



CITY OF TOPEKA

CITY COUNCIL COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES

POLICY AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

CITY COUNCIL
City Hall, 215 SE 7th Street, Suite 255
Topeka, KS 66603-3914
Tel: 785-368-3710
Fax: 785-368-3958
www.topeka.org

Date: July 2, 2021

Time: 10:00 a.m.

Location: 1st Floor Conference Room; Holliday Bldg 620 SE Madison

Attendance

Committee members Present: Spencer Duncan (Chair), Hannah Naeger, Tony Emerson

City Staff Present: City Manager Brent Trout, Chief of Staff Bill Cochran, City Attorney Lisa Robertson,

1) Call to Order

Chairman Duncan called the meeting to order at 10:00am.

Chairman Duncan would like to add an item to the agenda to discuss CIP bond & debt discussion. Committee member Emerson made a motion to approve the addition of the item. Committee member Naeger seconded. Approved 3:0.

2) Approve Minutes from May 7, 2021 Meeting

Committee member Emerson made a motion to approve the minutes. Committee member Naeger seconded the motion. Minutes approved 3:0.

3) Update: Governing Body Rules

[Items pertaining to this section can be found as Supplemental Material on the Policy & Finance Committee's webpage: <https://www.topeka.org/citycouncil/policy-finance-committee>]

City Manager Brent Trout noted there had been some prior discussion from Council members with an interest in possibly revising the Governing Body Rules to include electronic participation. City Attorney Lisa Robertson went through the document and made a number of updates to reflect these items.

City Attorney Robertson identified areas where the electronic participation would be addressed within the body of the rules. Section 2.3 Electronic Participation, outlines the process. It will basically be a request by a Governing Body member to participate electronically or remotely, and that would be based on three different reasons: Emergency situation, some type of disability that would not allow for in-person participation, or if it is a personal matter. If participating remotely due to personal reasons, there would be two instances where this would be allowed. This

1 - Policy and Finance Committee

Minutes Taken: July 2, 2021

Minutes Approved:

language was formatted by using language in other communities that had begun allowing for remote participation. It could be subject to change depending on our Governing Body's recommendation. On page one, the voting rules were verified. Previous to COVID-19, everyone was physically present and used the voting board. If electronic participation is allowed, and even one member is participating remotely, then the vote will be done through roll call and the voting board cannot be used, and language was added to clarify that process.

Other changes include cleaning up the language for making a motion, to align better with Robert's Rules of Order. And taking out things that Robert's Rules or League of Kansas Municipalities did not address. The primary point in those being the 'motion to reconsider the motion' versus the 'motion to resend an action previously taken'. We had been using motions to reconsider kind of like a 'motion to amend an action previously taken'; when really, the motion to reconsider is supposed to be a motion made by somebody on the prevailing side at the same meeting, period. The 'motion to amend an action previously taken', we have done in the past, has not been contained in our rules, so I placed it in there. It does not have a wait period associated with it, but I included a week provision on it, (p. 11), because that is what the Body had done with 'motions to reconsider', so I'm thinking that the desire there was to give people time to think it over and not be reactionary. Attorney Robertson reminded the Committee that her suggested language could be changed if desired.

Additional item pertains to Committee Items (p. 16 of tracking document). The rules currently say that you have to bring a motion or an item that was referred, or initiated by a committee, back to the Governing Body as an action item. We are adding an option to allow item to go to the Governing Body as a discussion item, rather than simply as an action item.

Chairman Duncan inquired about the process of the Governing Body members requesting permission to participate via electronic attendance. City Clerk Brenda Younger felt it may be appropriate to go through the City Clerk's office. Chairman Duncan inquired if the request and approval should be made through the Mayor and/or the Deputy Mayor. Committee member Naeger agreed to this. Chairman Duncan made a motion to allow Mayor, or Deputy Mayor, to consider the request of a Governing Body member to attend a Governing Body meeting virtually. Committee member Naeger seconded the motion. Motion approved 3:0.

Chairman Duncan made a motion to allow for three (3) instances of a personal matter where Governing Body members may be allowed to attend the meeting virtually, per calendar year. Committee member Emerson seconded the motion. Motion approved 3:0.

Chairman Duncan inquired about virtual attendance as it applies to committees. City Manager Trout and Chairman Duncan exchanged comments wondering if the rule related to remote meetings would carry over to committees or not, or if it would be at the discretion of the Chair to allow or not allow electronic participation. Attorney Robertson recommended adding the language in the Committee section of the Governing Body Rules, whatever was felt to be comfortable, to help clarify. Committee member Emerson noted that, unlike the rules for Governing Body meetings, Committees are afforded the option to appoint a proxy. Committee member Emerson and Chairman Duncan conversed about the suggested language. Chairman Duncan's intention was to allow for one, or however many was decided on, instance where a committee member could choose to participate electronically rather than to appoint a proxy or be absent. Chairman Duncan stated he felt it would be okay for a committee member to attend electronically whenever, to keep the momentum of the Committee's work pace and noted that oftentimes, a proxy may not be as up to speed on the current work of a committee, and that sometimes slows meetings down. Chairman Duncan offered to include language to allow for electronic participation to any Committee meeting, with permission from the Chair. Committee member Naeger was supportive of this suggestion, and agreed she felt there was a difference between electronic participation at committee meetings versus Governing Body meetings. Committee member Emerson inquired about the effect remote participation may have on the Staff who run the meetings. City Manager Trout stated that it may just be needing to have one more staff member available to cover the meetings, but that he felt comfortable saying we could do it. He noted that other committees have also had public participation and comments, and that being able to allow for the additional way to participate has made it easier for them to attend the meetings and be heard. It also allows other presenters, who may not be first in line on the agenda, to remain at their office and be productive until it is their time to participate in the meeting. Chairman Duncan made a motion to add a provision to the Governing Body Rules that would allow for electronic participation to any Committee meeting, with the permission of the Committee Chair. Committee member Emerson seconded the motion. Motion approved 3:0.

Committee member Emerson inquired if there were any additional changes to the document from the last review to this one. City Attorney Robertson stated there were no other changes.

Chairman Duncan made a motion to approve the revised Governing Body Rules with amendments, for approval by the Governing Body. Committee member Naeger seconded. Motion approved 3:0.

4) Contracts \$50K and Above [Video 18:10 minute mark]

3 - Policy and Finance Committee
Minutes Taken: July 2, 2021
Minutes Approved:

[The red-line and clean version of these documents will be available on the Committee's webpage].

City Manager Brent Trout stated this item was a request to look at the possibility of having the Governing Body review and approve contracts that the City does with consultants over \$50,000. Currently, any contract over \$50,000 that is proposed, goes through an RFP process, and then can be approved by the City Manager. Any contract less than \$50,000 can be approved by the City Manager without going through an RFP process. Based on the current set-up, there is no requirement to require the Governing Body to approve any contract that is done with a consultant. All contracts related to other projects that are done go through the normal bidding process of our Contracts & Procurement process, and the City Manager signs off on all contracts of the City. This is an opportunity where an additional step in the current process of approving contracts over \$50,000 would be presented.

Chairman Duncan stated in reviewing the ten year historical of these types of contracts, the lowest number for a year was five contracts, and the highest was fourteen. In some years, it is less than a million dollars, and other years it can be several million dollars to pay upon the level of contracts that are being put through. His hope is that \$50,000, and above, would be a starting point for being more involved in the process. Chairman Duncan stated some of his impetus of moving this forward would be to allow Governing Body members time, prior to the item being presented, to have input or ask questions about the funding and process; that the meeting where it is being presented should really stay focused on the results of the product.

Joe Ledbetter provided public comment. He felt that roughly a quarter of the budget is used for contracts. Mr. Ledbetter would like to have the Governing Body review and approve all contracts \$50,000 and above.

Carol Marple, tax payer, provided public comment. She noted there being a lot of overhead and inquired if there was a need for such an amount of overhead. She feels constituents have a responsibility to do their due diligence when it comes to reviewing the budget. She feels the Governing Body should be reviewing these contracts, as there is the opportunity for misuse of spending tax payer dollars.

Committee member Emerson pondered impacts to the project timelines. He noted that there are a number of cities where the oversight process by the Governing Body is being done. On the other end, he has some concern that these types of contracts could become politicized. He felt that as long as there was some way to keep this from happening, he would be ok with it. Chairman Duncan noted that Staff would do the initial work and bring the recommendations to the Governing Body, so that step may reduce or eliminate the politicization of awarding contracts. Additional considerations were made to allow for some input into the

consulting issues, and this would be a place, with a focus, to begin. Committee member Naeger noted that she appreciated the step rather than a leap with making changes to the process.

City Manager Trout stated that all of the projects that are being talked about with hiring consultants, that the Body would be approving, are all projects that have been budgeted for and approved by the Governing Body. He shared concerns for some of the process being politicized, noting there have been past instances where a vendor has come in as a second place, but is then chosen over the vendor that Staff has recommended. He used the example of Staff potentially making a recommendation for an out-of-town vendor rather than a local vendor. Although it is a concern, City Manager Trout noted there are generally a number of qualified local vendors.

City Manager Trout also noted there may be a delay in the timeline by a minimum of one week, possibly two, depending on when the contract was approved. If the contract is presented at the third Governing Body meeting of the month, that week or two week delay will present itself. There is an effort by Staff to speed up the process by using DocuSign programs, and adding the additional approval step to the process will counter this effort. It is a decision for the Committee and Governing Body to make, and Staff will be able to accept that decision, but he wanted to make everyone aware of the issue.

Committee member Naeger stated she shared the concern about the delay in the process, but noted she would be comfortable with explaining to constituents that the delay was due to the Governing Body working through the review and approval process.

Chairman Duncan stated he understood the concerns. With regard to politicizing the process, he noted that part is hypothetically already part of the process, and that if the concern was that this would make politicizing outward, he would prefer that to inward conversations. He also felt confident that other cities are able to work on a reasonable timeline, and felt like the City of Topeka would be able to also do this.

Committee member Emerson reviewed two versions of the draft policy, noting one has Article II in it, and one does not. He inquired about the differences. City Attorney Robertson responded that the Article II deals with public buildings and improvements, and hones in on architects, engineers and appraisers. The language in the previous Article I gives authorization of the Governing Body to sign all contracts, language included in the proviso also lists professional services to include architects, engineers, appraisers, and the others. She did not feel there would be a need to keep Article II, if the language was drafted to include the additional language in Article I. She did not know what the reasoning was for

having a special article that only pertained to those three categories of professional services, but not to others.

Contracts and Procurements Director, Leigha Boling, explained the City's E-Pro system. The E-Procurement System, or E-Pro, is categorized by commodity. When you are an architect, engineer or other professional service provider, you will elect to be registered under that commodity code. When anyone is listing bids for professional services, they are all already included in the notification and are sent the solicitation. Staff is recommending removal of Article II, as removal would not impact, and currently does not impact, how the City operates for professional services for those categories. City Attorney Robertson noted that in an effort to clean the document up, the repeal was made. Committee member Emerson stated he felt there may have been a reason in 1995 as to why the language was included, and is hesitant to remove it without understanding why it would have been added in the first place. With this meeting being the first time reviewing the information, he would like additional time to review.

Chairman Duncan asked for direction from the Committee. Committee member Emerson felt he would be agreeable to approving the document, but would like to keep Article II. Chairman Duncan inquired if it would be possible to make changes at a later time. City Attorney Robertson stated changes could be made at a later time. She noted that language associated with abandoning a contract would be included in the contract, rather than in the code. Staff's intention was to remove language from the Municipal Code that would already be placed into contracts. City Attorney Robertson stated that the language being submitted for approval includes architects, engineers, appraisers, and professional services, but that if the Committee preferred, Article II could remain, and a cover sheet could be added to explain the superfluous language.

Director Boling stated current contracts have three provisions for termination:

- Termination for cause
- Termination for convenience
- Termination for lack of appropriation funds

Those are the three terms that the City hold to a contract, making it possible if there is a need to cancel a contract. The City must justify the reason for canceling a contract, but those clauses are included in all contracts.

Chairman Duncan confirmed that the City is currently operating under Article II, to which City Manager Trout confirmed.

Committee member Emerson made a motion to move the "Duncan Proposal", with Article II retained, to the Governing Body for approval. Committee member Naeger seconded the motion. Motion approved 3:0.

5) Recruitment & Retention Process [video 47:30 minute mark]

Chairman Duncan stated this topic was introduced as an inquiry to learn how the City disseminates job opening information.

Human Resources Director, Jacque Russell, began with explaining the process for Union recruitment requirements that are in place for internal employees. Each of the five bargaining units: AFT, AFSME Development Services, AFSME Water, Teamsters, and Water Pollution Control, require an internal posting for all positions before the City can advertise to the public. That posting may be anywhere from five calendar days to ten working days. For some of the positions, the City works with the Unions to request concurrent posting; especially for entry-level positions where we can post out to the public and internally to the Union at the same time. If the City has that authorization, it helps speed up the process, because many of the current Union member employees are not interested in the entry-level positions.

For management and executive positions, the City posts internally for a minimum of five days. The application system the City uses is from the Clear Company, which posts job openings automatically onto:

- City's website [<https://www.topeka.org/hr/current-openings>]
- Indeed.com
- Monster.com
- Glassdoor.com
- ZipRecruiter.com
- LinkUp.com

The City also has a subscription service, found on the City's website, E-Notify, that allows individuals to receive email notifications of employment opportunities. [<https://www.topeka.org/e-notify>]. There are about 800 people registered to get that weekly notice. The City also sends information to roughly 80 additional area agencies of all job openings. This includes organizations such as the Topeka Rescue Mission, Kansas Division of Children & Family Services, the Topeka Workforce Center, and other similar agencies that help people in the community find jobs, as well as organizations that have requested to have them. Various schools and universities such as Washburn Tech and KU's career centers, and some local churches that have signed up. The City also posts most of the positions to the social media sites: Facebook and LinkedIn.

Director Russell stated the Human Resources Department monitors the applications coming in, and particularly with Facebook and LinkedIn, if the City is not seeing a good applicant flow, there is an option to go back and pay to boost those postings which will cast a wider net through those sources, through a paid recruitment.

A lot of the entry-level positions are recruited directly to the universities, on their websites. Another online recruitment tool that is geared toward college students is called Handshake, and the City posts certain positions with specific colleges directly through Handshake as well. This would include entry-level Engineering positions or Engineering Tech positions, and Planning positions. Depending on the type of position, HR also will post job openings to specific trade organization websites in hopes of a more targeted recruitment approach.

Chairman Duncan asked for clarification of the posting timeline. Director Russell noted that positions open internally for a minimum of 5 days prior to being opened to include external applicants. Typically, the verbiage states a position will be open until filled, however there is a first review of applications on a specified date. Typically, there is no date but they are refreshed every 30 days to many of the places. When the refresh occurs, HR also tries to retool the advertising to include additional clarifying language that may be more appealing to potential applicants.

Chairman Duncan inquired if an outside recruitment team is used to scout for positions other than City Manager. Director Russell noted it was usually only common to have two, the City Manager's position and the Police Chief. However, if a specialized position has been especially difficult to fill, the City Manager could grant approval to have a Recruiter contracted out to help with this search.

Committee member Emerson inquired if the Human Resources Department had a Recruiter position. Director Russell noted that there is a Recruitment Specialist within the Human Resources Department. She noted that the recruitment landscape is changing, and the City's recruitment strategies are changing along as well.

Committee member Emerson inquired if there was any type of referral incentive program, to where if someone was hired and able to stay employed for a minimum amount of time, if the employee who had made the referral would receive some type of incentive? Director Russell stated that City Manager Trout recently approved a pilot program to hopefully address the dispatch shortage, which impacts the City's Police and Fire Departments directly, to grant an employee an additional "e-day", paid day off, for a referral that leads to hire. This idea has been discussed as a way to extend to recruit for other positions as well.

Chief of Staff Bill Cochran noted that the professional recruiting efforts have increased over the past few months. The City has entered into conversation with a lot of local companies on how they hire and retain personnel. Conversations have occurred with Kansas University, Kansas State University, and Washburn University, in an effort to come up with a comprehensive recruiting plan that will be very impactful for the City in the near future. He stated the City has been

engaged with Kansas State University to focus on Engineers. Kansas State noted we were the first municipality to reach out to them to have such conversations and were impressed that we were ahead of the game with our ideas. Overall, although we have suffered through some tough hiring times over the past couple of years, Chief of Staff Cochran is confident about where the City is going to be within the next six months. The MPA program has brought in some great young candidates that will be future employees. The e-day idea is one of the more “outside of the box” ideas for incentivizing current employees to help with recruiting.

Director Russell noted that the HR Staff goes along with the Police Department Recruitment team when they go to events. She stated there had been additional partnerships with other departments to have Staff from those departments attend the recruiting events. There had seemed to be more success with potential applicants who had been able to ask questions and talk to Staff from those fields, rather than just the Recruiter.

Chief of Staff Cochran noted there would also be some dramatic changes to recruitment and hiring of the fire fighters, with additional information coming out within the next couple of months.

Committee member Naeger inquired if the City of Topeka faces a lot of competition from the State? Chief of Staff Cochran confirmed that is the case for some of the specialized fields such as Engineers. The State is a bigger employer and there are a lot more areas that you can work in, compared to the City. Chief of Staff Cochran noted that in a recent interview with an Engineering applicant, the topic of the residency requirement came up. The applicant noted that in all of the places he had worked, there had not been such a requirement. Chief of Staff Cochran noted that this is one of the hurdles that does come up, and needs to have further review.

Chief of Staff Cochran also noted that the City Manager has the authority to designate which positions qualify under the Greater Topeka Partnership’s “Choose Topeka” relocation program. He stated once a master list is compiled, if there are key positions that have been difficult to fill through other traditional methods, the City Manager may decide to allow that position to qualify for the program. This could potentially be expanded to the Police, Fire and Public Works departments. The City does face competition from the State as well as other municipalities, especially in areas such as the Attorneys and Engineers.

Chairman Duncan noted that the private sector is always a key competitor to governmental positions. He noted that the wage study will be compared to other municipalities, because it is not likely that it will be able to compete with the pay and other benefits of the private sector.

City Manager Trout noted there was an event coming up in August. Director Russell noted the event would be August 6th that would be a Public Safety Entry Level Testing event. The full recruitment teams from HR, Police and Fire would be on hand, and participants would be able to participate in the entry level test for both the Police and Fire agencies. The public campaign would be going out soon.

6) Budget Process item [video 1:09:00 minute mark]

Chairman Duncan noted that he had added this item to the agenda after receiving comments from colleagues, regarding reviewing whether or not any provisos should be added to the CIP, beginning with the 2022 process. He also asked for Staff to help explain what the City's Bond and debt services were. Staff has created a chart to help better understand this information, and additional information would include items such as total debt service from prior years, total debt service retired, new debt service, total debt service for the year, and anticipated revenue.

City Manager Trout stated there would be additional review at the next meeting, but that today he wanted to talk, generally, about some concepts related to how we look at that, as far as our capacities. The City's financial advisor, Jeff White, has also assisted with providing information to Staff as it relates to what the right direction may be for the City of Topeka. Generally, questions that were asked included:

- What should our CIP look like in the future?

That has a lot to do with identifying our needs, and prioritizing how quickly we want to try and tackle those needs. We know we have a number of water lines that need to be replaced, as well as other aging infrastructure in the plants. We have street needs, etc. As we begin to look at this, we are trying to determine the right balance here as it relates to how much we should bond, and how much we can afford to bond, and then compare it to how quickly we want to address some of the aging infrastructure.

Staff has been trying to meet that need, on an annual basis, based on feedback received by the Governing Body.

- What is our true capacity? How much could we do if we wanted to go full-bore and we had all the consultants and contractors available?

These considerations set the top bar, and Staff figures out where we are at and what we have been doing.

City Manager Trout stated that, according to Mr. White, the City's current General Obligation (G.O.) Bond max capacity that we could sell up to, \$350M to \$4M of G.O. debt on the books. Currently, the City is at \$182.4M, meaning there is additional capacity, if we chose to go that route. However, that has impacts. Our bond ratings would likely go down if we were trying to issue that much in debt.

We have certain limits with regard to our levy and capacity to be able to pay off that debt. That might cause issues as it relates to our ability to fund out General Fund, and our need to keep operations going. The previous Governing Body looked at that information when they established the \$9M cap on G.O. Bonding. The idea was, as we needed to curve, how much we had outstanding and to bring it down. The City was approaching about \$100M, roughly, that we will have outstanding. By 2025, it will be less than \$100M. For example, we are issuing \$9M this year, and are retiring \$15M. So, right now, we are retiring more debt than we are actually issuing. Even with the future years that were approved the other night, at \$10M - \$10.5M, to do some additional street work and other projects, we will still be retiring more debt than what we had done in years past.

City Manager Trout noted that Revenue Bonds were not the same as G.O. Bonds. However, what we have done with the Revenue Bonds has been a better job of managing and looking at what the market is doing. Issuing 30 year bonds at the rates we currently have allows us to accelerate some of the work that we need to do in our utility side. We are taking advantage, right now, of the low rates. Even though it seems like we are issuing a lot of debt. We will not be able to do this in the future, depending on what the rates do for selling those bonds. We are really restricted in the future, and are taking advantage of the low rates at this point. We have some concepts that we are floating around in the future, for looking at how we will use the American Rescue Plan money, and are getting closer to finalizing what that looks like. The biggest share of the money from the American Rescue Plan is going to go toward water and sewer projects. We have \$45.7M that we are going to receive. Even with other things on the list that we are considering, City Manager Trout stated he expected that well over \$30M of that money will be dedicated toward water and sewer. In conclusion, City Manager Trout stated he sees a good future, as it relates to maybe looking at how the City curves some of that borrowing back, and look at our rates. Maybe we take a pause at having a higher rate. All of that will need to be discussed in a bigger concept with much more detail, but generally looking at this as a possibility, given where we are at with this additional money, and the ways we can spend that money and looking at how it helps customers within our city regards to rates.

City Manager Trout noted there had been some questions related to open projects and how we will be able to manage those, to ensure projects are updated more frequently. In the past, the Governing Body would get an update at the time when quarterly reports are done. During the pandemic, those quarterly updates were removed in an effort to save time, however they will begin to be added to the Governing Body meetings again.

City Manager Trout noted there was also a question about the City's bonding, and what Staff thought the bonding request would look like in 2021. He stated the bonding request will match what is referenced in the CIP. Staff will look at the

projects that are ready to go, which projects are ready for full funding, which projects need temp notes, and then will bring the proposal to the Governing Body for Bond sale, that relates to what was approved on the CIP, depending on what projects and what stage they are in, will determine how much money will be requested, as it relates to the funding for those.

The overall arching key to understanding this process, is determining where we want the bond rating to be, as we are ranked for this. Even as we are ranked as one of the top 40 cities, the biggest component of that is our financial stability, and our financial way we do business. We need to decide where we want to see that bond rating. There are various factors, which will be left for another discussion with Jeff White. Mr. White is looking at all of that information on the City's behalf, to help explain it to us, where he may feel areas where things should be done differently; areas that would not affect our bond rating, and other areas that might affect it if we really wanted to pursue that direction.

City Manager Trout continued, that current bond interest rates are very low, historically, and that trend may continue for a little while, but we know it will not be this way forever. He urged that the City take advantage of the opportunity now.

Chairman Duncan inquired if there would be a presentation related to this topic coming to the Governing Body soon. City Manager Trout stated there will be a presentation on July 6th about Economic Development incentives, and Jeff White has incorporated some items related to Senate Bill 13 in the material, and how it affects the incentives. City Manager Trout envisions reviewing the presentation from Mr. White to the Committee, and have the Committee members ask questions at that time. The items brought to that meeting will impact what he presents on to the full Governing Body, as we look at these particular issues to provisos. There are so many variables and it is important to have discussions at the Committee level first, to gather the feedback and guidance, and then give a better presentation to the Governing Body.

Chairman Duncan stated the proviso issue is complicated as well, because there is consideration for identifying what those should be and what they would look like, and then discussion on what you can/cannot, should/should not do, and whether or not to bound future Governing Bodies to the terms. City Manager Trout noted that Staff had received some items from Councilwoman Karen Hiller, and that he would be reviewing those and bringing those answers to the next meeting. Some items are decisions that affect this CIP, and others are for a future time.

7) Introduction: Title 5 Revamp [video 1:21:15 minute mark]

City Attorney Lisa Robertson noted that the information for the Title 5 revamp is simply and introduction and overview for today, and that it will be brought to the

Committee in the months to come for more in-depth discussion. City Attorney Robertson stated she and City Manager Trout had begun working on this in 2019, but then the pandemic hit and work on the project was suspended for a year. The Policy and Finance Committee worked through a similar revamp a few years ago for Title 2 of the Topeka Municipal Code. In that case, the Committee and Staff worked through the title a few sections each month until the Title was finished. She suggested three ways to go through the process:

- Same way as before; work through the sections until the end and send a comprehensive package to the Governing Body for recommendation.
- Or, to do chapters at a time and send them to the Governing Body, as they are completed, for recommended approval.

City Attorney Robertson stated the first round would be to review the general provisions, and the process for how the City requires a license application to be done. Generally, the appeal process, and then the group would proceed with “vehicles for hire”. This is currently addressed as taxi cabs in both Title 5 and Title 10, so the recommendation from staff would be to combine everything into one document and either put it in Title 5 or Title 10, so that everything is in one location. “Vehicles for hire” will be a big one that the Committee would first consider, and the next one would be “Mobile homes”, “Mobile home craftsman”, where you’ve got the competing titles once again in Title 5 and Title 14. It will get easier and easier from there, but Staff would recommend working through those more difficult ones first.

8) Other Items

Chairman Duncan inquired about the suspension of rules. City Manager stated Staff would recommend suspending the rules for an additional two months, as the Council Chambers will be under construction for the months of July and August. During that time, the Governing Body meetings will be held in the Holliday 1st Floor Conference Room, and that having some Governing Body members participate virtually would help with the available space.

9) Schedule next meeting; Adjourn

Future date will be determined at a later time, however the committee would like to meet in August. Chairman Duncan adjourned the meeting at 11:29am.

The video of this meeting can be viewed at: <https://youtu.be/PhGK0VhB96o>