

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE AMES AREA
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION POLICY COMMITTEE
AND REGULAR MEETING OF THE AMES CITY COUNCIL
COUNCIL CHAMBERS - CITY HALL**

AMES, IOWA

JULY 9, 2013

**MEETING OF THE AMES AREA METROPOLITAN
PLANNING ORGANIZATION TRANSPORTATION POLICY COMMITTEE**

The Ames Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (AAMPO) Transportation Policy Committee met at 7:00 p.m. on the 9th day of July, 2013, in the City Council Chambers in City Hall, 515 Clark Avenue, pursuant to law with the following voting members present: Ann Campbell, Wayne Clinton, Jeremy Davis, Matthew Goodman, Jami Larson, Peter Orazem, Victoria Szopinski, and Tom Wacha. City of Ames Transportation Engineer Damion Pregitzer and Iowa State University representative Cathy Brown were also present. Voting Members Chet Hollingshead, Boone County Supervisor; Jonathan Popp, Gilbert City Council representative; and Dan Rediske, Transit Board representative were absent.

FISCAL YEAR 2014-17 (FY 2014-17) TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP): Ms. Campbell opened the public hearing. No one wished to speak, and the hearing was closed.

Moved by Davis, seconded by Clinton, to approve the proposed FY 2014-17 TIP.
Vote on Motion: 8-0. Motion declared carried unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT: Moved by Davis, seconded by Clinton, to adjourn the AAMPO Transportation Policy Committee meeting at 7:04 p.m.

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR CITY COUNCIL MEETING

Mayor Ann Campbell called the Regular Meeting of the Ames City Council to order at 7:10 p.m. with Jeremy Davis, Matthew Goodman, Jami Larson, Peter Orazem, Victoria Szopinski, and Tom Wacha present. *Ex officio* Member Alexandria Harvey was absent.

The Mayor informed the Council that, regarding the order of the Agenda, Ordinances would be acted on before Hearings.

CONSENT AGENDA: Mayor Campbell advised that Item No. 14 pertaining to the contract and bond for Power Plant Maintenance Services had been pulled by Purchasing staff; the bond had not been received.

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

1. Motion approving payment of claims
2. Motion approving Minutes of Regular Meeting of June 25, 2013
3. Motion approving certification of civil service applicants
4. Motion approving Report of Contract Change Orders for June 16 - 30, 2013
5. Motion approving renewal of the following beer permits, wine permits, and liquor licenses:
 - a. Class C Liquor – Welch Ave. Station, 207 Welch Avenue
 - b. Class B Native Wine – Artisan Peace Stores, 136 Main Street
 - c. Special Class C Liquor, B Native Wine, & Outdoor Service – Wheatsfield Cooperative, 413 Northwestern Avenue, Ste. 105
 - d. Class B Beer – Panchero’s Mexican Grill, 1310 South Duff Avenue
 - e. Class C Liquor – Applebee’s, 105 Chestnut Street

- f. Class C Liquor – Sportsman’s Lounge, 123 Main Street
 - g. Class C Liquor & Outdoor Service – Bar, 823 Wheeler Street, Suite 4
 - 6. RESOLUTION NO. 13-311 approving *Municipal Code* Supplement No. 2013-3
 - 7. RESOLUTION NO. 13-312 approving contract with EMC Risk Services for Workers Compensation Administrative Services
 - 8. RESOLUTION NO. 13-313 approving lease with Jefferson Lines at Intermodal Facility
 - 9. RESOLUTION NO. 13-314 approving Neighborhood Improvement Program grant for Old Town Park project
 - 10. RESOLUTION NO. 13-315 approving preliminary plans and specifications for Water Pollution Control Facility Methane Engine - Generator Set No. 2 Rehabilitation; setting August 15, 2013, as bid due date and August 27, 2013, as date of public hearing
 - 11. RESOLUTION NO. 13-316 approving waiver of formal bidding requirements and authorizing purchase of Software Maintenance from Sungard Public Sector
 - 12. RESOLUTION ON. 13-317 approving waiver of formal bidding requirements and authorizing purchase of Shared Public Safety Software Maintenance from Sungard Public Sector
 - 13. RESOLUTION NO. 13-318 approving contract and bond for 2012/13 Ames Municipal Cemetery Improvements (Paving Improvements)
 - 14. RESOLUTION NO. 13-320 approving Change Order No. 1 for CyRide Facility Improvements
 - 15. RESOLUTION NO. 13-321 approving renewal of contract with Fletcher Reinhardt of Cedar Rapids, Iowa, in accordance with unit prices bid for Watthour Meters for Electric Meter Division
 - 16. South Fork Subdivision, 4th Addition:
 - a. RESOLUTION NO. 13-322 accepting partial completion of public improvements
 - b. RESOLUTION NO. 13-323 approving Final Major Plat
- Roll Call Vote: 6-0. Resolutions/Motions declared adopted/carried unanimously, signed by the Mayor, and hereby made a portion of these Minutes.

PUBLIC FORUM: Richard Deyo, 505 Eighth Street, #2, Ames, requested that the City Council vote on his continued request to speak under Council Comments, instead of under Public Forum. Mayor Campbell advised that the rules had not changed.

No one else came forward to speak, and the Mayor closed Public Forum

5-DAY SPECIAL CLASS C LIQUOR LICENSE FOR OLDE MAIN BREWING COMPANY:
 Moved by Davis, seconded by Larson, to approve a 5-Day Special Class C Liquor License for Olde Main Brewing Company at ISU Alumni Center, 420 Beach Avenue.
 Vote on Motion: 6-0. Motion declared carried unanimously.

REQUEST FROM WATERS EDGE TOWN HOME ASSOCIATION PERTAINING TO PARKING REGULATIONS ON BURNHAM DRIVE: Damion Pregitzer, City Transportation Engineer, advised that, at its May 14, 2013, meeting, the City Council had referred a letter from the Waters Edge Town Home Association requesting that the parking regulations along Burnham Drive be changed to restrict parking along the north side of the street. Currently, parking is restricted at all times on the south side of the street. The Town Home Association’s letter cited two reasons for requesting the change: (1) the fire hydrants are located on the north side and (2) the south side has more street frontage for parking due to the current layout of driveways. The letter also indicated that 20 of the 27 residents living on Burnham Drive support the change; five would like to retain the parking restriction on the south side, and two did not respond. According to Mr. Pregitzer, staff found no safety or operational issues in changing the parking restriction to the north side of the

street. The change will actually bring the parking regulations into line with current standards for subdivisions by restricting parking on the same side of the street where fire hydrants are located.

Moved by Davis, seconded by Goodman, to direct the City Attorney to draft an ordinance that would restrict parking at all times on the north side of Burnham Drive and allow parking on the south side.

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

REQUEST FOR RESERVED HANDICAPPED ACCESSIBLE PARKING IN CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT (CBD) LOT X:

Transportation Engineer Pregitzer noted that, on June 11, 2013, the City Council had referred to staff a letter from Shelley Jaspering requesting that an existing van-accessible stall in CBD Parking Lot X be designated as a reserved parking stall. Ms. Jaspering is the owner of a business located in the Town Center building, which is directly adjacent to the east side of Tom Evans Park in the Downtown District; that building is only handicapped accessible from the back side of the building by way of a concrete ramp. Currently, there are no van-accessible reserved stalls in the Ames parking system that are designed for disabled users only. The parking stall in question is located in the far northeast corner of CBD Lot X (Stall 398H).

According to Mr. Pregitzer, this situation is a rare occurrence for business districts in Ames. This case, in particular, proved that there were times when Ms. Jaspering, who owns a Downtown business, needed to open her business, but the handicapped stall had already been taken. She then had to find another stall, which might be several blocks away, or not open her business. Mr. Pregitzer explained staff had met on-site to discuss the situation and believes that the most-cost-effective solution would be to designate one of the existing accessible stalls in CBD Lot X as a restricted reserved stall. That stall would be time-restricted, in that it would be reserved only during the work hours from Monday through Friday. The Council was told that Ms. Jaspering had requested that the stall be offered to her at a reduced price (\$25 instead of the standard \$35/month) since it would not be reserved for her 24/7.

Council Member Larson asked if the \$25 “business-hour-only” rate was offered to other people. Mr. Pregitzer stated that it is not offered anywhere else; however, because this is an American with Disabilities Act (ADA) request with specific needs, the City-wide policy regarding reserved stalls would not be changed. He pointed out that the City Council does have the option to retain the \$35 rate for a 24/7 reserved space. Mr. Larson said that he was concerned about setting a precedent. Assistant City Manager Melissa Mundt added that this is a unique situation in that it needs to be accessible for a van and other spaces do not have the correct configuration to allow that. She pointed out that the space would be made available to those with similar needs to use the space during the evening hours and weekends.

Moved by Davis, seconded by Szopinski, to adopt RESOLUTION NO. 13-328 approving an update to the Parking Meter Map to show Parking Stall 398H in CBD Lot X as a reserved van-accessible handicapped stall (No. 398RH) and establish a rate of \$25/month, Monday through Friday.

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

ORDINANCES TO ALLOW CONVERSION OF A FORMER SCHOOL BUILDING TO AN APARTMENT DWELLING IN THE URBAN CORE RESIDENTIAL MEDIUM-DENSITY ZONE (UCRM) AS A PERMITTED USE: Moved by Davis, seconded by Larson, to pass on second

reading an ordinance to allow conversion of a former school building to an apartment dwelling in the Urban Core Residential Medium-Density Zone (UCRM) as a permitted use.

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

Moved by Larson, seconded by Davis, to suspend the rules necessary for the adoption of an ordinance.

Roll Call Vote: 4-2. Voting aye: Davis, Larson, Szopinski, Orazem. Voting nay: Goodman, Wacha. Motion failed.

ORDINANCE TO ALLOW HIGHER RESIDENTIAL DENSITY IF SPECIFIED IN AN ADAPTIVE REUSE PLAN APPROVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL: Moved by Davis, seconded by Goodman, to pass on second reading an ordinance to allow higher residential density if specified in an Adaptive Reuse Plan approved by the City Council.

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

Moved by Goodman, seconded by Davis, to direct staff to place third reading on the workshop agenda for July 16, 2013.

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

ORDINANCE PERTAINING TO SHARED COMMON LOT LINE GARAGES: Moved by Davis, seconded by Goodman, to pass on third reading and adopt ORDINANCE NO. 4151 pertaining to shared common lot line garages.

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

ORDINANCE SETTING SPEED LIMIT ON STATE AVENUE: Moved by Davis, seconded by Goodman, to pass on third reading and adopt ORDINANCE NO. 4152 setting the speed limit on State Avenue from a point 250 feet north Meadow Glen Road to a point 250 feet south of Oakwood Road.

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

HEARING ON ZONING TEXT AMENDMENT TO CORRECT TABLE 29.808(2) PERTAINING TO USES IN THE DOWNTOWN SERVICE CENTER: Mayor Campbell opened the public hearing. No one came forward to speak, and the hearing was closed.

Moved by Larson, seconded by Davis, to pass on first reading an ordinance correcting Table 29.808(2) pertaining to uses in the Downtown Service Center.

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

HEARING ON VACATION OF UTILITY EASEMENT FOR 2825 EAST 13TH STREET: The public hearing was opened by the Mayor and closed after no one asked to speak.

Moved by Davis, seconded by Wacha, to adopt RESOLUTION NO. 13-324 approving the vacation of a utility easement for 2825 East 13th Street.

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

HEARING ON PURCHASE OF SF6 CIRCUIT BREAKERS: The public hearing was opened by Mayor Campbell. There being no one wishing to speak, the hearing was closed.

Moved by Davis, seconded by Wacha, to accept the report of bids and delay award of the contract.
Vote on Motion: 6-0. Motion declared carried unanimously.

HEARING ON PURCHASE OF SUBSTATION ELECTRICAL MATERIALS: Mayor Campbell opened the public hearing and closed same after no one requested to speak.

Moved by Davis, seconded by Goodman, to accept the report of bids and delay award of contract.
Vote on Motion: 6-0. Motion declared carried unanimously.

HEARING ON WOODVIEW DRIVE SANITARY SEWER AND WATER MAIN INSTALLATION PROJECT: The public hearing was opened by Mayor Campbell.

Mike Bryant, 2516 Woodview Drive, Ames, spoke as a proponent of the project. Mr. Bryant thanked members of City staff and the residents of Woodview Drive for working through the process.

The Mayor closed the hearing after no one else came forward to speak.

Moved by Davis, seconded by Wacha, to adopt FINAL RESOLUTION OF NECESSITY NO. 13-325.

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

HEARING ON REZONING PROPERTY AT 921-9TH STREET: The Mayor opened the public hearing.

Sharon Wirth, 803 Burnett, Ames, spoke as Chairperson of the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC). Ms. Wirth advised that, at its June 19, 2013, Special Meeting, the HPC voted unanimously to recommend that the City Council approve the rezoning so that the project could move ahead.

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

Moved by Goodman, seconded by Davis, to pass on first reading an ordinance rezoning property located at 921-9th Street (former Roosevelt Elementary) from Government/Airport (S-GA) to Urban Core Residential Medium Density (UCRM)

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

Moved by Davis, seconded by Larson, to direct City staff to place this item on the City Council workshop agenda for second reading on July 16, 2013.

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

ASSET PRIORITIES FOR 2014/15: Assistant City Manager Melissa Mundt said that, in December 2012, the City Council directed staff to meet with the City's ASSET volunteers to discuss the current schedule since the Council had been approving the priorities after the agencies had applied for funding. The ASSET members voted to change their schedule and have the funders bring back

their priorities in August and set the priorities prior to the instructions being sent to the agencies applying to have services funded.

Ms. Mundt reviewed the City's ASSET Priorities as adopted by the City Council for 2013/14 (from high to lower priority):

1. Emphasis on assistance to low- and moderate-income families
2. Meeting basic needs
3. Crisis intervention
4. Prevention
5. Transportation

Ms. Mundt said that the City's ASSET volunteers met in May and early June to discuss the priorities for Ames and to review data to help develop an understanding of needs. The sources of data reviewed were listed by Ms. Mundt. City staff had already provided the ASSET volunteers three years' funding recommendations from ASSET volunteers that had been approved by the City Council. From that review, it was discovered that the approved funding fell into one of four panels: Health Services, Basic Needs, Youth and Children Services, and Prevention and Support, and the volunteers concluded that funding was being prioritized in a way that was consistent with the City Council's priorities.

According to Ms. Mundt, the volunteers then looked at the outside data to determine needs in the community and attempted to understand what it means to be of low- to moderate-income. Ms. Mundt listed some of the statistics the volunteers looked at when conducting their research. The Council was told by Ms. Mundt that ASSET volunteers also tried to determine, through looking at data, the cost of meeting the basic needs. She shared that, according to the *Cost of Living in Iowa --2011 Edition* study, it is estimated that 74% of working single-parent families in Iowa earn less than the minimum amount needed to meet basic needs. Ms. Mundt also made the Council aware that the estimated median household income from 2007-2011 for Ames was \$42,062, moderate income \$33,649 (or 80% area median income), and low income \$21,031 (or 50% of median area income).

Ms. Mundt stated that the City's ASSET volunteers have determined that the focus needs to remain similar to prior years' priorities and reaffirmed that meeting basic needs was the top priority. However, they would like more emphasis on bridging the needs for those falling below median income and above Federal poverty level. The volunteers had made the following recommendations for the 2014/15 Priorities:

1. Meet basic needs of low- to moderate-income:
 - a. Housing cost-offset programs
 - b. Quality childcare cost- offset programs, including daycare and State of Iowa licensed in-home facilities
 - c. Food cost-offset programs to assist in providing nutritional perishables and staples
 - d. Transportation cost-offset programs for the elderly and families

According to Ms. Mundt, the volunteers wanted to emphasize the gap where individuals are considered the "working poor" and to see how the City dollars could make more of an impact

on their fight against slipping completely into poverty.

Council Member Goodman raised the point of possibly using some funding from the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) allocation to help with these programs.

2. Meet mental health and chemical dependency services needs:
 - a. Provide outpatient emergency access to services
 - b. Provide crisis intervention services
 - c. Provide access to non-emergency services
 - d. Ensure substance abuse preventions and treatment is available in the community

Per Ms. Mundt, the volunteers for the City determined that continued emphasis on mental health and chemical dependency was necessary due to a study that was conducted by the University of Iowa Health Care system. It noted that there are 184,000 people with a serious mental illness in Iowa - approximately 6% of the population. Ms. Mundt noted that Iowa ranks 48th in the U.S. for number of psychiatric hospital beds per capita at only 4.9 per 100,000. Though ASSET does not fund inpatient services to help those with mental illness or chemical dependency, it is critical to have outpatient programs to help provide opportunities for those struggling with mental illness and dependency. State of Iowa funding for these services remains insubstantial, since the State of Iowa has not changed its funding formula to counties since 1995. Additionally, mental health redesign was not set up to address the issues of funding in any significant way. ASSET helps ensure these services are available in Ames for those above the federal poverty level.

3. Youth development services and activities. Ms. Mundt stated that the volunteers also agreed that the services and activities for all youth were critical to the community regardless of their ability to pay. The volunteers also noted that the City Council had identified youth in its goals as being a priority to help strengthen the community.
4. Provide ASSET-funded programs with dollars to increase awareness of assistance funded by ASSET. The volunteers wanted to work with ASSET to help ensure awareness about the services; there was concern that individuals who need assistance are not aware of the variety of programs in this community, and ASSET should support dollars toward ensuring awareness.

Council Member Orazem asked if there were agencies that fall out of the above-listed priorities. Ms. Mundt noted two agencies, Red Cross and Story County Volunteer Services, which provide emergency services. What is currently being funded with those two organizations are response services to disasters like flooding, tornado, or bad storms, so according to Ms. Mundt, there might be some logic to funding those organizations outside of the ASSET process, if the City Council so directed.

Council Member Larson noted that several Council members had questions about duplication of services after the large funding request came in from the Salvation Army. He pointed out that, even though ASSET funds services, not agencies, the funding is still distributed through agencies. Mr. Larson asked how it can be assured that the process is being closely monitored when the approval is ultimately going to agencies. Ms. Mundt advised that the ASSET panel volunteers ask those questions when they are reviewing the requests. There are similar services offered by different

agencies, but they start and stop at different places. Mr. Larson asked if it were possible for the Council to get an executive summary a week or two in advance of having to approve the requests. He specifically asked if the ASSET schedule could be moved up a little bit. Ms. Mundt said that the Joint Funders and the Administrative Team had discussed moving up the priorities process. A follow-up conversation had occurred on ensuring that the City, Story County, and United Way had enough time to review the recommendations; however, that was not resolved.

The next steps needed to be taken were explained by Ms. Mundt. The ASSET volunteers will seek final approval of the 2014/2015 ASSET priorities at the July 23, 2013, City Council meeting.

Council Member Davis said that he was concerned about No. 4 (Promotion and Awareness). He saw it as taxpayers paying for advertising, and in his opinion, that should come from non-taxpayer sources. Council Member Wacha said he agreed to some degree; however, if there are funded programs that are being underutilized, he could see where awareness of the program should be promoted. Council Member Szopinski said that there might be a need to promote programs to a segment of the population who does not have access to newspapers or computers. Ms. Mundt stated that it was not meant to be construed as advertising; it could mean that volunteers would hold community forums, print flyers, etc. She suggested that she talk to the volunteers to clarify what was meant by promoting the programs and contended that it did not mean advertising in the traditional sense.

Council Member Goodman said he was not aware that the City Council had desired to reset the priorities. He felt that the City Council was the appropriate agency to set priorities; they are the elected representatives in the community and they need to channel the funding to the priorities. He was surprised that ASSET volunteers had recommended new priorities.

The recollection of Council Member Goodman was that the Council receives a funding request, which may ask for an increase over the past year's allocation. The Council then needs to make a decision on funding and/or an increase in funding; that decision is influenced by what has been told to the Council about needs. He said he would like the conversation to be not just about what the agency thinks it should ask for. Council Member Larson suggested that perhaps a special meeting be held to ask specific questions about the requests and then the Council would actually vote on the requests at the next Council meeting. Ms. Mundt said that the ASSET volunteers are going to recommend that the City Council vote "by panel" similar to the way the United Way handles the requests. She said that would mean the Council would direct a certain percent of dollars be put towards each priority. The ASSET volunteers need to know the exact number of dollars they have to work with, be it a cap or threshold.

Council Member Goodman said he hoped that, when the Council discusses the funding requests next year, the conversation won't just be about the percentage requested or the percentage recommended, and the Council has to guess. He stated that he was more concerned about how many people had to be turned away from programs. It was most important to him to understand the needs of the community. Mr. Goodman advised that he is unsure if the present process is yielding the results that are desired.

Council Member Szopinski said she has no idea what percentage of the population fits into the various need areas. Council Member Larson pointed out that, every few years, the United Way conducts a Needs Assessment. Ms. Mundt advised that the ASSET volunteers look at the Story County Needs Assessment to determine how much of the City's population needs assistance, and

the priorities fall in line with that Assessment. Ms. Mundt said she would provide another copy of the Assessment to the Council.

Council Member Larson expressed his desire that, within one month time of when the Council is asked to approve an increase in its ASSET allocation, a staff report that would be a combination of written material and perhaps an executive summary be provided to the Council and that the Council would be given an opportunity to ask specific questions about the specific services. In this way, Council can ask questions, get answers, and provide feedback prior to the time the vote is taken. Assistant City Manager Mundt said the problem with that would be a process-related concern on the budget side. She said that Council is being asked for an allocation of dollars first so that the ASSET volunteers know what amount they have to work with along the Council's priorities. The soonest she would have a mid-year report to provide more information to the Council members to help them set that total allocation would be December and the soonest she would have information back from the volunteers would be November because they have between September and November to prepare agency reports and submit them to the Administrative Team.

Mayor Campbell noted that she had once served as a member of a human service agency and explained that the ASSET process came about as a way to keep the funders from having to decide on the percentages to be allocated to different agencies. It is important for the Council to set its priorities and give direction to the ASSET volunteers. Council Member Wacha agreed and expressed his concern that the City Council not micro-manage the ASSET process. He believes that the current process works well with dedicated volunteers. Ms. Mundt asked if the Council would prefer not to see what the agency asked for in the past, but rather whether a change in the panel had been seen based on the needs of the community, and then a suggestion made as to what percentage of an increase, if any, should be considered.

Council Member Wacha said his recollection of the previous discussion last fall was exactly what was presented by staff at this meeting; i.e., work with ASSET to set the priorities first, get Council approval of those priorities, and then use those priorities at the beginning of the ASSET deliberations for the next fiscal year.

Council Member Goodman advised that he still wants to know how many people did one of the agencies have to turn away. Ms. Mundt replied that the Administrative Team does not get statistics on that. Mr. Goodman noted that when he talks to people, he gets numbers. To him, the process should be about understanding the needs of the community. City Manager Schainker pointed out that all the funding entities have to agree or the City will have to pick up the increase. Council Member Goodman said that was the piece that had not been discussed at all, and it is a serious piece. In his opinion, the City actually held itself back from helping to solve community problems because one of the funders was not or chose not to increase its allocation. He does not believe that the way the City is allocating its funding is yielding the results that are desired. Mayor Campbell strongly encouraged the Council members to attend the Joint Funders' meetings in the future.

City Manager Schainker asked the Council to provide staff with direction. Ms. Mundt advised that the priorities will be brought back to the City Council for approval or modification at its July 23, 2013, meeting.

Council Member Szopinski shared that, under No. 4 (Promotion and Awareness), there are a lot of different ways to bring awareness to services. She feels that there is no reason to have those services if people who need them are not aware that they exist. Council Member Davis reiterated

that he did not believe that taxpayer dollars should be spent on advertising; that is why this is a joint-funding process and funding, that does not come from tax-payer dollars, could be used. Taxpayer funding needs to pay for the actual service. Mayor Campbell pointed out that there are other ways, besides putting an ad in the newspaper, to get the word out. Ms. Szopinski again noted that some populations in need have less access to information and require something more creative. Council Member Orazem said it is important that when people come to Ames and they talk to one agency, they are informed of what other agencies they need to talk to. It is difficult when you are new to a community to know what is available, and it is important that service providers need to know what other services are being provided.

Council Member Goodman said that he was more comfortable with the previous Council-approved priorities rather than the ones that the ASSET volunteers were now recommending.

Regarding mental health services, which traditionally had been a County responsibility, Council Member Orazem noted that the City had been asked to “shore-up” needs because of limitations on the County’s ability to fund them. He asked that if mental health services were set as a City priority, would that be construed to mean it was a funding priority or a need priority. Ms. Mundt said the volunteers were looking at it from a need perspective. Mr. Orazem stated it was really important not to confuse those two. He noted that the City is participating in mental health services because there was no one else who could step forward even though it wasn’t traditionally one of the City’s responsibilities.

Council Member Orazem also said that it was his hope that when the agencies are provided with the City’s funding priorities, they will provide information as to what percentage of the population they serve and what percentage of the population has a certain need.

Mr. Orazem suggested that No. 2 be broadened to include sheltering; that was a big problem with changes in funding in the last year.

Council Member Goodman said he was disappointed that Crisis Intervention was not a priority. Ms. Mundt pointed out that Crisis Intervention was included under No. 2.

Moved by Goodman to direct staff to provide, prior to the Council being asked to commit to the total ASSET funding allocation, the estimated number of citizens served in the previous year and the needs in those categories. Motion died for lack of a second.

Moved by Wacha, seconded by Orazem, to direct staff to come back at the July 23, 2013, Council meeting with a recommendation that the Council adopt the four recommended priorities for human services funding, as clarified.

Vote on Motion: 5-1. Voting aye: Davis, Larson, Orazem, Szopinski, Wacha. Voting nay: Goodman. Motion declared carried.

Moved by Goodman, seconded by Szopinski, to direct staff, in the regular ASSET budgeting cycle, but prior to the night the City Council is asked to approve the total funding allocation, to provide information about the needs served and the needs, as anticipated by the agencies, in the priorities that will be determined on July 23, 2013.

Assistant City Manager Mundt again expressed her concern about being able to provide that information due to the way ASSET’s calendar is set and it would be very difficult to change the

cycle. She noted that none of the other funders have an issue with the way the process has worked.

Council Member Goodman clarified his goal in making that request: before deciding on funding allocations, he would like to have a sense of what was served last year and the needs that didn't get served last year. City Manager Schainker asked if that information could be requested as part of the application. Ms. Mundt replied that there already is a statistics page in the application, so that information is being provided.

Motion withdrawn.

Moved by Goodman, seconded by Szopinski, for staff to make an effort to try to get the Council information at a meeting before the traditional meeting when Council determines the funding allocation on needs in the priority categories served and unserved needs in those categories for the previous year.

Ms. Mundt replied that the unserved is where there will be a challenge.

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

EXTENSION OF SUSTAINABILITY COORDINATOR CONTRACT: Assistant City Manager Mundt advised that the current Sustainability Coordinator contract expired on June 30, 2013. For the past two years, the City Council approved a Scope of Services to focus only on the reduction of electric consumption. The expectation was that the primary focus would be to provide City staff assistance to the three committees in implementing the Task Force's recommendations. According to Ms. Mundt, in keeping with the Council's direction, staff was recommending that the Sustainability Advisory Services Contract with ISU be approved with the Scope of Services being targeted in five specific areas and/or projects related to energy consumption reduction for 2013/14. Ms. Mundt and Electric Services Director Donald Kom explained the specific areas to be included, as follows:

1. Develop a program and related communications materials for businesses, non-profit and civic facilities entitled, "Five Ways to Start Saving Energy." As part of the program, an awards/recognition component will be developed and branded around the city's 150th Anniversary and/or Sesquicentennial.
2. Review of the city's building codes as it pertains to energy efficiency requirements and a report to the City Council regarding how the city compares other municipalities within the State of Iowa and nationally.
3. Advise the City on updating the Smart Energy programs on the City's website to provide a better customer experience.
4. Work with Iowa State University professors and students to develop a residential energy consumption comparison tool.
5. Work with Public Works and Electric Services to educate the ISU community and all residents on waste diversion and reuse as related to promoting the City's waste-to-energy program.

Council Member Goodman asked if the Sustainability Task Force was still operational. City

Manager Schainker advised that it was not; the Task Force had completed its report and recommended three committees to address various tasks. The Sustainability Coordinator works with those three committees. According to Mr. Schainker, the only one of the five recommended areas that doesn't tie back to the original Task Force was No. 5; that is because the Task Force focused directly on reducing electric consumption. There is, however, a direct tie to sustainability with No. 5 as it pertains to the Resource Recovery Plant (RRP) and subsequently to Electric Services. Council Member Goodman said he was in favor of adding No. 5, and hopes that it will actually further develop into composting and other ways to save capacity at the RRP.

Moved by Goodman, seconded by Szopinski, to adopt RESOLUTION NO. 13-326 approving extension of the Sustainability Coordinator Contract through June 30, 2014.

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

STAFF REPORT ON CITY WiFi SERVICE: Finance Director Duane Pitcher recalled that at the November 27, 2012, City Council budget guidelines, discussion included a suggestion for review of the public WiFi system, specifically a review of service for outdoor locations. Mr. Pitcher noted that the current contract for the service would expire August 2013, and would continue on a month-to-month basis after the expiration unless changes were directed back to staff to do otherwise.

Mr. Pitcher advised that the short-term use of the Internet appears to have shifted substantially since the program was started. Short-term outdoor access to the Internet is now accessed more commonly and conveniently using smart phones with faster 3G/4G data plans. The City's outdoor locations are Brookside Park, Campustown Court, Hunziker Youth Sports Complex, and Tom Evans Plaza. It was shared by Mr. Pitcher that staff had asked the managers of the Hunziker Youth Sports Complex to provide feedback as to the usage of that hotspot. Staff was told that people are not coming to the Complex to use their laptops; however, when there are soccer or softball tournaments, the tournament organizers are using the City's WiFi to enter results, schedule umpires, etc., and also using the Internet for their Board meetings. The intent for widespread public use has not been met at the Youth Sports Complex.

Council Member Orazem pointed out that WiFi is needed at the Furman Aquatic Center for City staff to use. Mr. Pitcher advised that that one is an extension of the City's system. There is no additional infrastructure needed to run it, and staff is recommending that it be retained.

Council Member Larson asked how much of a decrease in the amount for ICS locations would be realized if two of the four (Brookside and Hunziker Youth Sports Complex) were eliminated. Stan Davis, Information Technology Manager, advised that the entire amount (\$4,200) would be eliminated. He said that, with the City's desire to promote the Campustown Action Association (CAA) and the Main Street Cultural District (MSCD) as gathering spots, he would prefer the outdoor spots in those areas would not go away. Council Member Orazem noted that there are private businesses who already promote the service in those areas. Mr. Pitcher stated that the staff could provide the information to Council as to how much the cost would decrease and whether the two organizations (CAA and MSCD) would want to continue providing the service on their own. Mr. Larson said perhaps the two organizations could provide the service on a more cost-effective basis. Council Member Wachal pointed out that the usage data supports the belief that it is the people living in the apartments near Tom Evans Plaza and Campustown Town Plaza using the City's hotspots for free WiFi service. He noted that the average individual log-in for unique user was four times that of anyplace else.

Three options were presented for the City Council's direction in regards to outdoor service:

1. Continuing the service as currently offered while monitoring usage, and providing a report to Council at a later date.
2. Expanding service to include additional outdoor locations.
3. Eliminate some, or all, of the Pilot Outdoor locations, but continue the service to the City-managed locations which include all of the indoor locations and Furman Aquatics Center. Under this option the City would continue to offer access to private providers who offer service at City outdoor locations.

Moved by Davis, seconded by Orazem, to eliminate the four pilot outdoor locations: Brookside Park, Campustown Court, Hunziker Youth Sports Complex, and Tom Evans Plaza.

Council Member Szopinski wanted more information prior to deciding to eliminate all four of the outdoor service areas. She does not want to abruptly cut off the service.

Council Member Larson asked who had paid for the installation of infrastructure necessary to provide the Internet service. Mr. Davis replied that the City had paid for it; he thought it had cost \$25,000/location. Mr. Larson stated that he was interested in knowing what would happen to the capital investment made by the City. He wondered if the infrastructure would be left for a certain amount of time in case there was an overwhelming citizen response that would want the service back. Mr. Pitcher stated that staff would have to follow-up with that information. Mr. Larson said he could support the motion as long as the City's investment does not go away for a period of time.

Motion withdrawn by Davis.

It was noted that more information would be provided to the City Council, and the item would be placed on the Council's July 23, 2013, meeting Agenda. Council Member Goodman asked to also know the cost per location. Council Member Larson agreed and said he also wanted to specifically know what it would cost to retain the service in Campustown Court and Tom Evans Plaza.

CHANGE ORDER TO A&P/SAMUELS GROUP: Moved by Davis, seconded by Goodman, to adopt RESOLUTION NO. 13-327 approving Change Order No. 4 in the amount of \$21,214 to A&P/Samuels Group.

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

LIBRARY WINDOW RESTORATION: Moved by Davis, seconded by Wacha, to adopt RESOLUTION NO. 13-319 approving preliminary plans and specifications for Window Restoration, setting July 31, 2013, as bid due date and August 13, 2013, as date of public hearing.

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

The meeting recessed at 9:00 p.m. and reconvened at 9:10 p.m.

DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS FOR RESIDENTIAL ZONES: City Manager Steve Schainker emphasized that staff was not asking for any final decisions to be made at this meeting. He brought the Council’s attention to a summary of the issues that had been placed around the dais. Mr. Schainker said that staff is looking to develop consistency in the residential zoning regulation interpretations and wishes to verify with Council if the current standards meet the design intent and character that the Council is looking for in residential developments.

Planner Karen Marren identified the issues:

Issue 1: Occupancy Limits. By allowing single-family attached units to be classified as apartments when constructed on a large lot (more than one acre), the *Municipal Code* allows the occupancy limit for each unit to be increased from three unrelated persons as a single-family attached unit to five unrelated persons as an apartment.

The policy question being asked by staff is should the occupancy limits for single-family attached units (whether combined on one large lot with other units or on separate lots per each unit) be the same or different. Three options were presented by Ms. Marren, which included:

1. Revise the definitions in the Zoning Ordinance to only allow all single-family attached dwelling units to be occupied by a family, which, by definition, is no more than three unrelated people.

Ms. Marren noted that the City does not allow single-family attached units in Residential Low-Density.

2. Revise the definitions in the Zoning Ordinance to allow all single-family attached dwelling units to be occupied, as apartments, with up to five unrelated people.
3. Make no changes to the current Zoning Ordinance, thus continuing to allow a different maximum occupancy for single-family attached units that exist separately on a platted lot from multiple single-family attached units on one large lot.

Ms. Marren clarified that single-family attached and apartment units are not permitted in the RL Districts.

City Manager Schainker pointed out that if a customer came to the City asking to build four 24-plexes and a number of attached units on one lot, staff’s current interpretation would be that even in the attached units, up to five persons could occupy the dwellings.

Council Member Goodman said that he was comfortable with the existing Code.

Mr. Schainker noted that, even in the RM and RH, if the buildings were built on individual lots after subdividing the property, the occupy limit would be three unrelated.

Mr. Goodman said that he believes it is working fine now, and he cannot contemplate what the impacts would be if and when someone would come in and request to change it.

Issue 2: Adherence to Subdivision Requirements. It was noted by Planner Marren that Section 29.401(5) states “more than one single-family or two-family residential structure on the same lot

of one acre or less is prohibited.” That Code section allows, on residentially zoned lots (larger than one acre) more than one single-family and two-family structure on a single lot when developers choose not to subdivide. By allowing multiple single-family and two-family units to be constructed on one large lot (more than one acre), developments do not have to comply with the requirements of the Subdivision Code, i.e., lot and block standards, protection of natural features, landscape standards, public street standards including public sidewalks, utility requirements for water, sanitary sewer, electric and storm water management, erosion control, and also any improvement guarantees for any needed infrastructure improvements).

According to Ms. Marren, the policy question being asked by staff is if Council wanted to continue to allow multiple single-family and two-family structures on a single lot without requiring adherence to subdivision regulations. Three options were provided for Council consideration:

1. Revise the Zoning Ordinance or Subdivision Code to incorporate standards of the Subdivision Code, based on a created set of criteria, for developments that choose not to subdivide the property.

This option would allow certain regulations of the Subdivision Code, such as public streets, sidewalks, or public infrastructure to be met while allowing the developer to maintain a single lot development.

2. Revise the Zoning Ordinance to eliminate the right to construct multiple single-family or two-family structures on a single lot in a RL District.
3. Make no changes to the current Zoning ordinance and thereby continue to allow multiple single-family and two-family structures on lots of one acre or larger.

Ms. Marren advised that, if the City Council chooses to consider a specific change to some of the current zoning code standards, staff could be directed to draft the appropriate zoning text amendment(s), seek input from stakeholders, and hold a public hearing before the Planning and Zoning Commission. In that case, staff would work to bring the text amendment back to Council for adoption on first reading in late August or early September.

Council Member Goodman stated his opinion that the City needed to maintain some sort of control over what occurs on property to ensure that residential and business investors have some protection on what locates next to them.

Council Member Orazem asked how the Floating Zones fit into this issue. Planner Marren answered that, from a single-family and two-family standpoint, FSRL is very similar to RL in that single-family is allowed, but not two-family. The same large-lot development dilemma could have to be dealt with in FSRL. Ms. Marren said that FSRM also allows single-family and two-family dwellings. There could still be large-lot developments and still have multiple units on a large lot.

Moved by Goodman, seconded by Szopinski, to approve Option 1 pertaining to RL and FSRL, thus directing the City Attorney to revise the Zoning Ordinance or Subdivision Code to incorporate standards of the Subdivision Code, based on a created set of criteria, for developments that choose not to subdivide the property.

After discussion ensued as to whether each request should be handled on a case-by-case basis, Council Member Larson stated that he did not want that; he wanted the requirements to be clear.

Council Member Wacha questioned whether this should also pertain to RM zoning.

Moved by Wacha, seconded by Szopinski, to amend the motion to add RM and FSRM.
Vote on Amendment: 6-0. Motion declared carried unanimously.

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

SOUTH DUFF AVENUE ACCESS STUDY: Moved by Davis, seconded by Orazem, to grant staff the authority to conduct a traffic study of the South Duff Corridor, which would include a traffic signal warrant analysis.

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

COUNCIL COMMENTS: Moved by Orazem, seconded by Wacha, to direct staff to investigate whether there are successful entities in the United States who have managed to reach equitable settlements with rural water districts in a finite time.

Council Member Larson said he would rather keep the negotiations “at home.” Mr. Larson added that he believes employing outside counsel would actually lengthen the process. Mayor Campbell noted that she and Management Analyst Brian Phillips will attend a Metropolitan Planning Coalition meeting tomorrow and rural water issues will be discussed. Council Member Orazem said he believes that Xenia is just “going to wait it out” and expect extortionary amounts from the City. He sees Xenia as keeping Ames from growing. At the inquiry of Council Member Goodman, City Attorney Parks said it would not require a lot of staff time to investigate options.

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

Moved by Davis, seconded by Orazem, to refer to staff the letter from Dean Roosa and Carol Jacobs for a waiver of subdivision regulations for property located at 569 W. Riverside Road.

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

Moved by Larson, seconded by Goodman, to request a short staff report back on the City Council on the mosquito fogging process.

Council Member Davis suggested that a question be added to the Resident Satisfaction Survey as to whether residents want mosquito fogging in the parks to continue.

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

Moved by Wacha, seconded by Orazem, to refer back to staff the memo from Planner Charlie Kuester dated July 1, 2013, pertaining to a proposed text amendment for Special Use Permits in residential zones.

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

Moved by Goodman, seconded by Wacha, to refer the email from John Klaus dated July 7, 2013, to staff for comment.

Mr. Goodman clarified that, in the memo, Mr. Klaus had referenced recent discussions with Xenia rural water. He had specifically cited a section of the Iowa Constitution regarding governments assuming debts of associations or corporations.

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

ADJOURNMENT: Moved by Davis to adjourn the meeting at 10:05 p.m.

Diane R. Voss, City Clerk

Ann H. Campbell, Mayor