be under a public access easement, which the applicant has agreed to. Councilmember Brennan asked if the applicant reached out to the BDCA about the prior agreement. Mr. Lynch said he exchanged emails with them and with staff. He said the BDCA requested a resident manager on site, which was contained in the original agreement. That is not something that is done in the current residential rental market and they don't plan to comply. They will have a facilities manager and janitorial staff on-site 5 days/week. The BDCA requested an additional traffic study but the applicant is

not required to provide it at this phase. The BDCA requested permitted parking; the applicant is providing gated parking in the garage and permit parking on the surface lot.

A motion was made by Councilmember Brennan and seconded by Councilmember Dennis that the City Council recommend approval of Detailed Site Plan 19042 with conditions, in accordance with the staff recommendation and the Declaration of Covenants, in substantially the form attached.

Councilmember Brennan acknowledged this has been a lengthy process with a lot of twists and turns. The project is in line with current plans. He has tried to represent both sides of the arguments; the final decision is the County's. This project included a lawsuit; we need to get beyond the heat that generated and find a positive way forward. He is moved by the Cruz family's commitment to affordable housing.

Tom Tanner, Trustee, Branchville Volunteer Fire Company: Happy they added the sidewalk area; thinks the project is too large and the parking is inadequate; thinks there will be future parking problems on Branchville Road and 49th Avenue. They will raise their concerns with the County. A facility that is supposed to be for families has a dearth of amenities for families.

Karen Keating, resident, Co-President, BDCA: The BDCA Board of Directors is on record as not supporting or protesting this development.

Councilmember Rigg said affordable housing is difficult to do even with state and federal support. We need residential property to accommodate our elder population that will encourage aging in our City.

Councilmember Kabir thanked the Cruz family for their commitment to this project. Our surveys show the need for affordable housing. We will be watchful if future challenges arise.

Councilmember Mitchell thanked the D. 2 Councilmembers for working with the community on this. We do need affordable housing; she hopes the developer and community will work together.

Councilmember Dennis echoes what has been said. We're at the point that we can see a viable development and he looks forward to continued collaboration among all the parties if future issues arise.

Mayor Wojahn applauded the collaboration and engagement he saw on this project. He acknowledged the desperate need for affordable housing.

The motion passed 8-0.

20-G-128 Approval of a recommendation to the Prince George's County Planning Board of support, with conditions, of the Detailed Site Plan for the Marriott Residence Inn

Ms. Schum said this property is across the street from the College Park Metro Station. The DSP was presented at the July 7 Worksession, but the application was then continued to September 24 to allow the applicant to file a companion application for a departure from parking and loading standards.

Ms. Bader reviewed the site plan and the minor revised recommendations. The development is 5 stories, 161 hotel rooms, and 5K feet of ground floor retail facing Campus Drive. She stated the Applicant agrees with the conditions.

For the applicant, Arthur Horne, Attorney, and David Bickel, Civil Engineer: Mr. Horne stated they requested a departure for 2 loading spaces instead of 3.

Councilmember Rigg asked about parking. Mr. Horne said they are hopeful the 8 spots on Lehigh, that are not supported by the City, would be helpful for additional parking. There are also surrounding properties where a relationship for parking might be established.

Ms. Schum said because this project is in a transit district, there is a TDDP (Transit District Development Plan). There are no minimum requirements for parking. The applicant is providing a total of 72 spaces and the maximum number allowed in this district is 70 spaces.

A motion was made by Councilmember Day and seconded by Councilmember Rigg that the City Council recommend approval of Detailed Site Plan 18047 and Departure from Parking and Loading Standards DPLS-485, with conditions in accordance with the staff recommendation dated September 4, 2020.

Councilmember Day said this project will bring some life to the area near the Metro and he looks forward to future development here.

Comments from the audience:

Mary King, resident: She asked for a clarification as to the number of parking spaces. Ms. Schum said staff is supporting 72 spaces, which is 2 more than the 70 provided. The applicant is requesting 8 additional parking spaces on Lehigh that staff does not support.

Councilmember Mitchell expressed support for the Marriott brand coming to College Park.

The motion passed 8-0

20-G-147 Consider recommendation to continue live camera monitoring MOU with UMD until June, 2021

Mr. Ryan said this item stems from a request by the University of Maryland, that he and the City Manager support, to sustain live monitoring of the security cameras. He reviewed the past history: historically, these cameras were live monitored, but Council voted to end live monitoring this fiscal year. The UMD has not turned it off yet. They are concerned about large

groups of people gathering and feel they would be able to respond quickly if they see that type of gathering. Staff recommends funding live monitoring; funds are in the budget.

Councilmember Kabir acknowledged the unique situation we are in because of the pandemic. This is a big budget item. Do we need 24/7 monitoring? What if the UMD closes campus to in-person classes? This is a partnership with the UMD; can they share the cost or enhance their police presence? He would like to delay the decision so that he can get these answers.

Mr. Ryan responded that our protocol is to notify UMD Police if we need their assistance. He can't speculate about what we would do if the campus closed. These cameras are in the areas where we observe large groups of pedestrians. Mr. Somers added the UMD has been a great partner is actively engaged in enforcement. If the UMD closes that doesn't necessarily mean the students would go home. Many students are in off campus housing and would likely stay in the City.

Councilmember Mitchell requested clarification – this request is to fund monitoring for the current 18 cameras at their current locations? Ryan: Yes. Councilmember Mitchell said there are also large student populations in areas of District 4 and she hopes we can take a City-wide view.

Councilmember Mackie asked how this will deter the large groups? What happens when large groups are observed? Mr. Ryan said when certain activity is seen on the cameras in the Security Operation Center, police are dispatched to intervene. If a complaint comes in to our hotline, we notify UMD police so they can train the camera on the location.

A motion was made by Councilmember Rigg and seconded by Councilmember Day to approve continued live monitoring of security cameras as described, and to authorize the City Manager to sign an MOU with UMD to continue live monitoring through FY21 upon the approval of the City Attorney.

Councilmember Rigg supports live monitoring. It can be difficult to prove its impact on crime, but in a high-density commercial district, this is an additional tool to keep our residents safe in this extraordinary time.

Comments from the audience:

Carlo Colella, non-resident, UMD Vice President of Administration and Finance: The University urges approval of this recommendation. It is important during the pandemic to see in real time where large crowds are gathering. The same is done on-campus in areas such as McKeldin Mall where people tend to gather. This allows us to react in real time.

Councilmember Kabir asked, in the spirit of our partnership and because these are UMD students that we are talking about, a suggestion has been made to share the cost. Mr. Colella said the proposed rate is the discounted internal rate; the UMD absorbs a large amount of the overhead.

Mary King, resident: She is stunned that the UMD has the temerity to ask the City to use these cameras for live monitoring and expect the citizens of College Park to pay for it – over \$100K. These cameras were established to assist with crime-fighting, not to spy on citizens 24/7. There are other ways the University can address the search for large gatherings. If the UMD wants to use these cameras for public health services for their students, they should pay 100% of the cost.

Stephanie Stulich, resident: There are still large gatherings, albeit not as large as before, that can have a public health impact on the community. Many people in the groups are without masks and without social distancing. She thinks the live monitoring is an important step to protect everyone in the community.

Stuart Adams, resident: Supports the motion. The cameras are already there and the monitoring can be useful to help the community address COVID concerns. Having a significant outbreak that would cause business to close would cost more.

Stephen Robie, resident: Supports the motion. The consequences of these large gatherings will be delayed because of the incubation period of up to two weeks, during which time there could be continued spread. He wishes the UMD would pay more for the investment, but he thinks it is money well spent.

Councilmember Day supports the motion. It gives us the tools we need to address issues immediately. The analytics are getting better day-by-day to address this exact scenario on campuses across the country.

Councilmember Brennan said when the Council voted to stop live monitoring a few months ago it wasn't yet illegal or known to be unsafe to be in these large groups. When we looked at this last time, there was no data that indicated any true value to the City. \$150K is a significant amount of money to us. The ACLU looks at live monitoring as largely ineffective and an intrusion on people's private lives. He supports this in the current context, but when the pandemic is gone, he urges Council to look at the data for the results.

Councilmember Kennedy agrees with Councilmember Brennan.

Councilmember Mackie thanked the University for their emails to students about safety precautions. If students were following that advice, we wouldn't be having this issue now.

Councilmember Mitchell said this is about the current pandemic health and safety issue. After the pandemic she would like to see a discussion about City-wide monitoring.

Councilmember Kabir said the FY'21 budget is for \$153K but we are in the 3rd month of FY'21 and there will be a sunset in spring, so the live monitoring they are proposing is only for 7 months? Mr. Ryan said the UMD has not shut off live monitoring, so we would pay for a full fiscal year. Councilmember Kabir asked why we would pay for 12 months when we the MOU is for 7 months? Mr. Somers said the recommendation is to continue live monitoring through the end of the Fiscal Year, June 30, 2021. The entire fiscal year is \$153K, but we would pay on a monthly basis going forward depending on the vote tonight, so we would not pay for the full fiscal year.

The motion passed 8-0.

Councilmember Mitchell asked for talking points to show our residents what UMD is bringing to the table. Mr. Somers said we can try to put something together to illustrate the partnership.

20-O-12 Consideration of an Emergency Ordinance Amending Chapter 110-2, Penalties, to increase the fines for violations of Chapter 141-1, Nuisances, and Chapter 144-5, Mandatory Disclosures

Mr. Ryan said this has been discussed in the past and is coming back now because of pandemic. It involves two fines in the City Code. One is the code requirement that property owners provide the names of their tenants when the City has a reasonable cause to request those names.

Currently, the fine is \$75. The second is use of our nuisance ordinance to cite for violations of state, county and health department orders regarding the pandemic. The current fine for that section of the nuisance ordinance is \$50. Neither fine provides any incentive to comply and we are not getting the cooperation we need in almost half of the cases. He discussed some specific cases of non-compliance where there were violations in regard to the number of people allowed in a space. Our purpose is to identify university students and refer them to the UMD Office of Student Conduct. The City's application for the Rental Occupancy Permit includes a statement that says, "I agree to disclose within 24 hours of the City's request for any legal public purpose the identity of any occupants of the property known to me."

Council asked about the proposed change in the fine, the potential revocation of the occupancy permit, the letter from the PGPOA and their attorney, and why landlords would say no to our request for tenant names.

Mr. Rosenbaum clarified that the fine is \$1,000/day and asked whether the City had continued to levy the fine on a daily basis in the past. Mr. Ryan said the City's goal is compliance, not to pile on fines. He asked if there is any conceivable way that as a result of this ordinance students could be put out on the street. Mr. Somers said the City has the ability to revoke a permit but not to evict tenants. He asked for examples of what could be considered a nuisance. Mr. Ryan said that is the section of the code they site for violations of the County, state or health department laws about large gatherings. Mr. Rosenbaum is uneasy about how broadly this is written. Ms. Ferguson gave examples of how this section might be used. She added that no one's aim is to go to court and issue fines. Mr. Rosenbaum asked if there is anything that prevents a landlord from passing a fine on to renters. Ms. Ferguson said the City doesn't give landlord-tenant advice. He asked how the decision was made to handle as an Emergency Ordinance. Mayor Wojahn said because there is an ongoing pandemic and every weekend there are landlords who are not willing to comply with basic requirements to protect the health and safety of College Park residents, and every day that ticks by, more people are put at risk. Mr. Ryan added that we have advised major stakeholders that this is being considered tonight so they have a chance to speak.

Councilmember Day asked if there is any plan to sunset the increased fine after the pandemic? Ms. Ferguson said the law hasn't been drafted so that it would sunset. He asked how we are determining whether a house is overcrowded – by square footage or by zoning? The square

footage determines capacity limits during the pandemic; zoning determines occupancy limits. Are we including all rental properties, not just single family? Yes, all rentals.

A Motion Was Made By Councilmember Rigg And Seconded By Councilmember Brennan To Amend Section 110-2, "Penalties," To Reflect The Higher Amounts Shown In The Council Packet For The Period Of Time In Which A Declared Emergency Is In Effect In The City Of College Park Related To The COVID Pandemic.

Councilmember Rigg said this is a time that we need to step up in an extraordinary way. It is incumbent upon us as policy makers to provide our staff with the tools they need for proper contact tracing. He can't understand why our landlord community would not want to work with us on this.

[10:30 p.m. - Motion to extend meeting to 11:00 - Rigg/Mitchell 8-0]

Comments from the audience:

Carlo Colella, UMD VP for Administration and Finance: In this public health context, the University fully supports the proposed changes regarding providing tenant names. It is important to our partnership; we are looking for compliance. The current tactics have not been sufficient. Early contract tracing is critical to mitigating the spread of this virus. He is pleased to hear that there is no intention to evict tenants.

Del. Joseline Peña Melnyk, District 21, speaking on behalf of the entire 21st Delegation:

They are in strong support of this emergency ordinance. Our community must work together to safeguard public health; the landlords must cooperate. She cited pandemic statistics.

Sen. Jim Rosapepe, District 21: To have landlords intentionally disobey the law and put their own tenants and neighbors in danger is morally obtuse and abominable. What kind of message does it send if half of the landlords are refusing to obey the law? What message would it send to the University if the City didn't step up to the plate to make this law work? The University is willing to hold students accountable for good behavior, and they are asking the City do its part.

County Council Member Dannielle Glaros: She is in support of this motion. We are faced with extraordinary times; this is about the health and safety of our community. The fine was quite low to begin with; a sunset clause could be considered after the pandemic. It took a lot of partnership to get students back to campus and we need to take smart actions to do everything possible where the risk is the greatest to protect the health and safety of our residents. This is the right choice for College Park, the County, and our students.

Vernon Cunningham, prior resident, property owner: Upset to hear his morals questioned. They provide safe healthy housing to college students. The census doesn't ask for names of residents. US Constitution and 4th amendment speak to right of privacy. Tenants are grown adults. He can't control their behavior. He can't sign away the rights of the tenants.

[The Mayor corrected the record and said the Census does indeed ask for the names of residents.]

Lisa Miller, non-resident, president, PGPOA: Wants the safety for all of College Park. She owns the property on Baltimore Avenue that Mr. Ryan referenced. The notice doesn't explain the violation which is why you're not getting the information. The law doesn't say it will sunset after the pandemic. Tenants have the right to live in a house and not be disturbed if there is no violation. The landlord can't control the tenants' action. Their lease says she will not divulge their names. You are asking her to break the lease with the tenants. Step back from this and work together. If you just want to slap fines on them she will take you to court.

Mary King, resident: Why should anyone respect an ordinance if you don't respect it enough to enforce it and have appropriate sanctions.

Richard Biffl, non-resident, property owner: No problem with the ordinance. There is a chronic problem of overcrowding that hasn't been enforced, which is the more serious problem. He doesn't agree with the County's interpretation of the 200 sq. foot rule.

John Hawvermale, non-resident, property owner: Don't cast a wide net about how landlords feel about their tenants. As to providing names, the compromise was that when there was a municipal infraction, they would provide the names. The way the ordinance is written, it says they should provide tenants' names for any reason. He gave an example of how he recently cooperated with Code Enforcement on an MI.

Stephanie Stulich, resident: Refusing to provide tenants' name could prevent contact tracing. Homeowners' names are a matter of public record so why shouldn't the tenants' names be? The 4th amendment does not talk about a persons' identity being kept a secret. There is no point in having an ineffective ordinance; we have ordinance for a reason and something needs to be done to make sure it is followed.

Stuart Adams, resident: During this time we must take extraordinary measures to support actions to keep UMD open, keep businesses open and further public safety.

[11:00 p.m. - Motion to suspend the rules to extend the meeting - Kennedy/Day 8-0]

Mr. Rosenbaum is confused about the purpose of this ordinance: is it to help with contact tracing efforts or to help enforce occupancy requirements? He thinks there should be a sunset period that coincides with the end of the emergency.

Councilmember Rigg said he made the motion that would sunset the fines at the end of the emergency.

Councilmember Day agrees with the sunset.

Councilmember Kabir asked how we will define when the emergency is over. Councilmember Rigg said the motion specifically relates to a local emergency declaration. He asked if the Code should be further amended to address citations specific to the pandemic to make it more clear. The citation could say we need this information for contact tracing or for reasons related to the pandemic. Ms. Ferguson said this ordinance amends Chapter 110-2, not Chapter 141. Mayor

Wojahn clarified that we don't want to say that the only reason we ask for tenants' names is because of the pandemic. Ms. Ferguson clarified that the City emergency would be terminated by City resolution.

A motion was made by Councilmember Kabir to amend the Code to have a two-tier fine structure so that the higher fine is related specifically to a COVID-19 situation.

Councilmember Mitchell asked for clarification. Mayor Wojahn gave examples about overcrowding, parties, large gatherings, and asked whether they would be considered related to the current emergency and would qualify as the lower tier v. higher tier fine. Councilmember Kabir said it could be for any reason.

Councilmember Kabir's motion failed for lack of a second.

Councilmember Mitchell wants to make sure the fine would only be implemented if there is a violation. Mr. Somers said there is no change to Chapter 144. The City is only proposing to increase the fine.

Councilmember Mackie disclosed she has spoken to someone from PGPOA. We are here to pass something tough but is going to be good. We need to talk with our landlords, but this is a good start to protect our people.

The motion carried 8-0.

20-O-10 Introduction of Ordinance 20-O-10, FY '21 Budget Amendment (#1)

Mr. Fields said the items in this budget amendment are mostly COVID related and include revenue reductions, the associated reductions in expenditures, and a \$13K increase for the Special Election. He reviewed the spreadsheet and line items. He stated that a Public Hearing will be held on Tuesday, September 22 at 7:30 p.m. and that this ordinance will require 6 affirmative votes to pass.

Councilmember Kabir asked about the impact it will have to reduce funding to the pavement management plan and the vehicle replacement program and whether another amendment will be needed.

A motion was made by Councilmember Kennedy and seconded by Councilmember Kabir to introduce 20-O-10, an Ordinance to amend the Fiscal Year '21 operating and capital budget of the City of College Park (Amendment #1), and to schedule a public hearing.

Mayor Wojahn repeated the Public Hearing information.

20-CR-02 Charter Resolution Of The Mayor And Council Of The City Of College Park, Amending Article III, "Mayor And Council", § C3-1, "Membership;

Election; Term Of Office”, To Delete The Requirement That Elected Officials Shall Be Registered To Vote For One Year Prior To Their Election And To Add A Requirement That Elected Officials Shall Be Domiciled In The City For At Least One Year Prior To Their Election

A motion was made by Councilmember Kennedy and seconded by Councilmember Kabir to introduce 20-CR-02, to amend Article III, “Mayor and Council”, §C3-1, “Membership; Election; Term of Office”, to delete the requirement that a candidate for City elected office be a registered voter for at least one year prior to election and to substitute the requirement that a candidate shall have been domiciled in the City for at least one year prior to the election, to clarify that a candidate for Council member must be a resident of their respective district at the time of qualification, to authorize the Supervisors of Elections to verify the requirements of age, citizenship and domicile to be a candidate, and to make conforming changes.

Councilmember Kennedy said the Public Hearing will be held on Tuesday, October 13.

General Comments:

K. Suarez – Asked about the Zone 4A parking permits on Cherokee Street. The Owners are in need of a long-term solution for the lack of parking that was part of Lennar’s purchase of this property. We cannot park on the street in front of the homes that we own.

Mayor Wojahn explained the Council action taken during the Consent Agenda.

ADJOURN: A motion was made by Councilmember Rigg and seconded by Councilmember Kabir to adjourn the Regular meeting. The Mayor announced there would not be a Closed Session tonight. With a vote of 8-0, the meeting was adjourned at 11:33 p.m.

The Mayor reminded everyone about the Strategic Planning Session on Saturday at 8:00 a.m. at The Hotel.

Janeen S. Miller
City Clerk

Date
Approved