

STATE OF KANSAS)
WYANDOTTE COUNTY)) SS
CITY OF KANSAS CITY, KS)

PLANNING & ZONING SESSION
THURSDAY, MARCH 25, 2010

The Unified Government Commission of Wyandotte County/Kansas City, Kansas, met in regular session Thursday, March 25, 2010, with eleven members present: Holland, Commissioner At-Large First District; Mendez, Commissioner At-Large Second District; Barnes, Commissioner First District; Miller, Commissioner Second District; Murguia, Commissioner Third District; Mitchell, Commissioner Fourth District; Kane, Commissioner Fifth District; Pettey, Commissioner Sixth District; Cooley, Commissioner Seventh District; Ellison, Commissioner Eighth District; and Mayor/CEO Reardon, presiding. The following officials were also in attendance: Dennis Hays, County Administrator; Doug Bach, Deputy County Administrator, Delia York, Assistant Counsel; Bridgette Cobbins, Interim Unified Government Clerk; Robin H. Richardson, Director of Planning; J. Bradley Munford, Planner; Byron Toy, Planner; Janet L. Parker, Administrative Assistant; and Captain Randy Balliett, Sergeant-at-Arms.

MAYOR REARDON called the meeting to order.

ROLL CALL: Kane, Pettey, Cooley, Ellison, Holland, Mendez, Barnes, Miller, Murguia, Mitchell, Reardon.

INVOCATION was given by Commissioner Mark Holland.

THE AGENDA FOR MARCH 25, 2010, was presented. **Mayor Reardon** asked if there were revisions to the agenda. **Bridgette Cobbins, Interim UG Clerk**, stated a blue sheet has been distributed to the Commissioners. Under the Planning & Zoning Non-Consent Agenda, Items 1 and 2 have been withdrawn by the petitioner. They were Master Plan Amendment from Mixed Residential (Prairie-Delaware-Piper Master Plan) to Medium Density Residential (City-Wide Master Plan) and Change of Zone Application #2992 – Shane Danner with Kansas Development, LLC, Change of Zone from R-1 Single Family District to R-5 Apartment District for 224 garden apartment units in 21 buildings at 1342 North 126th Street. A new item was added under the

Non-Planning Agenda which is a resolution authorizing staff to negotiate the final details of the Settlement Agreement with the United States concerning the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).

PRESENTATION:

PRESENTATION OF WIZARDS STADIUM FINAL ARCHITECTURE.

Rob Richardson, Planning Director, introduced Jeff Spear with Populous and Rory O'Connor with Ongal. He stated they would like to make a presentation on the final architecture for the Wizards Stadium. He further stated that the final plans typically do not come before the Unified Government Board of Commissioners. The final plans were approved by the City Planning Commission about two weeks ago, but the staff and applicant thought the Commissioners would want to see the information.

Jeff Spear, Populous, and **Rory O'Connor, Ongal**, appeared to make a presentation to the Commissioners concerning the proposed world class Kansas City Wizards stadium. They showed a PowerPoint presentation to the Commissioners. (NOTE: The presentation is part of the official file in the Urban Planning and Land Use Department.) They also showed the Commissioners the material palette of the different types of materials that will be used for the stadium.

Mayor Reardon asked if there is a mix of benches and seats or is it all seats? **Mr. Spear** stated the majority of the seats are armchair seats similar to those at the Royals Stadium and Arrowhead Stadium. Where the supporters sit, there are benches with backs. The supporter section is in the north stands and a small portion of the south stands. **Mayor Reardon** stated in looking at the drawing, it appears that you can see through the stadium. He asked if the intent is that there will be a mix (of materials) along the wall face? **Mr. Spear** stated that the model represents every condition in the building and it might be a little out-of-date. Mostly the metal fins will go over all the materials near the ground. Wherever there is block, precast, etc. there will be fins. **Mr. O'Connor** stated that each fin is at a different angle. If you are looking straight on at it, it will look more opaque and less translucent. He stated you will not be able to see the game from there. **Mayor Reardon** asked if he is walking down the street and he looks

over, can he see through or is it solid? **Mr. O'Connor** stated yes you can; that is on the north side of the building. You will not be able to watch the game from there. **Mayor Reardon** stated he understands that; he was trying to get a sense visually as you are driving up Village West Parkway if it looks like a solid wall or can you see some depth in it. **Mr. O'Connor** stated at that point, Village West Parkway is the same elevation as the concourse and that is why it is somewhat see-through. **Mayor Reardon** stated he likes that instead of a solid wall up Village West Parkway and was hoping that would be the case. **Mr. Spear** showed the material that will be used and it can be seen through. The fins are made out of similar materials and some parts are glass and some are solid.

Action: No action required.

Bridgette Cobbins, Interim UG Clerk, asked if any members of the Commission wished to disclose any contacts with proponents or opponents. **Commissioner Pettey** stated she had contact with proponents with regard to the sign amendment. **Mayor Reardon** stated he had contact with the applicant for #SP-2010-5.

Mayor Reardon asked if there were any set-asides on the Consent Agenda. **Commissioner Pettey** requested to set aside the Sign Amendment request.

Action: **Commissioner Cooley made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Ellison, to approve the Consent Agenda.** Roll call was taken and there were ten "Ayes," Kane, Pettey, Cooley, Ellison, Holland, Mendez, Barnes, Miller, Murguia, Mitchell.

PLANNING & ZONING CONSENT AGENDA

SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPLICATIONS:

ITEM NO. 1 – 080809...SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION #SP-2010-4 – JUNE BRODERSON

SYNOPSIS: Renewal of a special use permit (#SP-2010-4) for a kennel for three (3) dogs at 2809 South 54th Street. June Broderon is requesting renewal of a special use permit for a

kennel to keep 3 dogs. Ms. Broderon has two Bassett hounds and one Dachshund. The Planning Commission voted 8 to 0 to recommend approval of Special Use Permit Application #SP-2010-4, subject to:

Urban Planning and Land Use Comments:

Below are the stipulations to the previous special use approval. Staff requested a letter and pictures from the applicant that gives us a progress report on how she has complied with these stipulations over the past two (2) years. The applicant's response letter and pictures can be found at the end of this report.

1. The applicant shall keep the fence properly maintained to keep the dogs from getting out.
2. The number of dogs living on the premises shall never be over three (3). Over time, the number of dogs shall be reduced until the legal limit of 2 is met.
3. Two (2) year approval period.
4. All dogs must be supervised in yard or inside home.
5. Clean yard regularly to avoid odor problems.

Based on the letter provided by the applicant and staff's visit to the property, we conclude that the applicant has complied with all of the stipulation of the prior approval. Staff recommends approval for a two-year period of time with stipulations 1-5 listed above.

Action: Commissioner Cooley made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Ellison, to approve Special Use Permit Application #SP-2010-4 subject to the stipulations. Roll call was taken and there were ten "Ayes," Kane, Pettey, Cooley, Ellison, Holland, Mendez, Barnes, Miller, Murguia, Mitchell.

ITEM NO. 2 – 100052... #SP-2010-5 – RORY O'CONNOR WITH KANSAS UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT LLC

SYNOPSIS: Special use permit for a temporary construction trailer in the Nebraska Furniture Mart parking lot at 1699 Village West Parkway. This is a special use permit for a temporary trailer. To facilitate construction of the stadium, staff permitted the trailer to be placed in advance of approval at the applicant's risk. If this is not approved, the trailer will be removed. The Planning Commission voted 8 to 0 to recommend approval of Special Use Permit Application #SP-2010-5, subject to:

Urban Planning and Land Use Comments:

1. This use should be approved for a period of no more than two (2) years or until the multi-purpose stadium is completed, whichever is sooner.

Public Works Comments:

A. Items that require plan revision or additional documentation before engineering can recommend approval:

- 1) None

B. Items that are conditions of approval (stipulations):

- 1) Provide details regarding sanitary sewer service.

C. Comments that are not critical to engineering's recommendations for this specific submittal, but may be helpful in preparing future documents:

- 1) None

Action: Commissioner Cooley made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Ellison, to approve Special Use Permit Application #SP-2010-5 subject to the stipulations. Roll call was taken and there were ten "Ayes," Kane, Pettey, Cooley, Ellison, Holland, Mendez, Barnes, Miller, Murguia, Mitchell.

PLAN REVIEW APPLICATION:

ITEM NO. 1 – 100055...PLAN REVIEW APPLICATION #PR-2010-10 – HARLAND RUSSELL WITH GBS, INC.

SYNOPSIS: Preliminary plan review for a long-term acute care hospital with forty (40) beds at 1821 North 90th Street. Dan Blaker with Select Hospital is requesting approval of a 34,212 square foot, 40 bed, long-term acute care hospital. The Planning Commission voted 8 to 0 to recommend approval of Plan Review Application #PR-2010-10, subject to: NOTE: the comments below were created during the review of the applicant's original plan submittal. Staff and the applicant are working towards solution to all of these issues. If these issues are not resolved by the time of the March 8th Planning Commission meeting, staff is recommending a continuation for one (1) month. Staff met with the applicant on March 3, 2010. Satisfactory progress is being made on the three (3) critical items of storm shelter, architecture and rooftop

equipment screening so that the application can move forward and resolve the remaining issues at final plan.

Urban Planning and Land Use Comments:

Architecture:

The architecture for this building is good, but there are some aspects that need to be improved upon. These aspects deal with the amount of masonry used on the building, breaking up the façade of the building, and creating details in the building that brings this large building down to the pedestrian scale.

Amount of masonry

Historically, planning staff has worked with medical facilities to increase the amount of masonry materials used on these buildings. In recent cases, plans were approved for buildings that have as much as 40 to 50 percent masonry on all façades. Staff would like to work with the applicant to achieve these same results on this site.

Massing

The massing of the building needs to be improved. A building of this size should have articulation in several different areas. Currently, the use of articulation is minimal at best. The only places where they are used are in the areas where the building branches off to another wing. These major articulated areas are great, but some mid and minor articulations are needed as well. Staff recommends that stone columns or stone walls are used as mid-sized bump outs. These bump outs should be around 18 to 24 inches deep. The vertical columns would also break up and add demission to the stone wainscot.

Rooftop screening

Historically, staff has not supported the use of individual rooftop screening. Staff recommends that all roof mounted equipment is screened by the parapet of the building.

Pedestrian friendly feature

Pedestrian friendly feature need to be added along the front of the building. Some features such as awnings, trellises or special lighting could be added to enhance theses areas and bring the building down to the pedestrian scale.

There are a number of ways that have not been mentioned in this report that can accomplish the same goals. Staff is open to solutions the applicant may have that achieve the same intent of what has been listed.

Landscaping:

The minimum caliper for trees in new developments is 2". Staff stipulates that trees on the plan are planted with 2" calipers. To create a sense of arrival, staff believes that the drive that comes off of 90th Street should be lined on both sides with shade trees. There is also a large grass peninsula area between the two parking fields north of the building. Staff is recommending that trees are added on the east side of that area as well.

Storm Protection

Storm protection need to be provided for the patients that will be staying in this building. Staff is requesting that those areas be identified. Whatever area used must meet the FEMA standard for storm protection.

Signs

Signs are approved under a separate process. If approved, staff stipulates that only detached sign allowed shall be a monument sign.

Trash and Bulk Storage Area

The trash enclosure and screen wall for the bulk storage area shall be constructed from the same materials as the building. These areas should take into account the volume of trash generated from this building and the circulation pattern of the vehicles that will pick it up.

Retaining walls

Staff is requesting to know the materials used to build the retaining walls.

Parking

Parking for a use such as this is 5 spaces per 1000 square feet of building area. We are aware that the applicant intends to share parking with the main hospital. In order to make sure that adequate parking is provided, staff is asking for a chart that gives the square footage of the hospital, the square footage of the proposed building, and the total number of parking spaces provided for the campus.

Public Works Comments:

A) Items that require plan revision or additional documentation before engineering can recommend approval:

- 1) None

B) Items that are conditions of approval (stipulations):

1) Storm water treatment will be required.

C) Comments that are not critical to engineering's recommendations for this specific submittal, but may be helpful in preparing future documents:

1) None

Action: Commissioner Cooley made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Ellison, to approve Plan Review Application #PR-2010-10 subject to the stipulations.

Roll call was taken and there were ten "Ayes," Kane, Pettey, Cooley, Ellison, Holland, Mendez, Barnes, Miller, Murguia, Mitchell.

MISCELLANEOUS – PLANNING AND ZONING

ITEM NO. 1 – 100058...SIGN AMENDMENT

SYNOPSIS: Consideration of certain amendments to Chapter 27-726(7), Planning and Development of the Kansas City, Kansas Code of Ordinances, generally concerning a zoning text amendment to allow electronic message centers. This request comes forward at the direction of the Neighborhood and Community Development Standing Committee, in response to the concerns of the Oak Grove Baptist Church. At the September 28, 2009 standing committee meeting, church representatives requested assistance to erect a LED sign (electronic message center) on their property located at 5500 Woodend Avenue. This request was preceded by a denial of a sign variance by the Board of Zoning Appeals on September 8, 2009. The Neighborhood and Community Development Standing Committee responded by directing staff to explore revisions to the sign code that would allow churches on major streets to have electronic message centers. The Planning Commission voted 8 to 0 to recommend denial of this Sign Amendment.

Commissioner Pettey stated several people from the Oak Grove Baptist Church are present this evening and Russ Clark is going to come forward and make comments.

Russ Clark, 223 South 74th Street, Kansas City, Kansas and Chairman of the Sign Committee for Oak Grove Baptist Church and Kansas City, Kansas Christian School at 5500 Woodend Avenue, appeared concerning this amendment. He read the following statement into the record.

March 25, 2010

“In November of 2008, our Pastor asked me to head up and form a committee to begin the process of what sign would be good for Oak Grove. In November and December, the committee met a number of times and decided that the manual, changeable copy sign was old technology and the computer driven LED sign was the best use of our money. Discussions with Stewart Sign Company, Sarasota, Florida, produced the design that in the spring of 2009 I took to the Planning Department twice in order to get a permit and it seemed we could only be able to get a permit for a sign that displayed time and temperature and that is not the message that we want to reach our Turner community with. In early 2009 the installing company, Infinity Signs of Independence, made application for a permit on behalf of Oak Grove. Three weeks later the permit was denied because we did not meet the current codes. I was advised that our next recourse was to file an appeal. In August I spent many hours meeting neighborhood families and requesting their signatures on a petition in favor of the sign. The church family did a petition at the same time. On September 8, 2009, the owner of Infinity Signs and one staff member, Pastor Dennis Thompson, and I appeared before the Board of Zoning Appeals. We presented the petitions and many pictures of like signs already installed in our city. Our appeal was denied. I was encouraged by our Turner Commissioner Pat Pettey to meet with the Neighborhood and Community Development Committee to request help in getting the sign. On September 28th the owner of Infinity Signs, Pastor Thompson, and I met with the Neighborhood and Community Development Committee which was very receptive to our plight. The Planning Department staff admitted that over 50% of the signs in the city are illegal and the committee directed the Planning Department to have a new policy drawn up by the February 2010 meeting and they asked us to be patient. On February 8, 2010, Planner Brad Munford reported on the progress of this code amendment and said that one would be ready for the March 8th meeting. At the March 8th meeting the amendment was presented to the Planning Commission by the Planning staff with a recommendation for denial, which they did. I was encouraged to begin the process of a special use permit. Right now, that is what we are doing. We are working with Rob Richardson in seeing if we can secure that special use permit. I would like to finish by saying that we are committed to doing what is right according to codes and city policies and we are, of course, patient. We have been going at this for a long time and we are still working at it.

March 25, 2010

Commissioner Ellison asked what the reason was for denial of this particular sign. **Mr. Richardson** stated that there have been three (3) of these signs approved by the Board of Zoning Appeals. The basis of that decision was because they were adjacent to The Legends which has a special use permit for special signage and they were for banks on Parallel Parkway. The Board of Zoning Appeals did not feel that this particular case met the criteria of the statutory requirements. **Commissioner Ellison** asked if there are any of these types of signs at any other church in the Wyandotte County area. **Mr. Richardson** stated the staff has not issued a permit for a sign permit for a church. He stated that there is a size issue here. There may be a smaller one somewhere, but there has not been a permit issued for one of this size.

Commissioner Pettey stated she has had a discussion with Mr. Clark and the church understands what the staff has brought forward is a result of looking at our ordinance and ordinances from surrounding areas and the staff's recommendation is a denial of changing the ordinance so that their request would be a legal request; is that correct? **Mr. Richardson** stated he has been in the process of talking with them about a special use permit. They can get a special use permit for signage but they have to meet certain criteria. There has to be a venue for 1,000 people or have a regional entertainment aspect to the facility to be able to achieve that. Mr. Clark is working on making sure that they meet one of those two criteria to apply for a special use permit. **Commissioner Pettey** asked if that is what Mr. Clark was referring to when he said he had been working with Rob and Brad to provide that information to prove that they meet the criteria for a special use permit. **Mr. Richardson** stated yes. **Commissioner Pettey** asked how much will they have to pay for the special use permit. **Mr. Richardson** stated the fee is \$1,100 to \$1,300 for the special use permit as it is calculated by acreage. He stated that Mr. Clark is aware of that. **Commissioner Pettey** stated that her concern with the issue is that, and she understands the dilemma the city and Planning staff is in when it comes to signage. Within one-quarter mile from this church there is a digital sign on school property that they know did not get a permit when the new Turner High School was built. Within one-half mile at the middle school there is a digital sign. It does seem to be, as Mr. Clark referred to, an acceptable technology. She asked if it appears to staff that others are making decisions to put up signs and waiting to see whether or not they can be approved or whether the city is going after them. **Mr. Richardson** stated that a lot of people are not aware of the process and go ahead and do it.

Commissioner Pettey stated that it is good technology and a good way to get information out so they go ahead and proceed. **Mr. Richardson** stated yes. If they had a sign before, they do not understand that there are regulations. **Commissioner Pettey** stated that Oak Grove Baptist Church has started this process and they have made the decision that they want to work within the laws; is that correct? **Mr. Richardson** stated yes, and the staff appreciates that.

Commissioner Mendez asked who filed this sign amendment. **Mr. Richardson** stated the standing committee directed the staff to prepare an amendment so the staff prepared and submitted it. At the standing committee meeting it seemed like a good idea but when the staff started researching it and realized that it would have to be made generally applicable and not just to churches, it is a different situation and that is why the staff has recommended denial as stated in the report. **Commissioner Mendez** asked, no one paid any money for the filing of this amendment? **Mr. Richardson** stated no. Their fee for the Board of Zoning appeals was \$100 or \$200. **Commissioner Mendez** stated he is concerned about the \$1,000 special use permit fee that they will have to pay as they are trying to do things right and he thinks that they are going to pursue a special use permit; is that correct? **Mr. Richardson** stated yes.

Commissioner Holland stated that on page 12 of the staff report, it shows two (2) examples: a middle school with a changeable sign on the left and on the right a digital sign. Would it be permissible to have a LED sign on the left that had text that did not change, did not show any movement or video and just showed the text, and rather than changing the letters manually, you would change the letters on a computer and save a trip out in the cold? The sign on the left is lit from behind and the only difference in the LED is how it is lit. Having a static lit sign is legal, but having it lit by LED is not legal. **Mr. Richardson** stated the distinction at the bottom of the page is under changeable message sign and if you can change the message, no matter how you do it, that is where the restriction applies. The changeable area counts double the sign face area and that is where the size issue comes in. If you imagine that the signs at the top of the page are the same size, the middle school sign without changeable message, under the code, could be about 25% larger than it is. If the whole sign was LED or changeable sign, it would only be about two-thirds of the size of the sign there. When you introduce the changeable face, the sign code reduces the area that you can have. If you are going to invest in a video board, it does not

make sense, is what he has been told. That has been the argument that everyone has used that has approached him with a request. It does make sense to get one if you cannot have a big electronic sign.

Commissioner Holland stated that he can see reasons why the city does not want flashing signs on the roadways because in his mind they create a hazard. If a sign is flashing, it is distracting and he presumes that is why the Kansas City, Missouri ordinance, for instance, limits how often signs can change. He stated that the sign at his church, if changed more than once a week, would be a hassle because you have to go out there and pull the letters off. If it were electronic, it does not seem that it would be any more of a nuisance because it is backlit already. **Mr. Richardson** stated with the electronic signs, there are a lot of issues and even the people who have been approved for the signs are not complying with the restrictions that were put on them by the Board of Zoning Appeals. The signs are changing more often than they are supposed to and they are flashing and enforcement is a major issue. He stated that Sonic controls all its signs nationally from a single center and the local owner cannot control that. When this gets into the broader commercial spectrum, enforcement would be impossible. **Commissioner Holland** stated that Wal-Greens at 78th and State Avenue has a LED sign. **Mr. Richardson** stated yes, and it meets the percentage requirement of doubling the sign face area, calculation for the LED portion, and it meets the sign code. The one at 29th and State Avenue does as well. Both of them fail to meet the sign code because the current code only allows you to change those twice a day and they change almost every four (4) seconds. **Commissioner Holland** stated theoretically if all you did was put a message up every day and did not change it, it would be legal. **Mr. Richardson** stated yes.

Commissioner Holland asked, someone can have an electronic sign, it just has to be smaller than a regular sign and it cannot flash? **Mr. Richardson** stated yes.

Commissioner Cooley asked when the appeal was filed, was the grounds for the appeal the size of the sign or the fact that it was flashing? **Mr. Richardson** stated there were two components; one was the size which was the primary issue. There are five criteria, and under history on page 2 it gives the five conditions and the staff's opinion of what those criteria were and the Board

acted on that recommendation. **Commissioner Cooley** asked based on the size, was the variance requested a substantial amount in difference of size or was it close? When you go to the Board of Zoning Appeals, you cannot change the use but some of the restrictions within the use. If you are asking for a special use permit, the special use permit has to allow that type of sign under certain conditions. Is their application for a special use permit still within the parameters of ordinance? **Mr. Richardson** stated the special use permit basically allows you to rewrite the sign code for that area.

Ms. Norma Bolt, 5127 Lakewood, stated she is close to the church. It is important to note that the church's front yard is the size of a football field and the lot next to them is the size of a football field. She stated that it is double lanes outside the church. It is two separate roads and she feels that is an important note.

Mr. Clark stated he is opposed to the amendment to the sign ordinance because they do not want State Avenue, Parallel Parkway, Leavenworth Road, etc. to become a Las Vegas. They are not in favor of the ordinance changing the general parameters so that anyone can be allowed to get a sign under a change in the code. **Mayor Reardon** asked if their intent is to go forward with a special use permit. **Mr. Clark** stated yes.

Action: **Commissioner Mendez made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Cooley, to uphold the Planning Commission's recommendation and deny the Sign Amendment.** Roll call was taken and there were ten "Ayes," Kane, Pettey, Cooley, Ellison, Holland, Mendez, Barnes, Miller, Murguia, Mitchell.

PLANNING AND ZONING NON-CONSENT AGENDA

CHANGE OF ZONE APPLICATION

ITEM NO. 1 – MASTER PLAN AMENDMENT from Mixed Residential (Prairie-Delaware-Piper Master Plan) to Medium Density Residential (City-Wide Master Plan) in conjunction with Change of Zone Application #2992.

Action: **Withdrawn by petitioner**

ITEM NO. 2 – 100051...CHANGE OF ZONE PETITION #2992 – SHANE DANNER WITH KANSAS DEVELOPMENT, LLC

SYNOPSIS: Change of Zone from R-1 Single Family District to R-5 Apartment District for 224 garden apartment units in 21 buildings at 1342 North 126th Street.

Action: **Withdrawn by petitioner**

NON-PLANNING AGENDA

ITEM NO. 1 – 100065...RESOLUTION

SYNOPSIS: Authorizing staff to negotiate the final details of the Settlement Agreement with the United States concerning the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). The agreement requires the UG to take remedial actions in the following area: general communications, 9-1-1, law enforcement, employment, polling places, emergency management, sidewalks, web-based services and programs, and facilities. The UG is required to make numerous modifications to facilities during the next three (3) years. In addition, within ten (10) years, the UG is required to install curb ramps adjacent to all streets that have been resurfaced since January 26, 1992.

Action: **RESOLUTION NO. R-20-10**, “A resolution that staff is authorized to negotiate final details of the Settlement Agreement between the United States of America and the Unified Government of Wyandotte County/Kansas City, Kansas under the Americans with Disabilities Act, DJ 204-29-136 and that the Mayor/CEO is authorized and directed to execute the Settlement Agreement in substantially its present form in the name of the Unified Government of Wyandotte County/Kansas City, Kansas.” **Commissioner Miller made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Mendez, to adopt the resolution.** Roll call was taken and there were ten “Ayes,” Kane, Pettey, Cooley, Ellison, Holland, Mendez, Barnes, Miller, Murguia, Mitchell.

MAYOR REARDONADJOURNED

THE MEETING AT 7:47 P.M.

Bridgette Cobbins
Interim Unified Government Clerk