

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF WASHINGTON, FRANKLIN COUNTY, MISSOURI
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 2020**

INTRODUCTORY ITEMS:

The Regular Meeting of the City of Washington, Missouri, City Council was held on Tuesday, February 18, 2020, at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chamber. Mayor Sandy Lucy opened the meeting with roll call and Pledge of Allegiance.

Mayor:	Sandy Lucy	Present
Council Members:	Ward I	Steve Sullentrup Present
		Nick Obermark Present
	Ward II	Mark Wessels Present (7:07 p.m.)
		Mark Hidritch Absent
	Ward III	Jeff Patke Absent
		Greg Skornia Present
	Ward IV	Gretchen Pettet Present
		Joe Holtmeier Present
Also Present:	City Attorney	Mark Piontek (7:40 p.m.)
	City Administrator	Darren Lamb
	City Clerk	Mary Trentmann
	Police Chief	Ed Menefee
	Public Works Director	John Nilges
	Economic Development Director	Sal Maniaci
	Shauna Pfitzinger	Human Resources Generalist
	Finance Director	Mary Sprung
	Mark Skornia	Emg. Mngmt. Director
	Lisa Moffitt	Communications Director
	Tony Bonastia	Street Superintendent
	Chad Owens	Parks Foreman

Originals and/or copies of agenda items of the meeting, including recorded votes are available on record in the office of the City Clerk. Each ordinance is read a minimum of twice by title, unless otherwise noted.

Approval of Minutes:

* Approval of the Minutes from the February 3, 2020 Council Meeting

A motion to accept the minutes as presented was made by Councilmember Sullentrup, seconded by Councilmember Holtmeier, passed without dissent.

Approval and Adjustment of Agenda including Consent Agenda:

* 2012-2016 Landfill Ticket Destruction Request

February 5, 2020

Honorable Mayor and City Council

405 Jefferson Street

Washington, MO 63090

Re: City of Washington Struckhoff Sanitary Landfill

Landfill Ticket Destruction Request

Dear Mayor and City Council Members:

The Missouri Department of Natural Resources requires that municipalities retain daily landfill tonnage tickets for a minimum of three years per 10 CSR 80-2.080 Tonnage Fees (2) Record Keeping (A). These tickets are kept on file in the Planning & Engineering Department. Per Municipal Records Retention Schedule 0030 Landfill Fee Records, the required retention time is 3 years as well.

Paper landfill tickets still on file for the calendar years 2012 through 2016 have met their retention schedule. Therefore, I hereby request your permission to destroy these tickets.

Respectfully submitted,

Andrea F. Lueken, P.E.

Assistant City Engineer

* Fire Department Record Destruction Request

5 February 2020

Ms. Mary Trentmann, City Clerk

City of Washington

405 Jefferson Street

Washington, MO 63090

Ms. Trentmann:

Per the City of Washington's Record Retention Policy and Missouri State Statutes referenced in the policy, the Washington Fire Department has removed and discarded/destroyed the following records as directed:

All Workers Comp files more than 5 year's old

All Safety Incident reports more than 5 year's old

Personal Protective Equipment Fit Test Records which have been superseded

Insurance policies that are more than 6 year's old

Time and Attendance records that are more than 3 year's old

1099's that are more than 5 year's old

As always, if you have any questions, feel free to contact me.

Yours in service,

Tim Frankenberg, CT, CFPS

Fire Chief

TPF/lfs

* Municipal Record Destruction Request

February 11, 2020

Honorable Mayor and City Council

City of Washington

Washington, Missouri

RE: Municipal Records Disposal

Dear Mayor and Council Members:

The attached list of records has met the retention schedule and is recommended for disposal under RSMo 109.255. The retention schedule does not prescribe the methods of destruction but records that contain confidential data will be securely destroyed to ensure that data cannot be reconstructed. Authorization is hereby requested to dispose of the attached list of Municipal Records of the City of Washington, Missouri.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Trentmann, MRCC

City Clerk

Attachment

RECORD SERIES	DESCRIPTION/DATES	RETENTION
GS 057	Insurance Claim files - Certificates of Insurance 2013-2014	5 Years
GS 050	Permits & License Liquor License - Catering Permits 2016	2 Years
GS 022	Public Notice Records 2015 PD Newspaper Listings	3 Years
GS 049	Requests & Complaints 2015 Laundromat Horn Street complaint	3 Years
LS 764	Surplus Property 2014 sold vehicles	5 Years
GS 049	Request & Complaint Files 2015 - 2016 - 2017	3 Years
GS 062	Employment Recruitment & Selection Records (Unsuccessful Applications, Background Checks & Records) 2015 - 2016 - 2017 - 2018	1 Year

* Liquor License Request – Xpress Liquor & Smokes

* Final Pay Request – Washington Electric – Front Street Decorative Lighting

A motion to accept and approve the agenda including the consent agenda accordingly was made by Councilmember Sullentrup, seconded by Councilmember Obermark, passed without dissent.

PRIORITY ITEMS:

Mayor’s Presentations, Appointments & Re-Appointments:

* Library Board of Trustees Appointment

February 3, 2020

City of Washington

Washington, Missouri

Dear Council Members:

I herewith submit for your approval the following for appointment to the Library Board of Trustees:

Carolyn M. Witt – term ending June 2022

Respectfully submitted,

Sandy Lucy

Mayor

MKT:

A motion to accept and approve appointment was made by Councilmember Holtmeier, seconded by Councilmember Skornia, passed without dissent.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

* Rezone 700 West 2nd Street from M-2, Heavy Industrial to PD-R Planned Residential

February 11, 2020

*Mayor & City Council
City of Washington
Washington, MO 63090*

*RE: File NO. 20-0201-Rezoning 700 W. Second Street from M-2, Heavy Industrial to PD-R,
Planned Residential*

Mayor & City Council:

*At their regularly scheduled meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission held on Monday,
February 10, 2020 the Commission voted to recommend approval of the above request with a
unanimous vote with the exception of Samantha Cerutti Wacker who was not present.*

Sincerely,

Thomas R. Holdmeier

Commission Chairman

Maniaci: Alright, so I know that a lot of you are vaguely familiar with this request now just because it has gotten a lot of press and it is a very big project. This is the rezoning and development plan approval for the International Shoe Factory at 700 West Second Street. It kind of takes the whole block there between Rand and Johnson Street and down to Edith. You can see what's not highlighted three homes on that same block but otherwise it does take up two city blocks technically.

The property is still zoned M-2 Heavy Industrial; it has been that way since zoning came into effect obviously because of the original use. It has been vacant from what our records can find since 1964; I think the factory closed in '59 they used it for warehousing until about '64 and it sat vacant ever since.

You can see the surrounding zoning is all R-2 Overlay meaning it does allow single and two-family uses. There is a number of, without us going too in depth, there's a lot of single-family right around the area but there are some of them use it as two units as permitted in that zone district, and they are just requesting to rezone these two portions.

Here is the site plan that was submitted with the application. When you go to a planned district, this is what's required up front, so unplanned districts which the majority of our properties are, require these to be submitted after the fact. So, zoning gets approved this is all done in-house.

A planned district allows developers to submit a development plan that is a little bit unique in nature that doesn't necessarily fit, conform into our code, it's really meant for properties that are in fill, existing buildings that are a little bit more unique that allows them to basically say here's what I'm requesting. When it gets rezoned, this development plan is approved by ordinance with it, and so it's not just a rezoning to a district where they can do whatever is allowed in that district. It's a rezoning to say this is what's being requested and this is what's being approved, it cannot be anything else. If there are any major changes to the development plan because it's a planned district, would have to come back in front of Planning and Zoning and City Council.

Again here is the site plan that is required for this. You can see a lot of the major changes to the site is the parking. They do remove, and I'll get to the demolition exhibit, there's about four buildings to the rear, they are not considering contributing to the historic nature of the building. They are pretty derelict, there's a quonset hut that I think has fallen down pretty much on its own.

You can see on purple here; this is the three-story portion of the building along Johnson. In pink, this is the middle portion that's two-stories, and then this red is the single-story. I don't

know the full history, I don't know if it was built in phases that way but it is considered one structure and that is where the main proposed development is.

You can see parking in the rear here as well as parking in the front that believe would be designated parking for the apartments in those wings, and then there is also parking over on the street side as well.

This green area to the south is the designed stormwater retention area. There may not be a large amount of increase in stormwater because of the fact that it is a lot of impervious already with the building in the existing buildings, but because of the fact that they are adding the parking, there will be some sort of increase and so they will have to hire some engineers to verify, some Stormwater Engineers to verify, that they're not going to be increasing runoff so that will result in some type of retention pond in this area, and that's what they show that it being reserved for as well as some open green space for a mini dog park or an area for the residents to utilize.

Again this is the demolition plan, it's hard to read on here. It was in your packet but you can see they did mark the buildings to be removed. These three as well as this building in this middle court yard to the south. This area hashed in red is a proposed vacation of an alley, that is a 12' wide alley; our City maps actually had it listed as unknown but as far as we can see it is a public alley that has never been improved. When you go out there, it's grass all the way through the length of the block, but is technically 12' wide easement that is owned by us. We just never had it approved. As part of that vacation here, we really don't see it as an asset to us. We don't have a need to maintain that 12' easement. In reality, if someone were to come around and ask for us to improve it, we would probably at that point want to vacate it anyway. In this case, half of it will go to the property owners to the south here and the other half will go back to the developer's property to the north.

So, this is just a quick aerial showing what's going to be demolished; you can see what's being cleared out and then where it says unk, that unknown, that's that alley that will be vacated, and obviously the one in red is what's being demolished.

In purple here, this is the proposed parking areas. I did add the on-street parking because, I'll kind of get to that. That is an area we are recommending be added in striped to maximize the amount of parking. As you all know, the only places that we normally do that are downtown so we can maximize parking. If people start pulling in wherever is most convenient, they're going to lose a lot of spots along that length, and so if we require the developer to actually strip that to City codes that will allow us to maximize on that.

Sullentrup: So he's not in compliance with our ordinance for parking with 85 units, is that what you're saying?

Maniaci: Correct, so I'll get to that. So there are two items that require for this to be a planned district. I'll kind of get to that. Parking and density are two items that require this to be approved by ordinance. There are some pictures of the existing building you guys are no stranger to this, but for larger planned developments we just like to get as much information as we can.

This is looking on Johnson Street south, obviously the three-story side. This is looking south, so I am standing at the intersection of Johnson and Second. This is on the other side of Second Street on that block looking again south on Rand; this is obviously the single-story. To the rear this is everything that's going to be cleared out; this is kind of the stormwater area that

I'm standing in, and then obviously these three buildings in a row here is what's proposed to be demolished and created for parking.

This is looking north on the left hand side of Rand Street towards the river. I want to show this, this is just kind of where the two-story goes into the one-story. This, where the open gate is, actually is where the proposed entrance will be. I don't want to go back to far, but in the 40's, Robert Street was actually vacated. It used to go all of the way through and when they built the factory, that was part of the new deal, money to have some job creation and this was vacated. This entrance so you can see on site plan will be opened back up for the parking area.

So where I was standing in that picture, this entrance is kind of the general area that you will see in the parking lot that will cut all of the back through to the other side where Roberts would have come in. We will create a four-way intersection, lined-up driveway entrances with the intersections of Roberts Street. It is not public right-of-way to come through but it is shown, it does match up already where original right-of-way was which is a safer pull in, pull out from people coming out of the parking lot.

On the right is where the alley is, I know that I was out on a snowy day and I kind of ran out of time before Planning and Zoning, but you can see the curb cut that goes in there so there originally was some type of improvement but there is alley is unimproved all of the way through. I'm standing on Rand looking towards Johnson. So where they proposed to vacate, half of this property will go back to the developer's side and half of it will go back to the neighboring property to the south just like what happens when we vacate all of our right-of-way.

Here's some renderings. Whenever we do planned districts, we do require that they submit some type of rendering of what it's going to look like, to have an idea of the end game. This obviously, you can see the three phases of three-stories.

Standing, this is Rand Street and then the Second Street. This is looking north instead of the parking lot to the rear that's been added. I believe, and the applicant can explain a little bit, the main delivery point will be to the rear so the main address point will bring all deliveries, moving trucks and everything to the rear-side so not on the Second Street coming through the parking lot.

Just another view. This is looking at the main, so I'm standing on Second Street looking at the main courtyard that will be added parking and just an aerial view of that same courtyard. This is the rear-side of the parking lot again, showing where the driveway, the delivery access will be. I didn't get a picture of it, the reason this is colored differently is because right now it's covered, looks like corrugated metal, some type of tin is what that building façade is, so obviously that won't remain. The applicant can answer; I'm assuming this is probably colored differently for showing where maybe the leasing office is or to designate here the deliveries are here, that's not residential access or individual apartment access.

This is just a bird's eye view, this the back-side as well showing the parking lot access and then this is just the lower level of Second and Rand Street showing that intersection.

There are over three options shown here that were submitted. We did find out at P&Z that there's going to be a fourth option as well. So on the left here, you see two-bedroom, two-bath, the middle is a one-bedroom, an actual traditional one-bedroom apartment, and on the right is a two-bedroom, one-bath. They range from, I believe this is 680 square feet, a little over 1,000, and like 966.

There is a fourth rendering that shows, we don't have it in here, but we were told there's also going to be traditional studio apartments, which are a little bit smaller, well I don't know the square footage I don't have traditional studios and have walls. You walk in, you have your bedroom, living room, everything kind of wide open.

So there will be four options, four different price points. The applicant did give that information at P&Z and I don't remember off the top of my head so he'll be able to share the price points on that. To be honest, that doesn't come into our factor with recommending approval or denial, but I'm sure that would be a question that you all or the audience may have that he did give at Planning & Zoning.

So that's really all I have for slides and I will kind of get into what I put into my Development Plan or my Staff Report. So, like I said this is required to go to a planned district. If this were to come in just under regular R-3, Multi-Family Residential which is what we require new apartment buildings when they're building out on the highway or building on larger lots to come into, there were a handful of things that they had to meet not even listing setbacks.

So obviously this building is existing, it's got pretty much zero lot line if not close to it on three out of four sides of that block. Parking and density are the two main reasons whenever an applicant came forward, we said you know you're going to have to go to a planned district, which we're going to acquire this up front for a project this big we really recommend that anyway it's more transparent to the neighborhood. They get to see what's coming in rather than just approving an unplanned district. This is all done in-house. This makes the process a little bit more open, or a lot more open I should say.

But I'll kind of get into density first. So they're requesting to have 85 units here. In our existing code, if someone where to build new apartments they would have to be able prove that on the lot they can have 3,000 square feet per unit and that is not per apartment size, that's on the lot in its entirety, open space, parking, stormwater or all of that. That is a new code as you all know, we just approved that just in 2017. We actually increased the density to try and encourage more development. We haven't seen new apartments in a long time and that was part of our Master Plan to increase entry-level housing, which obviously has seen a successful with more applications that are meeting those density requirements.

In this case, it's not it becomes an issue because of the amount of units that are requested and it's submitted as feasible to make the project work. They are pretty limited in their open space. Because of the fact that the building takes up two City blocks or the development site plan takes up two City blocks, there's not a lot of room adding open space to decrease that density. You can't add open space across the block because that would be on a different, even if they were to buy up surrounding properties that would be on a different block, it wouldn't count towards there density calculation. They are kind of land-locked by having the right-of-way on all four sides.

We would not recommend demolition of any of the remain contributing structure to decrease density. Because of the fact that this is a historically significant building, I kind of get into it, one of our Historic Preservation Commission has been focusing on but would not be something we would want to encourage. We have this zoned district for a reason. We think we would rather encourage that before we encourage any demolition.

Lastly like I mentioned, if you're going to utilize the existing building and try to meet that density you come up with units that are much larger and would increase in price and get to a market

feasibility. The applicant had said it wouldn't work and we concur with that. If you get units too large you're going to have to charge an amount that really makes the project unfeasible.

So, with that all being said, we are recommending approval of this request of the density. We think that it doesn't detriment the surrounding property, the building is existing, they have the stormwater, take over for the extra parking, parking lot that's going to be added and we think given the size of the existing building that proposed density is adequate for what's being requested.

Secondly, parking. Our current code requires all new apartments to have two parking stalls created for every unit. That is no matter if it's one-bedroom, two-bedroom, three-bedroom, they have to have two stalls per unit. This results, well, this proposed development plan is showing 153 parking spaces total. That is 120 off-street as well as 25 on-street stripe like I mentioned on Rand Street and on Second Street. That comes to a ratio of 1.8 per unit so that is a little bit below, 20% below or not 10% below the maximum that we would or the minimum that we would require for a new apartment building.

There are a couple of things that the applicant submitted and talked about at P&Z and then brought into the record of why there are proposing that this as an adequate parking calculation. One is that they're going to have 41% of the units are going to be one-bedroom so by their calculation they're saying at least 20% of those are going to have one car. That factors into the fact of not going to have a need for that much, for the full 1.8 or I'm sorry, 2 parking spaces per unit.

Second is that, when you have two-bedroom units, of course you're going to have couples there with two cars but their experience, and he had data from his other apartments that he's developed, you don't often see 100% of the two-bedroom even have two cars. So, even with assuming that 20% of the one-bedroom is not going to have one car, that's assuming that 100% of the two-bedroom have two cars which is often not the case.

Secondly, they anticipate about a 3% vacancy which has some influx and there's room for adjustment there.

Lastly, there is, we've used it for other parts of our code whenever we have looked at amending our code, the American Planning Association has national standards for different requirements. They do have a standard for parking, for apartments and that is when it's a one-bedroom unit, it's 1.5 spaces per unit that's required, and when it's two-bedroom and above whether it's two or three but in this the max is two, it's two spaces per unit.

If you would use the national standard calculation and not our City code standard, it requires 153 spaces which is what they propose on and off street. They do have some precedent as what the applicant is to showing as to why they think this is applicable. They think that this one, the statement he put on record at P&Z is that his existing apartments that are built two per unit, are over-parked two, he's going to have 3% vacancy and three, he's going to have 20% of the, I'm sorry 41% of the these be one-bedroom is that he has reasoning to believe that the 1.8 parking ratio is going to be sufficient.

With all of the being submitted and being reviewed, we do agree with that. We think we have the capability of not detracting the surrounding neighborhood with this proposed parking plan, especially with the fact that if he does some permanent parking up front for the units that are the closest and then stripe what's on Rand and Second Street to maximum the amount of parking, that is something that we wanted to recommend. Johnson Street is not no parking right now, but

it is more narrow and so we did not want to encourage parking on Johnson Street by striping any of that. It would be designated parking for Rand and Second Street and not private parking. Anyone in the neighborhood can still park there just like any other on-street parking but we wanted to designate it as a possibility as well.

I do want to add, this did go the Traffic Committee the first week of February and there were no major concerns. They didn't have any comments or changes. The main comments were that they agreed to not add stripe parking on Johnson to not narrow that down anymore than it already is, to not do any permit parking on street or any restricted parking. We kind of thought on the idea maybe adding some signage that said tenant parking only. We want to keep it open in case the neighbor has people over during the day, they could park on the building side that would be no problem and we didn't want to do permanent parking for the neighborhood either. So, the recommendation was that this was an adequate plan and it wouldn't severely detriment the surrounding property.

Something that else that did come up, was that we have currently have in our City code that after 10 p.m. at night, a vehicle parked in front of a house has to be registered at that home. It could be an enforcement issue for the first few weeks, but if it did become an issue, that is something that the Police Department could enforce to make sure that all the proper vehicles are parked in front of the correct homes.

With all of that being said, we did, knowing that we had a code in place to enforce people parking in the wrong area and like I said and stated before, the applicant is saying they believe they have enough parking per their bedroom count. We are also recommending approval of their request in that regard for their 1.8 parking spaces per unit.

So, I kind of just want to wrap this up here, and I know we will have a lot of comments. There's just a couple of things that I want to acknowledge up front. It's important to us to make a recommendation on this. The first is that the International Shoe Factory has been a targeted redevelopment for decades. I'm sure it's not a surprise to any of you. We have mentioned this in our Comprehensive Plan and in our interpretation. There's at least seven objectives that we believe the implementation strategy of that plan that this redevelopment will meet, help us meet those objectives that we've listed. I'm not going to stand up here and read all of them to you, I put them in here. Land use goals about entry level housing, increasing the aesthetics downtown and providing for more Historic Preservation. There are a lot of boxes in our Comprehensive Plan that we think this development checks.

Secondly, in 2007 we had a conservation study done as part of our first original TIF that designated redevelopment areas all through the downtown area as far south as Eighth Street on for the Busch Brewery as far west as for this property. We did as part of that study, approve and accept this area as Redevelopment Project Area #5, RPA #5 that included Elijah McLean's and this property as a Designated Redevelopment Area. The City thought we should put resources towards and try to encourage and that's been done since 2007. We finally have the first person who's serious about taking advantage of any of those resources and going through the process to get that redeveloped.

Lastly, we just actually had our meeting right before this, the Washington Historic Preservation Commission has had this on their agenda for over three years now. So, just about four years it's been an item on the agenda as a focused area. We have applied for with matching

funds and spent over \$60,000 with grant funds and with some matching funds from the City, to survey this area as a National Historic District. The building itself, we found out does qualify to be on the National Register of Historic Places and we believe the district itself is also eligible given the story behind the developers of the factory sold off homes to finance the factory and had the employees live there as basically shareholders of property owners of that development. All the street names in the area around there are the original families that developed that. The Shoe Factory and the fact that this has been a priority of trying to not only acknowledge it as a national historic place for the Historic Registry but also significant to our community and would hope to encourage redevelopment of that.

With all of that being said, this is a big development. Normally we would just go over the site plan, but the fact that we do think that the site plan doesn't significantly detriment the area, does put in a lot of concern and thought to make sure that it actually has the least amount of impact that it can for the development size to the area, and the fact that we have our Comprehensive Plan, our conservation study and the Preservation Commission all having priority on this.

We are recommending approval of it as submitted; we do have some conditions of approval. First, I kind of already mentioned some of these but I just want to make sure they're on the record as staff's recommendations, that the parking stalls along Rand and Second Street must be painted to City on-street parking requirements to capitalize the most spots available; two, the on-street parking stalls must not be reserved and remained public as all on-street parking is; third, a 6' site proof fence is placed along the southern boundary of the parking lot. Along this area, there was a fence showing the plan didn't give any detail because there, like you saw in the pictures they are existing homes here that is one area that vehicles come in and turning around there at night with headlights and that kind of thing, we thought it would be appropriate to have some type of screening along the southern boundary to create, lessen the nuisance there so we are recommending that change to the plan.

Lastly, this is the one we always add just to make sure that it is in the ordinance and the developer has to adhere to it, that stormwater calculations must be verified by City staff and if changes to the stormwater significantly alter the site plan, they will have to come back. The reason we put that in there, they can basically make alterations to this corner of the plan with the stormwater but if they realize they need more space and they have to configure the parking lot to add more stormwater, it will trigger a change in the development plans significant enough that they will have to come back.

Sullentrup: Could they do under the parking lot for stormwater?

Maniaci: I'm sure, I mean...

Nilges: What was that?

Sullentrup: Could they do under the parking lot for stormwater?

Nilges: That's always a possibility.

Maniaci: So, and I think...

Sullentrup: In case they need more parking they could do that?

Maniaci: Yeah, and I think where you're going with that was brought up at Planning and Zoning. Is this area eligible for additional parking spaces? In reality only 11 more stalls will get them to the code. And that, yes, one, I think the developer would prefer to have the greenspace there. His argument is saying that 11 more spaces isn't necessarily building layout in their room capacity. I

will also can see that realistically this is a 100 yards away, a football field away from the back door. People are going to park up and down the street before they park in this back parking lot. So, that's where we said look, yes we could add the 11 spots but people are going to be parking on streets. Let's stripe the on-street parking, let's capitalize on that because it's going to be happening anyway, and then pair that with the fact that there will have to be an issue with the Police Department knows and the neighbors know that, if people are parking on the wrong side of the street, it can be called on. I think it's just an education with the tenants that they are going to know you can get ticketed for parking on the wrong side of the street.

Sullentrup: My concern, why I brought that up John, was because if there is a problem with stormwater, we're going to have to come up with a conclusion. We can put stormwater like they do in commercials, parking lots underneath...*(inaudible.)*

Nilges: If there is an issue with stormwater, yes. In the existing condition, you know we always look at proposed to an existing condition that's what the code essentially reads. The existing condition is how it essentially sits today with all of those roofs, those type of things. You don't go back to a situation where it was a green field, you know way back in the early 1900's. So, I wouldn't anticipate too big of an issue with stormwater. I actually looked at the lower corridor, we do have stormsewer down there Edith and Johnson so really their design that they would have to do is that pipe. What can they push through essentially, that pipe without doing substantial improvement even further downstream? How you overcome that is improving this stormwater on site. So, with that area there we haven't seen any calculations obviously, but I would say that the value that you get out of the greenspace would utilize the impervious area that you have available to you, which would be the streets. I think that the greenspace has more value or at least if you paved it, I would have more detriment to a stormwater issue, which we do know somewhat exists downstream. Either way, code drives it so its...

Sullentrup: Well, if it becomes a problem we will have to fix the problem.

Nilges: And there is a solution, there is always a solution to do that. It just obviously takes more effort to do so.

Maniaci: Just a couple of more things, I am thinking about that got brought up. There are two dumpster enclosures shown to the south here, so none of them on Second Street. There won't be any trash trucks stopping on Second, Rand or Johnson. Seeing this area here, there will be a dumpster enclosure in this area here. A, the applicant or the owner will work with Public Works to actually make sure they have adequate sizing, appropriate dumpster sizes per the amount of units, obviously that is something that the owner doesn't want to happen otherwise they are going to have trash overflowing on their own.

It's hard to see it, but you can kind of see all these darker gray areas are the proposed entrance points to the buildings. So there is one in this courtyard here, one on Rand, I believe there is one here to the south, you can kind of see it on the building here, one on Johnson and then back here on the front side. So there is only one elevator and it will be on this main three-story side so a lot of the traffic will most likely be coming in this main area, like I said they are designated all deliveries and moving trucks to be kind of in this loading area.

Planning & Zoning did vote to approve this unanimously last Monday night. Is there anything else? I think that's about it if you guys have any questions for me.

Mayor: Any questions of Sal?

Holtmeier: Are they following the historical *inaudible* building like windows and such and so on?

Maniaci: They are so since this is an unregistered district, we did get it surveyed. It is eligible and it's through the National Park Service. You have to wait a year, once the survey is done you have to take a year off and then resubmit, I guess just to make sure there's no significant changes. We are in that waiting period right now. So we know it's eligible and from what we can see from it being submitted it does meet our design guidelines. It is not required to meet any guidelines because it's not in a national district yet but this went to Historic Preservation right before this. There was no major concerns, they're obviously thrilled with the project given it's been on their agenda, but long story short, yes, it meets the guidelines.

Holtmeier: Okay.

Mayor: So then it would go on the historic register later or once you do all this it cannot?

Maniaci: It can.

Mayor: It can.

Maniaci: Yeah they just don't they can't, it's more based on demolition and stuff. It can go on in 2021.

Mayor: Right.

Maniaci: It definitely as a building individually but we're hoping because the owner cannot do the building individually on their own. We don't go and pay for people to get individual buildings done. We hope to get the district done, because that will open up every single building in that district for state and federal tax credits.

Mayor: Okay. You may have said this but what year was the building built, do you know or does anybody? I'm just curious.

Maniaci: You know, I want to say like 19...

Sullentrup: A long time ago.

Maniaci: Yeah...(*inaudible.*)

Obermark: *Inaudible*

Maniaci: Yeah.

Mayor: Okay that's all.

Maniaci: I know when it's vacated.

Mayor: Okay.

Unknown: *Inaudible*

Mayor: Okay.

Maniaci: And that's a good point, all the reason that historically significant I believe there was a big push to have military boots made here during World War II.

Mayor: Nice historic...

Maniaci: Yeah...

Mayor: Information.

Maniaci: There was a lot that was dug up on that survey. I'd be happy to share it with all of you and paid as part of the grant, we used landmarks out of St. Louis to do a pretty significant survey on the whole area but significantly this building since it's the primary structure.

Mayor: Okay, any other questions from Councilmembers? Okay, thank you. So this is a Public Hearing so is there anyone here who would like to address the Council on this item, and if you do, just come forward one at a time and state your name and your address and then express your...

Mark Taylor: Good Evening Ladies and Gentleman...

Mayor: Concern.

Mark Taylor: My name is Mark Taylor; I live at 225 Valley Drive. My daughter lives at 242 Rand, right up the block from this. First off, I want to commend you. It was a very nice presentation you gave Sal.

Secondly, I'd like to commend our Council here and all the previous Councils. In my opinion, the City of Washington is absolutely a wonderful place to live and raise your kids. I have a grandson that's five years old and will be in that area. There's a lot of extra cars and everything there going to be around here. I can't say if I'm against the density or against the parking, maybe it's the combination of both. I just think it's an awful lot for this area, and I have two things I'd like for you to consider.

One is, I'm sure with the codes City code being two spaces per every unit that there's developers that have already been here and have been approved for two spaces for their developments. I'm wondering how much flashback you're going to those guys if you allow this to go in without having what your code requires, although it is a new planned development, but still for basic purposes it's two spots per unit.

The second thing is, what about all of the people that might have three cars or may be even more? What about people, last I knew it wasn't against the City code to park a trailer or a boat or any toys people might have on the street.

So, I guess what I'm saying is I'm going to trust you guys to make the right decision for our town, I know you always have in the past and I hope you do again. Thank you.

Mayor: Okay, thank you Mark.

Sullentrup: Excuse me Mark, you said you lived on Alley Drive?

Mark Taylor: Yes.

Sullentrup: Where's Alley Drive?

Mayor: Valley.

Sullentrup: Oh, Valley.

Lamb: He's in Dawn Valley.

Sullentrup: Okay.

Mayor: Okay, next.

Tara Marquart: Hi, my name is Tara Marquart and I live at 701 West Second Street directly across from the factory. I want to thank you for doing this. It's been down and out of commission since before I was born, so I'm kind of excited about this, this is exciting. When you're consider street side parking, when you're coming down Johnson, north and there's cars parked there now, you can't see, so if we're going to have street parking, it's going to be an issue. So just consider street parking maybe there's more parking space I mean the green space may be nice, I don't know it's just, it's already dangerous, now we're going to have planned parking.

Lamb: Are you concerned about parking on Johnson Street or Second Street?

Tara Marquart: Second Street.

Lamb: Second, okay.

Tara Marquart: But as you're coming down Johnson going north across Second

Lamb: Gotcha.

Tara Marquart: And those cars are parked on Second Street, you can't see now, like you have to like edge your way through.

Lamb: Start out there, a little. I understand.

Tara Marquart: Yeah.

Mayor: Okay.

Tara Marquart: That's it. I'm excited it's happening though, very excited. That's it.

Mayor: Thank you.

Holtmeier: Wouldn't our, when we stripe that, wouldn't we stripe a parking spot, so much for that?

Lamb: There's a sight distance triangle.

Holtmeier: Sight distance from the intersection, so once it's striped they'll have parking spots where they have to be in the sight distance, will be down the street farther.

Tara Marquart: It will be down the street more?

Holtmeier: Yeah.

Tara Marquart: Okay.

Lamb: I think it's twenty feet.

Holtmeier: Yeah.

Maniaci: It's a twenty-foot triangle.

Holtmeier: That's what the purpose of the striping is to get people to park in the right spots.

Mayor: Okay, anyone else?

Kimberly Bantle: Hello, my name is Kimberly Bantle. I live at 234 Rand Street, which is actually one of the three houses on the same block as the development. I'm pretty excited about this too, it's a pretty cool building, but my concern is also parking. To kind of piggy back a little bit off of what he said earlier about boats and stuff like that.

But, also visitors. People have people over to visit on the weekends on Rand Street there already gets pretty busy. I've had to park, my house is on the corner, I've had to park back towards that green area and I have a small child, I'd like to have more children. I really would not like to have to walk them two blocks just to get to our house when it's a busy weekend and everybody is having people over.

That's my biggest thing. Our streets are already pretty busy and all that street parking is just going to make things really rough. Other than that though, it looks good. So I don't know if there is any other parking options or.

Mayor: Well, we've had a couple of other people mention trailers and boats and things like that.

Lamb: There are ordinances on the books for those. Some of them, we have an ordinance that gets into the height and the width of the trailers. If they exceed that, they can be ticketed and told to move. Other than that, I don't know, Chief?

Menefee: You have for trailers, you have certain conditions, they have to be bought, they have to have a sign on the rear of the trailer that's a pretty large sign. You can't park it in front of your neighbor's property. I'd have to look to see if there's something...*(inaudible.)*

Nilges: There's 7 ½' wide there's a height restriction as well. There's various.

Menefee: You couldn't put an RV, a large RV in one of the parking spots. It wouldn't fit.

Lamb: You can't just do that not just there, anywhere within our...

Menefee: *Inaudible*

Mayor: Now mind you, that's complaint driven. So if anybody out there is saying well there is one, you know you have to complain about it. You guys just don't patrol the streets...

Menefee: *Inaudible*

Mayor: Looking for people who are illegally parked, so, but it's complaint driven.

Maniaci: *Inaudible*

Lamb: Yeah, I don't know. That's a question for the developer.

Mayor: So there are ways to get around that.

Kimberly Bantle: Okay, so what about the visitors though? Cause...

Menefee: That would be like someone visiting your house. I mean, people are going to have visitors.

Kimberly Bantle: How many street parking, parking lots did that, fifteen?

Maniaci: *Inaudible*

Lamb: There's 20, there are 25 on street, according to the site plan. That's in combination of Rand Street and Second Street.

Kim Bantle: Rand Street and Second Street.

Mayor: And nothing on Johnson...

Lamb: Correct.

Mayor: Because it's too narrow.

Lamb: Correct.

Nilges: I will add there is a restriction. There are various restrictions for trailer parking; different streets in town have that. Johnson Street is one of those streets.

Lamb: Because it's too narrow.

Nilges: It's too narrow of a street. It already has a restriction to where you can't park. Now I know that's not part of your immediate concern, but there are various streets where you cannot park trailers.

Lamb: Rand and Second are not on that list of those streets...

Nilges: They're not.

Lamb: Because they're wide enough to where they can go ahead and accommodate it but they still can't go over those height and length requirements.

Kimberly Bantle: Okay, alright well, thank you very much.

Mayor: You're welcome, thank you.

Kimberly Bantle: *Inaudible*

Mayor: Yes, thank you. Anyone else? Tim?

Tim Buddemeyer: My name is Tim Buddemeyer, I live at 619 Roberts Street right at the corner of and Robert and Johnson. If there is going to be a parking problem it's probably going to be pretty close to my house, because, like we know everybody wants to park as close to the place as they can. I know earlier you were talking about the green section adding 11 spaces there, that's not going to do any good. Like Sal said, that's a football field away. I mean we already have City cars that are parked on the parking lot just right in front knowing that there is a big council meeting tonight. You know, you would have thought being if we pay to park down

by the US Bank parking lot, they could have parked there tonight but that's not the way it goes. Everybody, even when you go to work out at the YMCA, all the spots are out front and they're going to go walk.

Mayor: You're getting your exercise.

Tim Buddemeyer: *Inaudible*

Mayor: You're getting your exercise.

Tim Buddemeyer: As far as the building itself being done, I think that's a great project. I recommend, I highly respect Ed for doing this project and trying to get this project done and everything else, but I do believe that the parking is going to be a problem. I think it maybe kind of like the Camp Street Bridge situation where it may not be as bad as what everybody thinks it is and that. I am in favor of it, even though I'm sure it's going to affect me, but I am in favor of it. I appreciate Sal doing such a great job as for as explaining it to us at the Planning and Zoning Meeting. He did a wonderful job there and that. I kind of wished that you know Joe and Gretchen would have been at the Planning and Zoning Meeting somewhat so we would have had some representation there too besides, but I understand sometimes people are busy and everything else too.

Overall, I think it's going to be a good project but I do believe that there could be some problems with the parking before it's all said and done but, but it'd be a good, it be a good improvement to the area, let's put it like that.

Mayor: A little urban renewal.

Tim Buddemeyer: Yeah, thank you very much.

Mayor: Thank you.

Holtmeier: *Inaudible*...don't you think we'd, we're in position to address a lot of those parking problems? Like when, if it does come about you would tell me or Gretchen or the Chief and we would try to address that?

Tim Buddemeyer: Yeah, I think so. I think that overall, you know as far as that kind of stuff I don't think it's going to be quite as bad as what everybody says. You know like Ed's got out there off of Bluff Road the new complex he's got now, he's suppling two spots per lot there and if you drive by there at any given time, it's not full. You know what I'm saying. So I think there's still places, and when visitors come, there's going to be times where it's going to be bad, but it isn't no different than your neighbor having a party, you know what I'm saying and there's going to be a lot of people there. The only bad thing is you're going to have 85 neighbors in a very tight area. So, it's going to make it a little rough, but, you'll get over it and everything else before it's all said and done. Thank you again.

Mayor: Thank you Tim. Anyone else?

Christine Taylor: I just have something to add really quick. My name is Christine Taylor, I live at 242 Rand and the only thing I want to add to maybe your guy's thought is that if you do own a home in this area, and you do have a trailer, you know a four wheeler, a wave runner and you're out for the day and you come home and the parking is taken in front of your home, I don't know anybody that would want to park their you know several thousand dollar property on the next street over. Or, I mean are we supposed to call the police every time someone's parked in front of our home? If we can't park our property in front of our home? Just something to think about. Thank you.

Lamb: Do you have off street parking places at yours, I mean do you have a driveway?

Christine Taylor: I personally have a driveway.

Lamb: Okay, I'm just asking.

Christine Taylor: But I'm just, something to think about. Because there are people around me that do not.

Lamb: I understand.

Christine Taylor: Thank you guys.

Mayor: Okay, thank you Christine.

Joan Meyer: Hi, my name is Joan Meyer and we live at 602 West Second. I just want to say that I am concerned about the parking. I remember when the plastic factory was there *inaudible*, and we had a lot of trouble with people blocking us in, or whatever and you know it's been vacant for a long time. I'm not sure if we're going to be ready for the excessive parking or whatever, but, I do think it will be a problem, but, not that I'm willing to cope with it or whatever, but I just want to mention it now. I hope the water and sewer system will work out because it is an older part of town. And that's it.

Mayor: Okay, thank you Joan. Anyone else? Ed?

Ed Schmelz: Hello, my name is Ed Schmelz; I'm the developer for the project. First of all, I'd like to thank everybody, neighbors. It sounds like for the most part everybody's pretty excited about the project itself. I really appreciate that, that's always a good feeling to know that the community is behind you, for the most part.

I do totally understand their concerns with the parking. I personally think a lot of that comes just from the code, saying two spots per unit. Many towns around here are 1.5 spots per unit, and if you look at that we're at 1.5 on site spots per unit not including the street spots. To many other, now I know that's not your code, but I'm just saying for many other local codes, we do meet that. I have several other subdivisions that have two and three-bedroom units that are in those 1.5 codes, and we have no problems with three and two bedrooms.

So, I feel very, very strongly that, even if we did not count the street parking and get it up to 1.8, I still feel very strongly that we have enough parking proposed to make this work. Frankly, it wouldn't benefit me at all as a developer putting this much money into this, not to have enough parking. It doesn't benefit me to have all of my entrances to the project, most of them are inside the corridor and their all pretty tight. It wouldn't benefit me at all to have people parking two blocks away. It would just, we wouldn't be able to lease everything up. It just wouldn't work. I feel very strongly what we have proposed is sufficient parking.

Just to answer a couple of questions, we won't allow trailer parking or boat parking in our lot so I know that was a concern, where what if somebody pulls in with a trailer or a boat, and it takes multiple spots. We don't allow that, so once again it is complaint driven by other tenants, but that would eliminate, losing a few spots there for us.

I know the comment was brought up that maybe other developers have come in here and asked for a variance. I don't think anybody has ever asked for this, I believe this is only the second R-4 proposal. What are we going to tell the next guy? Well, my simple answer is I really believe this is a special project that deserves a little bit of special consideration. It has been vacant for 60. I don't think that a little bit of a parking variance is a huge deal. That's about all I have. Questions?

Lamb: Can you point out; can you give him the laser to show where the entrance is? I don't know if we saw that or if Sal went over that, could you show the rest of them where the entrances are going to be for...

Maniaci: Yes.

Lamb: Tenants?

Ed Schmelz: So right here, oh entrances to the homes to the building, I'm sorry. Right here, is one, right here is one, here, here, here, and there, and also there's one in the basement here. This one is an emergency exit. It won't be a primary exit.

Unknown: *Inaudible*

Maniaci: *Inaudible*

Ed Schmelz: Right there.

Unknown: *Inaudible*

Ed Schmelz: Yes, it's a primary it's not and emergency exit.

Mayor: Does the Council have any questions of Ed?

Pettet: Ed, will your parking be open parking or will they be assigned per unit?

Ed Schmelz: It will be open, these areas here and the corridors, front and back right here, those will be assigned.

Pettet: Okay, thank you.

Mayor: Any other questions of Ed? Comments?

Holtmeier: Good luck.

Ed Schmelz: I may need it, thank you.

Mayor: Thank you Ed.

Sullentrup: I know Sarah, you were concerned about parking on Second Street. I know you weren't around back in the day when that place was open, but a lot of these people that live in these houses around that whole block probably weren't around when that business was open. I rehabbed a house on Johnson Street, and when I was doing the rehab I would drive around when I left and looked at the parking around because I was worried about parking for whoever I sold the building to or a place for them to park in the alley.

Unknown: *Inaudible*

Sullentrup: Okay.

Unknown: I just don't want my car to get hit.

Sullentrup: Well, I'm getting to that. You can talk to anyone of the Firemen and they will talk to you until they're blue or red in the face and tell you that there's problems all over Washington with parking on streets. It's and that street I think, is a lot wider than a lot of streets where we have a lot closer parking with less accidents. On one hand, you people got to think about this, on one hand, I'm getting something fixed up that's going to enhance the property of my house, on the other hand, this might be a burden on my parking, but give it a chance and see once how it goes and I'm sure with the City and owner it will all get straightened out.

Unknown: *Inaudible*

Sullentrup: I'll speak to everybody about it.

Unknown: *Inaudible*

Mayor: Is there anyone else? L.B.?

L.B. Eckelkamp: Excuse me, my name is L.B. Eckelkamp. I'm one of the owners of the property and have been for many, many years and was thinking while ago when we talked about that street being vacated, that was the year before I was born. I'm no spring chicken, so we've owned that property a long time, we also bought some of you may know, that we bought the Deb's Shoe Factory Building some years ago and we were able to find a developer who turned it into apartments many years ago. I think it has been a tremendous asset to that area, rather than have the building there, going downhill.

We've been looking for someone who could do exactly what Ed is talking about doing on this property. It fulfills so many of the things that we've been looking for here in Washington. We need some workforce housing, you could do fancy deals with this thing, and charge a lot of rent, but that's not what we need. What we need is some apartments that are useable and that people can afford to live in. It just turned out perfectly as far as his usage of the property. His units, number of units that he is planning to put in there in my opinion works perfectly for the space. We've got plenty of parking, in my judgement, and I think when it's all said and done, everybody will be happy with the parking, but elated with the fact that you don't have the run down building in your block and all of the people in the neighborhoods homes are going to increased in value because of the rehabilitation of this eyesore.

It's been something that I haven't been proud of for a lone time. I've been hoping that we were able to find something exactly like what is being proposed here. I really am very happy to endorse this and to sell the property to Ed because I think it's good for, it's good for everybody.

Mayor: Okay.

L.B. Eckelkamp: Thank you.

Mayor: Thank you L.B.

Wessels: Mayor, I was just going to ask Ed. People I've talked to are very excited about it just for the same reasons we've been saying. In fact, the question I get most often is when do you anticipate it being finished and ready for habitation?

Ed Schmelz: A year and a half.

Mayor: Is there anyone else? Okay, so this will conclude the Public Hearing.

With no further discussion, a motion to accept this item into the minutes was made by Councilmember Holtmeier, seconded by Councilmember Skornia, passed without dissent.

Bill No. 20-12116, POSTPONED, Introduced by Councilmember Holtmeier, An ordinance rezoning 700 West Second Street from M-2 Heavy Industrial to PD-R Planned Residential in the City of Washington, Franklin County, Missouri.

After a brief discussion, a motion to postpone to postpone was made by Councilmember Pettet, seconded by Councilmember Sullentrup, passed without dissent.

CITIZENS COMMENTS

* None

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

* None

REPORT OF DEPARTMENT HEADS

*** Spyglass Project Audit**

Memo

To: Mayor and City Council

From: Mayor Sprung

Date: February 18, 2020

Re: Spyglass Project Audit

I have been reviewing the City's expenditures for phone, internet, and other related services looking for ways to save the City money. During this process, Spyglass contacted me in the process and asked if they could do an audit of these bills to see what they could come up with as well. I explained that we already were working on the fire alarm project so they excluded these lines from their research. They did not find any savings on the internet bills, but did however, find some significant savings on our AT & T accounts.

Spyglass discovered approximately \$6,000 in monthly savings from looking at the phone bills. This would be \$73,000 in savings in one year and \$360,000 in 3 years. Spyglass normally charges one year of savings to perform the work and switch over the lines, etc. They provided the City with a generous discount of 45% and is only charging the City \$40,000 to clean up or AT & T accounts and lines. The City will save this fee in just 7 months time.

Therefore, I am asking for approval to proceed with this project and have Spyglass move forward with the proposed project changes for AT & T accounts.

A motion to accept this item was made by Councilmember Pettet, seconded by Councilmember Holtmeier, passed without dissent.

John Nilges briefly discussed the traffic signal at Highway 100 and High Street and the Third Street Project.

ORDINANCES/RESOLUTIONS

Bill No. 20-12117, Ordinance No. 20-13058, an ordinance approving Amendment No. 22 to the Development Plan for acquisition of an Industrial Tract commonly known as the Elmer C. Heidmann Industrial Park providing for the sale of currently un-platted Lots 21, 22 and 23 for Project Trace.

The ordinance was introduced by Councilmember Sullentrup.

After a brief discussion, the ordinance was read a second time and approved on the following vote; Skornia-aye, Obermark-aye, Wessels-aye, Pettet-aye, Sullentrup-aye, Holtmeier-aye, Patke-absent, Hidritch-absent.

Bill No. 20-12118, Ordinance No. 20-13059, an ordinance accepting the bid from Modern Auto Company, Inc. Washington, MO and to approve the purchase of a 2020 ¾ Ton 4x4 Truck with accessories and amend the 2019-2020 Budget by the City of Washington, Missouri.

The ordinance was introduced by Councilmember Holtmeier.

After a brief discussion, the ordinance was read a second time and approved on the following vote; Skornia-aye, Obermark-aye, Wessels-aye, Pettet-aye, Sullentrup-aye, Holtmeier-aye, Patke-absent, Hidritch-absent.

Bill No. 20-12119, Ordinance No. 20-13060, an ordinance amending the 2020 Budget for the period of October 01, 2019 through September 30, 2020 for the City of Washington, Missouri.

The ordinance was introduced by Councilmember Sullentrup.

After a brief discussion, the ordinance was read a second time and approved on the following vote; Skornia-aye, Obermark-aye, Wessels-aye, Pettet-aye, Sullentrup-aye, Holtmeier-aye, Patke-absent, Hidritch-absent.

Bill No. 20-12120, Ordinance No. 20-13061, an ordinance amending the provisions of Chapter 335, Schedule II of the Washington City Code by adding provisions for a stop sign at the location described below.

The ordinance was introduced by Councilmember Holtmeier.

After a brief discussion, the ordinance was read a second time and approved on the following vote; Skornia-aye, Obermark-aye, Wessels-aye, Pettet-aye, Sullentrup-aye, Holtmeier-aye, Patke-absent, Hidritch-absent.

Bill No. 20-12121, Ordinance No. 20-13062, an ordinance amending Section 700.020 Water Service Pipe, of the Code of the City of Washington, Missouri.

The ordinance was introduced by Councilmember Holtmeier.

After a brief discussion, the ordinance was read a second time and approved on the following vote; Skornia-aye, Obermark-aye, Wessels-aye, Pettet-aye, Sullentrup-aye, Holtmeier-aye, Patke-absent, Hidritch-absent.

Bill No. 20-12122, Ordinance No. 20-13063, an ordinance authorizing and directing the execution of a service agreement by and between the City of Washington, Missouri and Motorola Solutions.

The ordinance was introduced by Councilmember Skornia.

After a brief discussion, the ordinance was read a second time and approved on the following vote; Skornia-aye, Obermark-aye, Wessels-aye, Pettet-aye, Sullentrup-aye, Holtmeier-aye, Patke-absent, Hidritch-absent.

Bill No. 20-12123, Ordinance No. 20-13064, an ordinance authorizing and directing the execution of a Maintenance, Support and SUA Addendum Agreement by and between the City of Washington, Missouri and Motorola Solutions

The ordinance was introduced by Councilmember Holtmeier.

After a brief discussion, the ordinance was read a second time and approved on the following vote; Skornia-aye, Obermark-aye, Wessels-aye, Pettet-aye, Sullentrup-aye, Holtmeier-aye, Patke-absent, Hidritch-absent.

Bill No. 20-12124, Ordinance No. 20-13065, an ordinance authorizing and directing the execution of a Purchase Agreement by and between the City of Washington, Missouri and Outdoor Warning Consulting LLC.

The ordinance was introduced by Councilmember Holtmeier.

After a brief discussion, the ordinance was read a second time and approved on the following vote; Skornia-aye, Obermark-aye, Wessels-aye, Pettet-aye, Sullentrup-aye, Holtmeier-aye, Patke-absent, Hidritch-absent.

Bill No. 20-12125, Ordinance No. 20-13066, an ordinance accepting the bid from Landscape Structures to approve the purchase of a playground at Main Park by the City of Washington, Missouri.

The ordinance was introduced by Councilmember Holtmeier.

After a brief discussion, the ordinance was read a second time and approved on the following vote; Skornia-aye, Obermark-aye, Wessels-aye, Pettet-aye, Sullentrup-aye, Holtmeier-aye, Patke-absent, Hidritch-absent.

Bill No. 20-12126, Ordinance No. 20-13067, an ordinance authorizing and directing the execution of an agreement by and between the City of Washington, Missouri and Unnco Development, Corp., Big Elm, LLC, and Little Elm LLC and amend the 2020 Budget.

The ordinance was introduced by Councilmember Skornia.

After discussion, the ordinance was read a second time and approved on the following vote; Skornia-aye, Obermark-aye, Wessels-aye, Pettet-aye, Sullentrup-aye, Holtmeier-aye, Patke-absent, Hidritch-absent.

Resolution No. 20-13068, a resolution of the City of Washington, Missouri adopting the 2020-2025 St. Louis Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan.

The Resolution was introduced by Councilmember Obermark, seconded by Councilmember Sullentrup. After a brief discussion, passed without dissent.

COMMISSION, COMMITTEE AND BOARD REPORTS

Bill No. 20-12127, Ordinance No. 20-13069, an ordinance approving the Final Plat of Lot 26, Plat 13 of the Heidmann Industrial Park in the City of Washington, Franklin County, Missouri.

The ordinance was introduced by Councilmember Holtmeier.

After discussion, the ordinance was read a second time and approved on the following vote; Skornia-aye, Obermark-aye, Wessels-aye, Pettet-aye, Sullentrup-aye, Holtmeier-aye, Patke-absent, Hidritch-absent.

MAYOR'S REPORT

- * The City of Washington has been approved as a POW-MIA City.
- * E-Cycle Collection Event will be held at the Public Works Facility.

CITY ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT

- * Approval for the Waste Hauling Contract will be at the next City Council Meeting.
- * RFQ's for the Design-Build Teams for the Aquatic Complex are due this Friday.

COUNCIL COMMENTS

* None

CITY ATTORNEY’S REPORT

Public vote on whether or not to hold a closed meeting to discuss personnel, legal and real estate matters pursuant to Section 610.021 RSMo (2000) passed at 8:38 p.m. on the following roll call vote; Skornia-aye, Obermark-aye, Wessels-aye, Pettet-aye, Sullentrup-aye, Holtmeier-aye, Patke-absent, Hidritch-absent.

The regular session reconvened at 9:38 p.m.

A motion to approve the position of Payroll Specialist in the Finance Department was made by Councilmember Wessels, seconded by Councilmember Pettet, passed without dissent.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss, a motion to adjourn was made at 9:40 p.m. by Councilmember Holtmeier, seconded by Councilmember Sullentrup passed without dissent.

Adopted: _____

Attest: _____
City Clerk

President of City Council

Passed: _____

Attest: _____
City Clerk

Mayor of Washington, Missouri