

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
AMES CONFERENCE BOARD AND
REGULAR MEETING OF THE AMES CITY COUNCIL**

AMES, IOWA

FEBRUARY 24, 2015

REGULAR MEETING OF THE AMES CONFERENCE BOARD

The regular meeting of the Ames Conference Board was called to order by Chair Ann Campbell at 6:30 p.m. on February 24, 2015. Present from the Ames City Council were Gloria Betcher, Amber Corrieri, Tim Gartin, Matthew Goodman, and Peter Orazem. Council Member Chris Nelson was absent. Story County Board of Supervisors present were Paul Toot and Rick Sanders. Representing the Ames School Board were Jane Acker and Bill Talbot. Gilbert and United Community School Districts were not represented.

MINUTES OF JANUARY 27, 2015, MEETING OF THE CONFERENCE BOARD: Moved by Sanders, seconded by Betcher, to approve the Minutes of the January 27, 2015, meeting of the Ames Conference Board.

Vote on Motion: 3-0. Motion declared carried unanimously.

APPOINTMENT TO BOARD OF REVIEW: Moved by Gartin, seconded by Sanders, to approve the reappointment of Tom Jackson to the Board of Review.

Vote on Motion: 3-0. Motion declared carried unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARING ON PROPOSED FY 2015/16 BUDGET FOR CITY ASSESSOR'S OFFICE: Chair Campbell opened the hearing. After no one came forward wishing to speak, the hearing was closed.

Moved by Sanders, seconded by Corrieri, to adopt the FY 2015/16 budget for the Ames City Assessor's Office.

Vote on Motion: 3-0. Motion declared carried unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT: Moved by Toot, seconded by Goodman, to adjourn the Ames Conference Board meeting at 6:34 p.m.

Vote on Motion: 3-0. Motion declared carried unanimously.

REGULAR MEETING OF THE AMES CITY COUNCIL

The Regular Meeting of the Ames City Council was called to order by Mayor Ann Campbell at 6:36 p.m. on February 24, 2015, in the City Council Chambers in City Hall, 515 Clark Avenue. Present from the Ames City Council were Gloria Betcher, Amber Corrieri, Tim Gartin, Matthew Goodman, and Peter Orazem. *Ex officio* Member Lissandra Villa was also present. Council Member Chris Nelson arrived at 6:46 p.m.

CONSENT AGENDA: Council Member Betcher asked that Item No. 2 (Regular Meeting of the City Council of February 10, 2015, and Special Meeting of February 17, 2015) be pulled for separate discussion. Council Member Goodman requested that Item No. 8 (Requests from Main Street Cultural District for "Firefly Country Night") be pulled and discussed separately.

Moved by Goodman, seconded by Corrieri, to approve the following items on the Consent Agenda:

1. Motion approving payment of claims
2. Motion approving Report of Contract Change Orders for February 1-15, 2015

3. Motion approving renewal of the following Beer Permits, Wine Permits, and Liquor Licenses:
 - a. Class E Liquor, C Beer, and B Wine – Wal-Mart Supercenter #4256, 534 South Duff Avenue
 - b. Class C Liquor & Outdoor Service – Buffalo Wild Wings, 400 South Duff Avenue
 - c. Special Class C Liquor & Outdoor Service – Stomping Grounds, 303 Welch Avenue, #101
 - d. Class C Beer & B Native Wine – Casey’s General Store #2905, 3612 Stange Road
4. Motion approving 5-day (March 25-29) Special Class C Liquor License for Rotary Club of Ames at Gateway Hotel, 2100 Green Hills Drive
5. Motion approving new Class C Liquor License for Hy-Vee Market Café, 3800 Lincoln Way
6. Motion approving Artwork Acquisition and Deaccession Policies as recommended by Public Art Commission
7. RESOLUTION NO. 15-088 approving Lease extensions with Iowa State University for extension of park land leases
8. RESOLUTION NO. 15-089 approving Airport Improvements Architectural and Engineering Agreements with Bolton & Menk, Inc.
9. RESOLUTION NO. 15-090 approving submission of application for 2015/16 Governor’s Traffic Safety Bureau Enforcement Grant, and if awarded, authorizing participation by Police Department
10. Water Quality Grant Applications:
 - a. RESOLUTION NO. 15-091 authorizing applications for a Clean Water SRF Water Resource Restoration Sponsored Project and an Iowa Department of Agriculture and Land Stewardship Water Quality Urban Conservation Project
 - b. Motion designating Municipal Engineer Tracy Warner as authorized representative to sign Grant applications
11. RESOLUTION NO. 15-092 approving purchase agreement with Story County Habitat for Humanity for property located at 1109 Roosevelt Avenue
12. RESOLUTION NO. 15-093 approving contract with NOVA Bus of Plattsburgh, New York, for purchase of four 60' articulated buses in an amount not to exceed \$3,000,000
13. RESOLUTION NO. 15-094 approving preliminary plans and specifications for 2011/12 and 2012/13 Retaining Wall Reconstruction Program; setting March 18, 2015, as bid due date and March 24, 2015, as date of public hearing
14. RESOLUTION NO. 15-095 approving preliminary plans and specifications for WPC Biosolids Storage Tank; setting March 25, 2015, as bid due date and April 14, 2015, as date of public hearing
15. RESOLUTION NO. 15-096 approving preliminary plans and specifications for WPC Lighting Replacement Project; setting March 25, 2015, as bid due date and April 14, 2015, as date of public hearing
16. RESOLUTION NO. 15-097 awarding contract to Vermeer Sales and Service of Pella, Iowa, in the amount of \$33,448 for 18-inch capacity Wood Chipper
17. RESOLUTION NO. 15-098 authorizing revisions to Non-Domestic Waste Pretreatment Program for facilities performing continuous pH monitoring
18. RESOLUTION NO. 15-099 approving contract and bond for 2014/15 Collector Street Pavement Improvements (West Street and Woodland Street)
19. RESOLUTION NO. 15-100 approving contract and bond for 2014/15 Concrete Pavement Improvements (Hayward Avenue)
20. RESOLUTION NO. 15-101 approving contract and bond for 2014/15 CyRide Route Pavement Improvements (24th Street and Bloomington Road)
21. RESOLUTION NO. 15-102 accepting completion of WPC Blower Replacement Project
22. RESOLUTION NO. 15-103 accepting partial completion and reducing financial security being held for Northridge Heights Subdivision, 17th Addition
23. RESOLUTION NO. 15-104 accepting partial completion and reducing financial security being

held for Scenic Valley Subdivision, 1st Addition

Roll Call Vote: 5-0. Resolutions/Motions declared adopted/approved unanimously, signed by the Mayor, and hereby made a portion of these Minutes.

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING OF FEBRUARY 10, 2015, AND OF SPECIAL MEETING OF FEBRUARY 17, 2015: Moved by Betcher, seconded by Goodman, to amend the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of February 10, 2015, to reflect that Council Member Orazem, not Council Member Gartin, had voted nay in the 5-1 vote pertaining to the FY 2015/16 Budget allocation to the Ames Historical Society; approve the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of February 10, 2015, as amended; and approve the Minutes of the Special Meeting of February 17, 2015.

Vote on Motion: 5-0. Motion declared carried unanimously.

REQUESTS FROM MAIN STREET CULTURAL DISTRICT (MSCD) FOR “FIREFLY COUNTRY NIGHT” ON MAIN STREET ON JULY 9, 2015: Moved by Corrieri, seconded by Gartin, to approve/adopt the following:

- a. RESOLUTION NO. 15-085 approving closure of 200 block of Main Street from 12:01 a.m. on Thursday, July 9, to 2:00 a.m. on Friday, July 10
- b. RESOLUTION NO. 15-086 approving usage of electricity along Main Street
- c. Motion approving Blanket Temporary Obstruction Permit
- d. Motion approving Blanket Vending License
- e. RESOLUTION NO. 15-087 approving closure of 46 parking spaces on Main Street and 22 parking spaces on Kellogg Avenue

Roll Call Vote: 4-0-1. Voting aye: Betcher, Corrieri, Gartin, Orazem. Voting nay: None. Abstaining due to a Possible Conflict of Interest: Goodman. Resolutions/Motions declared adopted/approved, signed by the Mayor, and hereby made a portion of these Minutes.

PUBLIC FORUM: Darien Woods, 4810 Mortensen Road, Ames, Iowa, introduced herself as Vice-President of and representative for the Iowa State University (ISU) Health Promotion Club. Ms. Wood said that the ISU Health Promotion Club is an organization that works to bring attention to issues impacting public health. She stated that she was present to address the Council on the issue of Electronic Nicotine Delivery Systems (ENDS). Ms. Woods referenced the Smoke Free Air Act, which was enacted by Iowa lawmakers in Spring 2008 to protect members of the general public by prohibiting smoking in all public places. It was designed to protect the health and welfare of the public because it was recognized that chemicals in tobacco smoke are dangerous not only to those who inhale it directly, but also to those around them. According to Ms. Woods, ENDS do not contain tobacco, but do contain high concentrations of nicotine, which is toxic and addictive. The devices do not emit water vapors. They are very dangerous to children. The results of a survey about ENDS of approximately 600 Ames residents conducted by the ISU Health Promotion Club were shared. It was noted by Ms. Woods that the Iowa State University Government of the Student Body (GSB) had recently voted to support a proposal that would ban ENDS on the ISU Campus. On behalf of the ISU Health Promotion Club, Ms. Woods asked the City Council to join with the GSB and the other 225 U. S. cities in working to create an ordinance that would make all areas a safe place to live and breathe.

Council Member Nelson arrived at 6:46 p.m.

Ashley Sitzman, 5416 Thackeray Drive, Ames; Hope Mills, 2650 Cleveland Drive, Ames; and Missa Watters, 2830 Somerset Drive, Ames, all members of the Ames Mayor’s Youth

Committee, encouraged the City Council to take a preventative stand concerning ENDS by creating a local ordinance that would ban their use in public places. According to Ms. Mills, research on ENDS has indicated that the air vapor that is released from ENDS contains ten of the same cancer-causing chemicals that are released in second-hand tobacco smoke. These chemicals are not only dangerous for adults, but are particularly damaging to the lungs and brains of young children and youth. Ms. Watters stated that 631 Ames High students and staff took the same survey as what was conducted by the ISU Health Promotion Club. The results were similar; most respondents indicated that they did not want to be close to anyone using an ENDS.

There being no one else wishing to speak, the Mayor closed the public hearing.

CHANGE ORDER FOR REDUCTION IN PRICE FOR GAS BURNERS FOR UNIT NO. 8:

Assistant Electric Services Director Brian Trower informed the Council that the original bid came in for 12 burners, but it was determined that nine (9) burners were sufficient. It would not change the contract warranty or performance guarantees. This represents an aggregate savings of \$321,600.

Moved by Goodman, seconded by Corrieri, to adopt RESOLUTION NO. 15-105 approving a Change Order to Alstom for reduction in price due to reduction of natural gas burners for Unit No. 8.

Roll Call Vote: 6-0. Resolution declared adopted unanimously, signed by the Mayor, and hereby made a portion of these Minutes.

DISCUSSION OF RESIDENT SATISFACTION SURVEY POLICY QUESTIONS:

Susan Gwiasda, Public Relations Officer, stated that it was time for staff to get with the consultant at ISU to begin the process for the Resident Satisfaction Survey. As part of that Survey, there will be some space available if the Council were to desire to include a couple additional questions. She noted that she was not looking for the actual question, but just the topic, so that she can work with the consultant to craft the question(s). Typically, there is room for two to three questions, depending on how much explanation is necessary for the question. She asked the Council members to share their thoughts on topics.

Ms. Gwiasda informed the Council that she had received some input from the ISU Research Park regarding its expansion. Normally, the Survey does not expand beyond City topics; however, that could be done if the Council so directed.

Council Member Gartin suggested that the public be surveyed as to what they feel if [1] the City is providing adequate bike and multi-use trails (e.g., location, connectivity) and [2] there are areas of unmet needs in the area of social services.

Noting that the Airport Improvements are already in the CIP, Council Member Goodman would like to get the perspective of the community, in general, for this investment. Ms. Gwiasda advised that it could be added as a question included in the CIP portion of the Survey.

At the inquiry of Council Member Betcher, Ms. Gwiasda gave the approximate time line for the Survey. The analysis will come back to the Council in early fall.

Council Member Betcher said that she was interested in learning how people feel about limiting

rental properties in low-density neighborhoods; however, she is not sure if the timing of the Survey would work with any discussions that might occur by the Council as it moves forward on that issue. Mayor Campbell noted that the topic was on this meeting's Agenda. Ms. Betcher also wondered if the question about the amenities at the ISU Research Park might be worded in such a way that could actually help the Council address what types of amenities people might expect to see in the City's Southern Annexation. Council Member Corrieri offered that perhaps a similar question could be asked about the Lincoln Way Corridor. Mayor Campbell pointed out that these would also be beneficial as the City begins the process of updating its Land Use Policy Plan. City Manager Steve Schainker inquired as to what the boundaries would be when the Council is referring to the Southern Annexation. Council Member Betcher said she was most interested in whether people feel that, along with residential development going farther south, other types of zoning might need to be considered so as to allow for the providing of certain amenities and uses. In her opinion, the area would be around the ISU Research Park.

Council Member Gartin revisited the bike trails topic, stating that he felt it would be helpful to know if the public thinks that the City is providing adequate opportunities for bike trails and multi-use trails. This would be a helpful data point when the City is working on its Long-Range Transportation Plan. Council Member Orazem commented that there should be more specificity, such as expansion of trails along commuting corridors, e.g., increased use of sharrows on streets; and increased connectivity of trails through the Park system along creeks. Council Member Goodman offered that the Survey ask the respondents to rate existing trail infrastructure, from 1 to 10, for the City's recreational trails; and rate, from 1 to 10, the City's infrastructure for the biking community. Council Member Orazem would also like the Survey to ask respondents to indicate how much they would use the expanded service. Ms. Gwiasda informed the Council that the existing Survey, under Public Works, already requests respondents to rate the adequacy of the bike path system, and under Parks & Rec, asks respondents to rate hard-surface trails and crushed rock trails. At the inquiry of Council Member Goodman, Ms. Gwiasda indicated that a sentence referencing the commuting portion could be added. She clarified that she now had heard two bike questions that the Council would like to be added to the existing Survey.

Council Member Goodman said he liked Council Member Betcher's question about rental housing in low-density neighborhoods. He said that if the Council doesn't make changes, but the Legislators make changes, it would be good to know where the Ames community stands on the idea. Council Member Orazem offered that that would be the type of question where the response may depend on the nature of the regulation. He recommended that the Survey ask if respondents think that limiting the density of rental housing in low-density neighborhoods is desired. If it is no, the Council would have a clear directive. The question would need to be specific enough for the Council to determine what the answer means.

Council Member Orazem asked to revisit the suggestion from Council Member Corrieri that the Survey include questions about land use and zoning in the Lincoln Way Corridor. He commented that this was a good question because it is relevant to the LUPP; that is likely to be the corridor that will have the greatest change in possible intensification of use. Council Member Betcher asked if there would be enough refinement of the question if Lincoln Way would change in increments all the way out to the west to yield any valuable information. Council Member Orazem asked to know what the biggest issue might be, i.e., mixed use, more apartments, more commercial. Discussion ensued over how the question might be worded in order to provide the Council with the information it was seeking. Planning and Housing Department Director Kelly

Diekmann explained the staff's plan for public outreach. He is unsure whether a broad Survey question would be beneficial.

Council Member Goodman encouraged Council to think about what it primarily wants. He would like the space to be used for perspectives that can help guide the Council in the future.

Ms. Gwiasda summarized that she now had possible questions on unmet needs, rental density, and Southern Annexation amenities.

Moved by Goodman, seconded by Betcher, to direct that Susan Gwiasda report back to the Council on final wording for questions focused on human services needs and rental housing limitation.

Council Member Nelson commented that he was not in favor of including the rental density question since the Council had not heard the report by staff, which was later on this Agenda. Voting aye: 2-4. Voting aye: Betcher, Goodman. Voting nay: Corrieri, Gartin, Nelson, Orazem. Motion failed.

Moved by Orazem, seconded by Goodman, to include a question on unmet human services needs.

Vote on Motion: 6-0. Motion declared carried unanimously.

Council Member Orazem revisited the questions on bike and trails. He would like the question to ask respondents if they would use expanded trails. Council Member Goodman noted that CyRide uses a scale in its surveys, and he again suggested that something similar be used. City Manager Schainker said staff would come up with a way to indicate usage.

Moved by Orazem, seconded by Betcher, to include an expanded trails question that indicates intensity of usage by trail type.

Vote on Motion: 6-0. Motion declared carried unanimously.

CITY-OWNED LOTS AT 519- TO 601-6TH STREET: Vanessa Baker-Latimer, Housing Coordinator, noted that as part of the City's 2014/15 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Action Plan, \$324,000 was set aside under the Acquisition/Reuse for Affordable Housing Program. The Program is designed to address increasing the availability and affordability of housing for low- and moderate-income households at 80% or less of the Story County median income limits, which is designed by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Program funds are to be used to purchase in-fill lots (vacant or needing to be redeveloped) or to purchase single-family or multi-family properties that can be rehabilitated for affordable rental or owner-occupied use. According to Ms. Baker-Latimer, staff began researching opportunities to acquire lots or properties that met that objective. In July 2014, the City acquired three properties at 519- and 619-6th Street. The existing structures have now been demolished and the three lots are ready to be redeveloped. The properties total approximately 27,000 square feet. It is zoned Residential Medium Density with a Single-Family Conservation Overlay District.

According to Ms. Baker-Latimer, the Council's input is needed on two issues: (1) Type and Use and (2) Zoning Use before meeting with surrounding neighbors. Staff will bring a Draft RFP to the Council before it is distributed.

Ms. Baker-Latimer reported that staff would like the use of these properties to be for rental housing. She noted that the Impediment Study indicated that rental housing was needed. The data from the CDBG Program also indicated that need. Staff believes these lots would fit that need and give the City an opportunity to increase the availability of rental housing for low- and moderate-income households.

Director Diekmann advised that the site in question has an underlying RM zoning designation with the Single Family Conservation Overlay District (O-SFC). This is the only existing O-SFC District in the City. The underlying RM zoning would allow for up to 13 housing units, subject to meeting development requirements; however, the O-SFC significantly restricts the development due to its limitations on subdivision or consolidation of existing lots. The most likely development result under the O-SFC would be three duplexes for a total of six units. According to Mr. Diekmann, the housing type that would be appropriate would be a row house. However, with the limits in O-SFC, row houses may not be built; therefore, staff is looking for guidance as to whether Council is interested in seeing proposals that would include row houses. In order to facilitate that, the Single-Family Conservation Overlay would have to be removed from these properties. If Council is not interested in row houses, the most likely proposal would be for duplexes on each of the lots (which would equate to six units). With row houses, ten would fit.

Council Member Gartin referenced an issue that had occurred in Iowa City where students were living in units designed for low-income persons. According to Ms. Baker-Latimer, under the regulations of the CDBG Program, the City can add stipulations to indicate that it must be families with children, handicapped or disabled, or elderly and designate what income levels are going to be served. Staff could also look at partnering with the Central Iowa Regional Housing Authority and possibly offering tax credits that would limit it to low- and moderate-income households, not students. Director Diekmann stated that stipulations may be built into the Program that students are not an eligible entity for rental of the units; students are not a protected class under the Fair Housing Act.

According to Mr. Diekmann, if Council is interested in row houses, the RFP would indicate that the City may rezone the site to RM to facilitate that type of development. He reiterated that the level of development would be approximately ten units under RM zoning without the O-SFC overlay.

At the inquiry of Mayor Campbell over removing the overlay, Director Diekmann said any developer would want to know how committed the Council is to getting to higher than six units on the three properties together. The more committed the Council is, the more likely it is that a developer would propose something close to that targeted goal. Staff can initiate the rezoning, but could not have it complete before the RFP is complete.

Director Diekmann stated that the next step was to do outreach to the neighborhood residents to receive their input. Staff would then return to the Council on March 24. If Council wants to initiate the rezoning, it could be started on March 24. Council Member Goodman indicated that he would like to hear back after the public outreach is done by staff before moving forward with an RFP or rezoning.

Ex officio Member Lissandra Villa asked if students would qualify if they were categorized as dependents. Ms. Baker-Latimer advised that the Department of Housing and Urban Development has very defined rules for qualifying students under the Section 8 Program.

Council Member Betcher asked what staff meant in the Council Action Form when it said, “The intent would be for a mix of dwelling units, but to emphasize low-income family-oriented units in the development of the 6th Street site.” Director Diekmann said staff was attempting to indicate that some of the units would be larger to house families; there would be some variety.

Moved by Goodman, seconded by Orazem, to direct staff to reach out to the neighborhood residents on the two issues listed in the Council Action Form, i.e., type and use and zoning, to get their feedback.

Council Member Goodman again commented that he did not want things built in to the RFP until staff received input from the neighborhood. Ms. Baker-Latimer explained that her goal was to ensure that staff reached out to the neighborhood. It might be that that feedback is brought back to the Council on March 24. The input would then be used to draft an RFP, which would be brought back to the Council in April. Director Diekmann explained that, to be competitive for grants, an approved project is necessary. This would be the time line for an unsubsidized project to get started this year or at least be competitive for a grant in the fall for construction in the following spring approximately a year from now.

Council Member Gartin asked Housing Coordinator Baker-Latimer to send the Council additional information on the criteria for the eligibility of applicants for this type of housing.

Vote on Motion: 6-0. Motion declared carried unanimously.

RENTAL CONCENTRATION LIMITS FOR LOW-DENSITY ZONES: Director Diekmann explained that, at the Council meeting held August 26, 2014, it had directed staff to evaluate low-density housing and its use as rental property. It was clarified that the intent of the referral was to have staff present a report describing methods used to limit the concentration of rental properties within certain zoning areas, specifically within the residential low-density zones.

Mr. Diekmann described four approaches for rental concentration limiting regulations, as follows:

1. Apply rental density restrictions in certain zones. Create a new residential zoning district or an overlay zoning district to limit the percentage of rental properties.
2. Separation distance between rentals. This would involve the City Council identifying a minimum distance that rental properties must be from one another. It could be established through a restriction in the Rental Housing Code indicating a minimum separation distance.
3. Annual quota for new rental permits. This concept would be in response to a concern about the overall growth in the number of single-family home rentals, rather than in response to a concern about neighborhood concentration at the block level. The City would identify an annual allocation for new rental units based on factors such as university enrollment, existing housing stock, and development projects underway.

4. Allow neighborhoods to petition for a rental-free zoning overlay. A group of property owners could be permitted to petition the City Council to create a rental restriction overlay district in their neighborhood.

Director Diekmann noted that the four options were different approaches to the issue of rental concentration. If Council believes that there are concerns about rental concentration and wants to further pursue creating an ordinance, Council will need to focus on specific issues and provide direction to staff on how to proceed. After that, staff would further refine a concept, consider additional information that may support a *Code* change, and prepare draft language for Council consideration.

Council Member Orazem indicated that it might be that what the Council is interested in is not rentals per se. He believed what the Council was wanting was to not allow the Low-Density Residential zone to be used for a complex made up of individual units called houses, but are basically design-build units, to be rented by three unrelated individuals. Mr. Orazem said he was somewhat disappointed when staff indicated that it would be a wrong approach to attempt to limit how many combined properties one could have in Low-Density Residential. Director Diekmann clarified that what staff was stating was that such a complex under the control of one legal entity would not work. Council Member Orazem felt that it would be an arbitrary designation of a particular neighborhood where property rights might be taken away from people who presumed that they had because their neighbor was allowed to do something that they are not allowed to do. Mr. Orazem believes that the Council wants to be cautious about removing property rights for residents. He thinks the Council wanted to not allow people to do something in Low Density Residential that it did not think was possible before. According to Mr. Orazem, there are some neighborhoods where the rental properties are the best kept properties, and the owner-occupied ones are not. Another issue voiced by Mr. Orazem was that, in a college town, where some residents go on sabbatical or leave for an extended period of time, if they are not in the “correct” neighborhood, they would not be allowed to rent out their house. That house then would have to stay vacant for that period of time. Mr. Orazem stated that he felt the Council’s objective was to not allow purpose-built residential properties designed as a large combined rental unit.

Council Member Gartin said that he agreed with everything that Council Member Orazem had said. He added that Ames has a serious demand for rental housing, and he sees this as a vehicle that is only going to reduce the amount of rental housing and increase rents. Mr. Gartin indicated his strong reluctance to limiting rental units in single-family zones. Mr. Gartin asked if the Council was expected to provide direction on this. Mayor Campbell noted that the Council had referred this issue to staff to research; and that has now been done.

Mr. Orazem also believes that an unforeseen consequence would be that the City would be artificially raising the value of owner-occupied housing as rentals in some areas. That would actually increase the intensity of rentals in other neighborhoods, presumably farther away from where they would logically be placed. Council Member Betcher disagreed with Council Member Orazem, stating that her intent when making this referral to staff was to have healthy neighborhoods, and healthy neighborhoods are typically more mixed. Owner-occupied housing tends to mean more stable neighborhoods. She does not necessarily see pushing rentals into other neighborhoods as a bad thing. Ms. Betcher pointed out to Mr. Orazem that the ordinance allows short-term rental for various reasons. She referenced information contained in the Council Action Form on what is being done in other cities; perhaps what has been done elsewhere should

be considered. Ms. Betcher indicated that she is not opposed to rental housing in low-density neighborhoods; however, it becomes an issue if many or most of the affordable rentals in neighborhoods are being taken by students. She commented that she is very concerned about what is going on regarding occupancy limits at the Statehouse. If there is an overturning of the ability of localities to zone as they see fit and limit occupancy, the rental houses that Ames already has could see a large growth in population. If that is the case, one of the options proposed by staff might help the City limit the number of people that live in low-density neighborhoods.

Mayor Campbell gave an update on occupancy limits that is being considered by the legislators. She said that there is a great likelihood that the bill will pass and not allow occupancy of rental units to be limited.

Council Member Orazem offered that if there was a value to the option of converting property from owner-occupied to rental property, and then you make it so that your ability to exercise that is going to be limited, you will lock in virtually all existing rentals as rentals in perpetuity. Property owners would not want to risk not renting it out and then losing that option. He commented that if the objective is to limit the number of rental properties, none of the options would work. It is his opinion that the Council's intent was to try to prevent the use of available lots for the purpose of effectively building a very large complex. Mr. Orazem believes that if this passes, it would increase the pressure on existing rentals to get larger. He anticipated that existing rentals would be converting back to owner-occupied because there is a demand for owner-occupied and because they are being out-competed by more modern rental alternatives. According to Mr. Orazem, within a year, Ames will be close to meeting the number of new beds that will be added in terms of the number of new population. Also, for that reason, Mr. Orazem believes that conversion back to owner-occupied would occur.

Council Member Goodman contended that there is no data to support what Mr. Orazem was stating. Mr. Orazem noted that population has been being added at a very rapid rate. He asked how many beds were forecast to come on within the next year. Mr. Goodman commented that Ames has been turning owner-occupied housing into rental housing at an alarming rate for years, and he doesn't see that this would all of a sudden change. Mr. Goodman alleged that the number of revenue streams you can put into a house directly increases the price of property. Mr. Orazem stated that he agreed with that point. Council Member Goodman believes that when a person sees what market rates are for rentals, they will multiply that number by 3. They will then see if that number will cash-flow with insurance and property taxes. If it can, they might make that investment.

Council Member Orazem noted that he does not see this as being about students; it is about independent adults. It was alleged by Mr. Goodman that if the City does nothing, and the legislation being proposed at the state level passes, the number of people living in rental housing will go up 60% overnight. Council Members Nelson and Orazem disagreed, stating that there will be more concentration in some areas and less concentration in others.

Council Member Betcher pointed out that there are ordinances that very specifically target students. The four approaches presented by staff do not do that. She wants to find a way to have rental properties available, but she does not want them to overtake permanent residences.

Ms. Villa commented that a healthy environment is not one that excludes students.

Mr. Goodman said he would like the Council to get options on maintaining the status quo in anticipation that the Legislature passes something that takes away the City's ability to limit occupancy. Assistant City Manager Kindred shared that, if the legislation passes, it would have an effective date of January 1, 2016.

Council Member Orazem said that he wants to know what the City's options are for using the Rental Code to regulate. A second possibility might be to have a mechanism that prevents the consolidation of properties for the purpose of building an apartment "complex" made up of single-family homes. Mr. Orazem reiterated that the total amount of rental dollars will fall (the total value will decrease for rental properties) if the numbers of rental properties increase. Director Diekmann asked if Mr. Orazem was asking if there was a mechanism to control the concentration of ownership of rental units in a geographic area. Council Member Orazem replied that it was. Mr. Orazem reiterated that the regulations should be included in the Rental Code; the Rental Code would be the regulator.

Mayor Campbell noted that some of this is predicated on what occurs in the Legislature; that information will be known soon. In the meantime, the Mayor urged people to contact their legislators to convey their thoughts about this issue.

Council Member Betcher said that she would like to eliminate the option to allow neighborhoods to petition for a rental-free zoning overlay.

RIGHT-OF-WAY INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS: Planner Charlie Kuester recalled that the Council had directed staff on January 28, 2014, to research and prepare amendments to the *Municipal Code* to require the installation of missing infrastructure at the time of site plan review and approval. Amendments were directed to address only commercial, industrial, and medium- and high-density residential development; they are not intended to apply to single-family or two-family homes. According to Mr. Kuester, staff had contacted other cities to see what they require. He shared the information that staff had received.

Mr. Kuester told the Council that staff was seeking direction on three issues to begin preparation of text amendments, as follows:

1. What type of infrastructure should be installed at the time of development by the developer
2. What level of development or redevelopment should trigger the installation of right-of-way improvements
3. What additional changes to standards for infrastructure of sidewalks, shared use paths, street lights should be implemented to improve subdivision regulations and ensure appropriate infrastructure installation

Options under each issue were defined by Mr. Kuester.

According to Mr. Kuester, staff had identified approximately 3,200 properties of all types that lack sidewalks in the City. Of those properties, there are about 400 individual properties in commercial, industrial, and high-density residential districts that are lacking sidewalks. Staff had used the basis of 400 property owners for a mailing inviting participation in an outreach meeting. That meeting was held on February 5, 2015, with 24 members of the public present.

Tony McFarland, 1618 Top-O-Hollow Road, Ames, representing the Ames Rental Association, expressed concerns and questions as they pertain to existing rentals. On behalf of the Association, he asked if the City had conducted any type of survey to determine the desire for sidewalks. He referenced a survey that had been done in 2005 to determine how much sidewalks would be used along Grand Avenue; that survey had indicated that sidewalks were not needed. Mr. McFarland also stated that the Ames Rental Association would be in favor of installing more sidewalks if there was a safety issue. Mr. McFarland recalled that the City Council had decided to abandon the idea due to disinterest. It was asked by Mr. McFarland why it was being brought up again. Mr. Kuester explained what was currently required by the *Municipal Code* and what staff was trying to remedy inconsistency. Mr. McFarland asked what the trigger was that would require the installation of infrastructure. Director Diekmann stated that investment or reinvestment in the area would be the trigger (new development and/or substantial additions). Mr. McFarland commented that it needed to be determined if the City were addressing a real problem or a possible problem.

Council Member Orazem asked if there was a way to assess the relative public good and to determine the priority areas in those areas where there are gaps. Mr. Diekmann stated that none of the possible text amendments in question would proactively require anyone to install infrastructure unless investment or reinvestment in the property was to occur.

Council Member Gartin commented that he would like to start by requiring sidewalks and shared-use paths.

Discussion ensued about deferring the sidewalk requirement versus waiving the requirement. Director Diekmann noted the distinction that if there should never be a sidewalk at a particular location, Council could waive the requirement. The deferral means that, at some point in the future, sidewalks have to be installed. Traditionally, Council does not waive the requirement; it defers it with no expectation of when the sidewalk is actually going to be installed.

Mayor Campbell asked for a motion dealing with Issue 1: What deficient infrastructure should be installed.

Moved by Gartin, seconded by Goodman, to require the installation of sidewalks, shared use paths, street lights, and dedication of needed right-of-way or easements.

Vote on Motion:6-0. Motion declared carried unanimously.

Council Member Corrieri commented that she felt street paving was essential. Director Diekmann replied that the difference is that there is a means of access to the properties now even if it is not paved. However, without sidewalks, there is no pedestrian access. Council Member Goodman recalled former cases that had come before the Council where there are streets with small segments of gravel; the residents want less dust, but don't want to pay thousands of dollars. If all paved streets are desired, it might be most reasonable to have it done if a large investment is being made.

Moved by Corrieri, seconded by Orazem, to amend the motion to include street paving.

Vote on Amendment: 6-0. Motion declared carried unanimously.

Vote on Motion, as Amended: 6-0. Motion declared carried unanimously.

Director Diekmann answered the question posed by Council Member Goodman stating that single-family homes or low-density zoning areas would not be subject to these issues, e.g., if a person constructs an addition to his or her home, a sidewalk would not be triggered.

Mayor Campbell asked for a motion regarding Issue 2: What should trigger the installation of ROW improvements.

Council Member Goodman asked to know the definition of *substantial* when it refers to a building addition. Planner Kuester stated that it could be a 25% increase in floor area or improvements valued at 50% or more of the building. Director Diekmann added that staff is going to work on that substantial threshold; it is not absolute at this time that it is 25% or 50%. He said that what staff needs now is guidance from the Council as to what would trigger the installation of ROW improvements. Staff will also get feedback about the *substantial* threshold when a draft ordinance is created.

Moved by Goodman, seconded by Corrieri, that the installation of right-of-way improvements be triggered by new construction or redevelopment of a principle building and by substantial building addition in square footage or valuation.

Council Member Gartin asked if any of the 24 people attending the outreach meeting had comments about the trigger. Planner Kuester said he did not remember any comments that had been made about that in particular; most people were just concerned about the increased cost of development. Mr. Gartin said he did not want additional requirements to be a deterrent to people improving their property.

Vote on Motion: 6-0. Motion declared carried unanimously.

Direction on Issue 3 by the Council was asked for by Mayor Campbell.

Director Diekmann advised that Issue 3 consists of individual improvement requirements. These would be inserted into the Subdivision Code and into any other improvement ordinance that relates to Issue 1 and Issue 2. Issue 3 would be incremental expansions or enhancements to existing infrastructure standards.

Council Member Betcher asked if it would be possible to ensure that, if a new shared use path or sidewalk were to be required, it match the dimensions of anything that it is next to. She said that she had heard complaints about the width of the shared use path over Squaw Creek; it narrows considerably when it meets the sidewalk farther down Duff. Mr. Diekmann said that because shared use paths were not required, it is just a four-foot sidewalk.

Moved by Goodman, seconded by Orazem, to require street lights on arterial street frontages of a development site and to require new street lights to be LED.

Council Member Corrieri asked staff to address ADA requirements with sidewalks and the current issue with that. Director Diekmann said it becomes an issue when sidewalks are not required on both sides of the street because you have to be able to safely cross the intersection. The width at five feet means that there is not a need for turnaround areas; it is considered adequate. The five-foot width is also more convenient for more than one person walking on

the sidewalk. This presents an issue in industrial areas when sidewalks are only required on one side.

Vote on Motion: 5-1. Voting aye: Betcher, Corrieri, Gartin, Goodman, Orazem. Voting nay: Nelson. Motion declared carried.

Moved by Corrieri, seconded by Betcher, to require sidewalks on both sides of streets in all zoning districts as well as increase them to five feet in width to assist with ADA issues and to have complete streets and connectivity.

Council Member Orazem commented that he did not believe sidewalks should be required on both sides of a street in the Industrial zoning district. If that motion passes, it would mean that there would be more sidewalks leading to nowhere. Mr. Diekmann said that is the complete street argument: "Are you going to foster use by installing infrastructure." Mr. Orazem said that he would rather have one complete sidewalk on one side of the street than two incomplete sidewalks on both sides of the street. He suggested that, if there is no chance that a sidewalk will ever be complete in an area, in lieu of building a sidewalk in front of one property, the owner would help fill in some of the orphan stretches of sidewalk on a priority path. To him, that would do more public good than a stretch of sidewalk with nothing on either side of it.

Vote on Motion: 3-3. Voting aye: Betcher, Corrieri, Goodman. Voting nay: Gartin, Nelson, Orazem. Mayor Campbell voted aye to break the tie. Motion declared carried.

The meeting recessed at 10:10 p.m. and reconvened at 10:10 p.m.

HEARING ON REZONING PROPERTY AT 710 SOUTH DUFF AVENUE: Planner Kuester advised that U-Haul had acquired the property at 710 South Duff Avenue. The Planning and Zoning Commission, at its meeting held on January 21, 2015, had recommended approval by a 5-1 vote. At the time of site plan approval, legal access to the site must be acquired.

Mayor Campbell opened the public hearing.

Randy Dixon, President of U-Haul Company of Iowa, was present. After being questioned by Council Member Gartin, Mr. Dixon advised that legal access to the property will probably be gained via the existing easement.

Harry Wolf, 3101 Ingersoll, Des Moines, Iowa, said he was a representative of Buyers Realty, which manages property for Boston Commons. Mr. Wolf referenced the letter from the Hogan law Office be made part of the record.

No one else came forward to speak, and the Mayor closed the hearing.

Moved by Goodman, seconded by Nelson, to pass on first reading an ordinance rezoning property at 710 South Duff Avenue from Agricultural (A) to Highway-Oriented Commercial (HOC).

Roll Call Vote: 6-0. Motion declared carried unanimously.

HEARING ON VACATION OF STORM WATER RETENTION EASEMENT IN PATIO HOMES WEST: Civil Engineer Eric Cowles said staff had recommended that a minimum

protective elevation three feet above the 100-year ponding elevation be established to protect new openings. He advised that, if Council felt the same way, the easement would need to be modified. In that case, the hearing would need to be continued.

The public hearing was opened by Mayor Campbell.

Moved by Goodman, seconded by Corrieri, to continue the hearing and direct staff to work with the Legal Department and land owners to determine the best means to adopt a flood protection recommendation of 3' above the 100-year storm storage limits for any newly constructed structures adjacent to the new easement area and modify the storm water retention easement to allow for the flood protection recommendation.

Vote on Motion: 6-0. Motion declared carried unanimously.

HEARING ON VACATION OF SURFACE WATER FLOWAGE EASEMENT AND STORM SEWER EASEMENT AT 5328 TABOR DRIVE: Mayor Campbell opened the public hearing and closed same after no one came forward to speak.

Moved by Nelson, seconded by Goodman, to adopt RESOLUTION NO. 15-107 approving vacation of a Surface Water Flowage Easement and Storm Sewer Easement at 5328 Tabor Drive. Roll Call Vote: 6-0. Resolution declared adopted unanimously, signed by the Mayor, and hereby made a portion of these Minutes.

HEARING ON GT1 RETURN TO SERVICE PROJECT: The hearing was opened by the Mayor. There was no one requesting to speak, and the hearing was closed. No further action was taken on this item, since the Council had, during a Special Meeting, revised the bid due date and set a new date for the public hearing and award.

HEARING ON WATER POLLUTION CONTROL FACILITY SCREW PUMP REPAINTING & DRIVE REPLACEMENT: The public hearing was opened by Mayor Campbell. She closed same after no one came forward to speak.

Moved by Corrieri, seconded by Betcher, to adopt RESOLUTION NO. 15-108 approving final plans and specifications and awarding a contract to Woodruff Construction of Ames, Iowa, in the amount of \$276,700.

Roll Call Vote: 6-0. Resolution declared adopted unanimously, signed by the Mayor, and hereby made a portion of these Minutes.

HEARING ON WATER TREATMENT PLANT - CONTRACT 1: Mayor Campbell opened the hearing and closed it as no requested to speak.

Moved by Nelson, seconded by Betcher, to accept the report of bids.

Vote on Motion: 6-0. Motion declared carried unanimously.

HEARING ON BOILER TUBE SPRAY COATING AND RELATED SERVICES AND SUPPLIES FOR ELECTRIC SERVICES: The Mayor opened the public hearing. No one came asked to speak, and the hearing was closed.

Moved by Goodman, seconded by Corrieri, to accept the report of bids.

Vote on Motion: 6-0. Motion declared carried unanimously.

HEARING ON SCAFFOLDING AND RELATED SERVICES AND SUPPLIES FOR ELECTRIC SERVICES: Assistant Electric Services Director Trower reported that only one bid had been received, and it was determined to be non-responsive.

The hearing was opened by Mayor Campbell. There being no one wishing to speak, the hearing was closed.

Moved by Nelson, seconded by Betcher, to accept the report of bids and direct staff to re-bid the project at a later date.

Vote on Motion: 6-0. Motion declared carried unanimously.

HEARING ON UNDERGROUND TRENCHING FOR ELECTRIC SERVICES: Mayor Campbell opened the hearing. She closed same when no one asked to speak.

Moved by Goodman, seconded by Nelson, to adopt RESOLUTION NO. 15-109 approving final plans and specifications and awarding a primary contract to Ames Trenching & Excavating, Inc., of Ames, Iowa, for hourly rates and unit prices bid, in an amount not to exceed \$112,500.

Roll Call Vote: 6-0. Resolution declared adopted unanimously, signed by the Mayor, and hereby made a portion of these Minutes.

Moved by Goodman, seconded by Nelson, to adopt RESOLUTION NO. 15-110 approving final plans and specifications and awarding a secondary contract to Communication Technologies of Des Moines, Iowa, for hourly rates and unit prices bid, in an amount not to exceed \$37,500.

Roll Call Vote: 6-0. Resolution declared adopted unanimously, signed by the Mayor, and hereby made a portion of these Minutes.

HEARING ON 2011/12 ASPHALT STREET PAVING IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM (IRONWOOD COURT): The public hearing was opened by the Mayor. No one came forward to speak, and the Mayor closed the hearing.

Moved by Betcher, seconded by Corrieri, to adopt RESOLUTION NO. 15-111 final plans and specifications and awarding a contract to Manatt's, Inc., of Ames, Iowa, in the amount of \$231,170.71.

Roll Call Vote: 6-0. Resolution declared adopted unanimously, signed by the Mayor, and hereby made a portion of these Minutes.

HEARING ON 2012/13 CONCRETE PAVEMENT IMPROVEMENTS #2 (SOUTHEAST 5TH STREET): Mayor Campbell opened the hearing. The hearing was closed as there was no one who requested to speak.

Moved by Corrieri, seconded by Gartin, to adopt RESOLUTION NO. 15-112 approving final plans and specifications and awarding a contract to Synergy Contracting, LLC, of Bondurant, Iowa, in the amount of \$346,070.15.

Roll Call Vote: 6-0. Resolution declared adopted unanimously, signed by the Mayor, and hereby made a portion of these Minutes.

HEARING ON 2014/15 CONCRETE PAVEMENT IMPROVEMENTS #2 (RIDGEWOOD AVENUE, 9TH STREET, AND PARK WAY): The public hearing was opened by Mayor Campbell. No one asked to speak, and the Mayor closed the hearing.

Moved by Goodman, seconded by Corrieri, to adopt RESOLUTION NO. 15-106 approving final plans and specifications and awarding a contract to Keller Excavating, LLC, of Boone, Iowa, in the amount of \$1,264,261.

Roll Call Vote: 6-0. Resolution declared adopted unanimously, signed by the Mayor, and hereby made a portion of these Minutes.

LITTERING ORDINANCE: Police Chief Chuck Cychosz recalled that in September 2014, a staff report was presented to the City Council outlining gaps in the current littering ordinance. Staff was then directed to prepare a revision to the Ordinance to address types of discarded materials and common types of locations where that problem exists. Chief Cychosz explained that the proposed ordinance was developed after reviewing the issues. It incorporates language from state law and model ordinances.

At the inquiry of Council Member Gartin, Chief Cychosz answered that the proposed Ordinance does not solve the issue of trash cans being left too close to the road. City Manager Schainker said he believed that that issue was being dealt with by a separate referral made by the Council to staff.

Council Member Gartin asked about grass clippings on the sidewalk after mowing. Council Member Goodman offered an explanation that the verb *discarded* could be defined differently when mowing versus dumping a pile of grass clippings. Mr. Gartin explained that he wants to ensure that the Ordinance be very clear for the public as well as for those who will be in charge of enforcing it.

Moved by Goodman, seconded by Corrieri, to pass on first reading the Littering Ordinance.

Roll Call Vote: 6-0. Motion declared carried unanimously.

2014 NATIONAL ELECTRIC CODE: Moved by Goodman, seconded by Corrieri, to pass on second reading the 2014 *National Electric Code*, with local edits.

Roll Call Vote: 6-0. Motion declared carried unanimously.

ORDINANCE ESTABLISHING 517 LINCOLN WAY URBAN REVITALIZATION AREA:

Moved by Corrieri, seconded by Betcher, to pass on third reading and adopt ORDINANCE NO. 4209 establishing the 517 Lincoln Way Urban Revitalization Area.

Roll Call Vote: 6-0. Ordinance declared adopted unanimously, signed by the Mayor, and hereby made a portion of these Minutes.

COUNCIL COMMENTS: Moved by Goodman, seconded by Betcher, to refer to staff the letter from the Story County Prevention Policy Board dated February 18, 2015, pertaining to the ban on the use of Electronic Nicotine Delivery Systems (ENDS) and other vaping devices in all public spaces to come back on a future agenda to discuss whether or not Council has any interest in creating an ordinance to regulate this.

Ex officio Member Villa advised that the Government of Student Body Senate passed this ban on Iowa State University's Campus.

Council Member Gartin noted that he had already referred this to staff a few months ago. He recalled that George Belitsos from Youth and Shelter Services had sent a memo to the City Council. City Manager Schainker recollected that the Council had requested a memo from the

Police Department. Management Analyst Brian Phillips replied that the referral of the letter from George Belitsos was regarding the enforceability of such an ordinance, not necessarily other policy considerations; it was very limited in its scope.

Motion withdrawn.

Moved by Goodman, seconded by Betcher, to look at whether there is interest in an ordinance that would regulate ENDS when the report on enforceability is finished.

Council Member Orazem pointed out that the City's Smoking Ordinance had been ruled unconstitutional; therefore, he is not sure what the City can do until it is known if there is a different constitutional angle on an ordinance regulating ENDS.

Police Chief Chuck Cychosz stated that he was working on the first referral. He noted that he was focusing, in particular, on the way the state implemented its ordinance because enforcement authority is given to the Iowa Department of Public Health and then delegated to municipal government in different ways. Chief Cychosz advised that he has a call into the Story County Prevention Policy Board to get its input on why this would be important at the local level and what kind of public education might be appropriate to parallel some sort of enforcement application.

Vote on Motion: 5-1. Voting aye: Betcher, Corriero, Gartin, Goodman, Nelson. Voting nay: Orazem. Motion declared carried.

Council Member Goodman pointed out that the Ames Redemption Center had recently closed. He had heard from several persons in the community, especially small businesses, that the services formerly offered at the Redemption Center are needed.

Moved by Goodman, seconded by Gartin, to ask staff to look at how someone could provide this service in the community as an alternative to the Resource Recovery.

City Manager Schainker asked for clarification, specifically, if Mr. Goodman was asking the City to determine how someone could provide the service. Mr. Goodman said he meant "us or someone." He commented that there was a service that people were utilizing that is now gone and the market is not providing. Mr. Goodman stated that he believes there is a value to the service, and if the market is not going to provide it, the City should consider how it could be involved in ensuring that it continues to exist.

Mayor Campbell pointed out that the Redemption Center had a lot more than bottles and cans. Mr. Goodman acknowledged that; he said that was the biggest reason why the City would have an interest in ensuring that there is an opportunity to take that out of the waste stream. City Manager Schainker asked if Mr. Goodman was referring to bottles, glass, or cans. Council Member Goodman clarified that he wanted staff to look at the services formerly provided by the Ames Redemption Center to its customers to see if the City could be involved in ensuring their continuation.

Council Member Betcher said she was trying to get a sense as to whom this would be referred. She asked if this was a Resource Recovery Plant referral or a Sustainability Coordinator Merry Rankin-type of referral.

The Mayor asked Mr. Goodman if he were asking staff to look for someone who would continue the business. Council Member Nelson questioned whether Mr. Goodman was asking staff to look at what other communities could potentially be doing. Council Member Goodman said that he just wanted to ensure the service continues – it could be the City, it could be a third party, it could be in collaboration with Iowa State University (ISU), it could be Resource Recovery, the idea could come from other communities. He said he believes it is a reasonable service to expect in 2015.

Council Member Orazem asked if this would be primarily for businesses that aggregate a lot of bottles. Mr. Goodman replied that it would be for a diverse user group. Understanding the user group would be a piece of information to be gleaned. He reiterated that a service that had been valued by some people had disappeared from the community, and the market is not providing it; so he would like to look to the City to take a role in ensuring the service's continued existence.

Council Member Gartin said he had seconded the motion because he felt it was worth looking at.

Council Member Orazem offered his opinion that the largest producer of recyclables would be the University. If it has a redemption mechanism in place, perhaps the City could tap into its service. Council Member Betcher advised that ISU does not have a redemption mechanism; it primarily used the Ames Redemption Center.

Assistant City Manager Kindred suggested that, if the Council does refer this to staff, a good place to start might be to compare the services provided by the Redemption Center to those that are already provided by Resource Recovery, albeit by different means. That would reveal if there are gaps. Council Member Goodman said there is a distinction in the market place for people who want to recycle materials and people who want to incinerate materials. City Manager Schainker pointed out that the City does recycle the cans. Council Member Orazem said the real issue might be that the customers would not get reimbursed the nickel from cans.

Council Member Betcher asked if the Council would just discuss this or what would staff do with the referral. Mr. Goodman clarified that he wanted staff to ask some questions about replacing this service, perhaps talk to Merry Rankin, and possibly look at other communities; but he doesn't want the report on ten other communities. According to Mr. Goodman, he wants to understand what has been lost and if there are an appreciable number of people who need it or desire it, and whether the City can help.

Mayor Campbell pointed out that Ames is different from all other communities in Iowa because of the Resource Recovery Plant. Council Member Goodman acknowledged that, but said there were users who were choosing to use the Ames Redemption Center, not Resource Recovery, for different reasons; "dollars is one of those reasons, different values is another."

Council Member Corrieri asked why the Redemption Center closed – if it was that the demand was not that great or if there were other factors. Mr. Goodman claimed that there are sometimes services desired by people and expect from a community that the market can't provide. He is unsure whether this is one of those and doesn't know if there are enough people to justify it. Mr. Goodman agreed that the market demand given the business model did not work. The Mayor also noted that the reimbursement for cardboard is no longer cost-effective.

Vote on Motion: 4-2. Voting aye: Betcher, Gartin, Goodman, Nelson. Voting nay: Corrieri, Orazem. Motion declared carried.

Council Member Goodman referenced an email that had been sent directly to the Council from the Ames Bicycle Coalition pertaining to the proposed roundabout on University and bike paths in that area. Mr. Goodman asked to know the time line on the roundabout. He said that he had had conversations with the group about their ideas, and the ideas seemed reasonable. Mr. Goodman said he thinks that the Ames Bicycle Coalition feels that they are not getting answers. Assistant City Manager Bob Kindred noted that Civil Engineer Eric Cowles had corresponded with the Ames Bicycle Coalition, thanking them for all of their possible alternatives. Mr. Cowles had conveyed to them that, after discussing their ideas with the design engineers, they were not going to be able to do everything that they wanted to have included; however, some of the ideas might be incorporated in the future. Mr. Kindred noted that staff has had multiple lengthy meetings with people who chose to be involved in an attempt to understand their needs and desires and other options. Mr. Goodman said that there seemed to be a solution with a double bike lane going around the south and west to try and eliminate so many crossings of different traffic lanes; that seemed like a good solution, and he would like to know why that solution was not a good one.

Moved by Goodman, seconded by Gartin, to direct staff to respond via a memo to the City Council to explain why that solution in particular is not something that staff could support for this project.

Vote on Motion: 4-2. Voting aye: Betcher, Corrieri, Gartin, Goodman. Voting nay: Nelson, Orazem. Motion declared carried.

Council Member Betcher brought the Council members' attention to the letter sent to them by AMOS pertaining to the initiative to make available temporary driving permits to Iowa adults who lack Social Security Numbers. Council Member Orazem pointed out that it is state law and asked how the City could change state law. Ms. Betcher said she believes AMOS is just looking for support for the initiative, not that the City would create an ordinance. Council Member Goodman said he thought AMOS was just asking for a letter supporting the idea. He asked to hear from Chief Cychosz as to whether law enforcement supports the idea. Chief Cychosz advised that the Chiefs' Association and many other groups are supporting the initiative and are trying to work with the state legislators to ensure that it is crafted carefully so that it is effective and doesn't compromise the integrity of the ID system. Police departments see a benefit to having legal licensed drivers and identification on those drivers.

Moved by Betcher, seconded by Goodman, to support the initiative.

Council Member Nelson said that he did not know enough about the initiative to be able to support it. Council Member Gartin questioned if the City Council was the right body to take on this type of advocacy; it is being its scope.

Vote on Motion: 3-3. Voting aye: Betcher, Corrieri, Goodman. Voting nay: Gartin, Nelson, Orazem. Mayor Campbell elected not to vote to break the tie. Motion failed.

Moved by Goodman, seconded by Gartin, to refer to staff the letter pertaining to electric car chargers, asking that the City provide those chargers.

Council Member Gartin said he had seconded the motion only to get conversation about this. He is unsure whether it is the City's role to provide electric car chargers or if the private sector should do so.

Vote on Motion: 3-3. Voting aye: Betcher, Gartin, Goodman. Voting nay: Corrieri, Nelson, Orazem. Mayor Campbell elected not to vote to break the tie. Motion failed.

ADJOURNMENT: Moved by Goodman to adjourn the meeting at 11:23 p.m.

Diane R. Voss, City Clerk

Ann H. Campbell, Mayor