AGENDA FOR
CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS’ “NOON” MEETING
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 2000
Immediately Following Director’s Meeting
CONFERENCE ROOM 113

I. MINUTES


II. COUNCIL REPORTS ON BOARDS, COMMITTEES, COMMISSIONS AND CONFERENCES

*1. Entryway Corridor Design Committee–Phase 3 (Fortenberry)
*2. Joint Budget Committee (McRoy/Seng)
*3. Community Health Partners Meeting (Seng)
*4. Lincoln/Lancaster Child Care Advisory Committee School Age Sub-Committee (Shoecraft)
*5. PRT Meeting (Shoecraft)
**6. Mayor’s Downtown Action Team (Seng)
**7. Lincoln Partnership for Economic Development Meeting (Shoecraft)
  8. RTSD Meeting (Camp/Cook/Seng)
  9. Public Building Commission (Camp/Seng)
 10. Parks & Recreation Advisory Board Meeting (Cook)
 11. ISPC Meeting (Fortenberry)
 12. Multicultural Advisory Committee (McRoy)
 13. Parking Committee Meeting (Camp)

OTHER MEETINGS REPORTS:

III. APPOINTMENTS/REAPPOINTMENTS


IV. MEETINGS/INVITATIONS

1. Neighborhoods, Inc. – It’s a celebration of Lincoln’s Neighborhoods!! – You are cordially invited to Neighborhoods, Inc.’s Annual Meeting on Tuesday, September 19, 2000 from 4:30 p.m. to 7:00 p.m., at 2121 North 27th Street – Festivities include free barbecue, entertainment, and information – A board meeting has never been this much fun! (See Invitation).

2. On Monday, October 23, 2000, An Income of Her Own, the Lincoln/Lancaster Women’s Commission, Friends of the Lincoln-Lancaster Women’s Commission and Salomon Smith Barney invite you to attend an innovative Entrepreneurship Conference for Teen Women. The program will be held at the Lincoln Woman’s Woman’s Club, 407 S. 14th Street in Lincoln, Nebraska from 8:30 a.m. to 2:30 p.m., and they would be delighted if you could join them as an Observer for all or a portion of this unique and exciting day. (RSVP to 441-7716).

3. All Aboard for the Annual Updowntowners Suitcase Party! – On Thursday, September 28, 2000 from 5:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. – at P.O. Pears, 322 S. 9th Street – (See Invitation for more details).

4. The Lincoln Chamber Of Commerce will host its first annual Business to Business Tradeshow on Tuesday, October 10, 2000 at the Embassy Suites – enclosed with the letter of invitation are complimentary tickets – from 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. (See Letter of Invitation).

5. The YWCA Tribute to Women is Lincoln’s way of recognizing outstanding women who have contributed to making all our lives better. 2000 YWCA Tribute to Women – our 20th Anniversary celebration – The 2000 Tribute will be held on Friday, October 13, 2000 at the Cornhusker Hotel. They will begin with a social hour at 10:45 a.m., and the luncheon begins serving at 11:30 a.m. – Tickets $25.00 or table of ten $250.00 – PLEASE FILL OUT THE ENCLOSED FORM (See Invitation).

7. Lincoln Board of Realtors - President-Elect Gene F. Ward Invites you to the REALTORS Association of Lincoln 81st Inaugural on Tuesday, October 3, 2000 at the Embassy Suites Hotel, 1040 “P” Street - Luncheon at Noon - Please RSVP by September 28, 2000 to 441-3620 (See Invitation).

V. COUNCIL MEMBERS

VI. REQUESTS OF COUNCIL FROM MAYOR - NONE

VII. MISCELLANEOUS

1. Discussion on the RFI process (Requested by Jerry Shoecraft).

III. ADJOURNMENT

**HELD OVER FROM SEPTEMBER 11, 2000.
MINUTES
City Council Members’ “NOON” Meeting
Monday, September 18, 2000
CONFERENCE ROOM 113

Council Members Present: Jerry Shoecraft, Chair; Jeff Fortenberry, Vice-Chair; Jon Camp, Jonathan Cook, Cindy Johnson, Annette McRoy, Coleen Seng.

Others Present: Ann Harrell, Jennifer Brinkman, Mayor’s Office; Dana Roper, City Attorney; Darrell Podany, Aide to Councilman Camp; Karen Shinn, Aide to Council Member Fortenberry; Joan Ray, Council Secretary; Chris Hain, Journal Star representative.

I. MINUTES


* - Carried over from September 4, 2000
** - Carried over from September 11, 2000

Mr. Shoecraft, Council Chair, requested a motion to approve the above-listed minutes. The motion to approve the minutes as presented was made, seconded and carried by the following vote:
AYES: Jonathan Cook, Annette McRoy, Cindy Johnson, Jerry Shoecraft, Jeff Fortenberry, Coleen Seng, Jon Camp; NAYS: None.

II. COUNCIL REPORTS ON BOARDS, COMMITTEES, COMMISSIONS AND CONFERENCES

*1. ENTRYWAY CORRIDOR DESIGN COMMITTEE-PHASE 3 (Fortenberry) - Mr. Fortenberry reported that the meeting had not been held, but was rescheduled. Mr. Camp asked Mr. Fortenberry, regarding the entryway, if there was a good involvement of the private sector in this effort? Mr. Fortenberry answered that when the design standards that touch upon those issues come along, there will be. He mentioned that he met specifically with the Chamber of Commerce; there is no intent to bring forward a set of design standards without [the private sector]. He noted that the committee was trying to get something on paper...a vision, and then
work out the details. Mr. Camp cautioned Mr. Fortenberry, noting that many people are concerned about the private sector involvement in the entryway design decisions. Mr. Fortenberry acknowledged these concerns.

*2. JOINT BUDGET COMMITTEE (McRoy/Seng) Ms. Seng reported that one meeting had been held on September 1st and then another since then, a broader meeting than JBC, was held after the Common Meeting on September 15th. What they have actually been dealing with, after the Human Needs Study Assessment, is engaging in a follow-up on the prioritization and trying to figure out, between United Way and JBC how this will all shake out on funding.

Friday morning we interviewed the one group, which probably will be the group we follow through, though that is not definite.

The United Way has kicked-off their $5,000,000 fund raising effort. We're just trying to get ready for what's ahead.

*3. COMMUNITY HEALTH PARTNERS (Seng) Ms. Seng reported that she was not able to attend this meeting due to a schedule conflict.

*4. LINCOLN/LANCASTER CHILD CARE ADVISORY COMMITTEE (SCHOOL AGE SUB-COMMITTEE) (Shoecraft) Mr. Shoecraft stated that he was not on this committee (any longer). This will be removed from Mr. Shoecraft's list of committee assignments.

*5. PRT (Shoecraft) Mr. Shoecraft reported that the big issue PRT is working on right now is the Quality of Life ordinances dealing with problems in the housing industry; but we’re also working on a way that we can resolve issues regarding commercial and business districts. There are some problem properties in those zones that we can’t deal with at this time. So, we're either going to do a text change or draft some different legislation that will allow Building and Safety Department or PRT to address problem properties in commercial districts.

Ms. Johnson asked if that would cover the situation with the Cell Tower. Mr. Shoecraft thought that this would cover such situations. He stated that within the next month, after the next meeting, he will have more information to share with Council.

Ms. McRoy noted that another meeting regarding an issue related to current PRT investigation will be held this Friday. She just wanted to make sure that Mr. Shoecraft was aware of that. Mr. Shoecraft noted that Ms. Harrell might be attending that meeting.

*6. MAYOR'S DOWNTOWN ACTION TEAM (Seng) Ms. Seng reported that this group did not meet. They have scheduled a meeting for October.
Ms. McRoy asked if the Downtown Action Team is the group doing the plans for the downtown landscaping, or is that something different? Ms. Seng responded that the landscaping plans come through the DLA.

Ms. McRoy stated that she had received lots of complaints about the sidewalks being barricaded in the downtown area. During football game days and with all the university students returning, there is a danger there. Ms. McRoy indicated that this was along “O” Street where they’re doing the landscaping. Ms. Seng commented that the DLA had been working on that for a long time. They just keep going on it. Ms. McRoy thought it was rather bad timing to start on that right before school starts and during the football season. She reported that she had been walking there for the last home game and agreed that it was really a mess. Ms. Seng suggested that Ms. McRoy call and talk to Polly McMullen of DLA about this.

**7. LINCOLN PARTNERSHIP FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (Shoecraft)**
Mr. Shoecraft stated that he had not received notice of this meeting until after the fact. (The notice was sent in the material for the week of September 4th - an off-week for Council)

**8. RTSD (Camp/Cook/Seng)** Ms. Seng reported that the budget had been approved, even approval of exceeding the budget limit by 1%. We gave approval to the audit and we didn’t do anything with Antelope Valley. We’re waiting until after it’s been through the Planning Commission and the City Council.

Ms. Seng reported that the Journal Star agreed to remove some of their trackage. Mr. Fortenberry asked if there was a time-line on that? Mr. Camp noted that it was scheduled to be done before the end of this year, explaining that $25,000.00 had been appropriated to take the tracks out across “Q” Street. They’ll do the cement on “Q” and have a temporary crossing adjacent to the Journal Star.

Ms. Seng mentioned it would be temporary where there would eventually be plantings. Ms. Seng noted that they were working on it right now, and that it’s supposed to all be coordinated.

Discussion continued with Mr. Fortenberry stating he would like to see the projects move along faster. Mr. Camp indicated that currently beatification isn’t the aim of the efforts being made, merely maintenance of the intersection through the winter. Ms. Seng noted that they wanted something now for safe pedestrian crossing at the intersection. Ms. Brinkman stated that she would investigate further and get additional information back to the Council.

Ms. Seng continued her report noting that there had also been discussion on the “X” Street traffic and the 3rd and “A” Street Over-Pass.

**9. PUBLIC BUILDING COMMISSION (Camp/Seng)** Ms. Seng reported that they have a new security system in place in the Hall of Justice. Regarding the entrance
down at the parking level, each department will give authority to whoever needs to use that entrance, working with the Sheriff. All large parcels will have to go in the west doors. This has been a big deal on the security question for that building. Mr. Camp agreed, noting that there had been some interesting dialogue on the issue. Ms. Seng shared with Council that there had been some anger among some employees over this matter.

She reported that, regarding the Old Police Building, some State group is going in on the south part of the building. She did not know anything officially on what is going in on the north side of the building, but Don Killeen is attempting to get that all leased out.

She reported that it had been heard that someone might have wanted to lease the whole building, but they aren’t ready at this point.

She reported that there was going to be some sort of a marble inscription over on the front of the Hall of Justice that they’ve been working on...on the inside of the building - some sort of plaque that will be placed there.

She noted that there was a smoking area problem around the Hall of Justice. PBC solved this issue so successfully in the County-City Building area, by putting in a nice park bench....maybe they will do that over there in the southeast corner of that building.

Jim Hille and his firm have been hired to begin work on the parking study. Ms. Seng noted that Mr. Camp has been on the parking study, which is another sub-committee on the PBC, whose members were trying to determine a solution for staff and public parking.

10. PARKS & RECREATION ADVISORY BOARD (Cook) Mr. Cook reported that they had discussed the surplusing of some park land. One of the locations is for Fairview Cemetery...surplus land for that use. The other is near Holmes Park Golf Course, which may be a little more controversial. Mr. Shoecraft asked if that was where Talent Plus is? Mr. Cook indicated that it was. Mr. Cook stated that they had voted for that, contingent on the golf committee input.

He noted that they had also voted on a cell tower policy and a set of procedures they wanted to see implemented in any case where cell towers were planned to be placed in City Parks.

He noted that there had been an update on the Uni-Place pool, which Mr. Cook thought looked like the Highland pool, except, of course, for the flood plain concern. Ms. Seng commented that there was a big meeting on this issue scheduled for this evening.

11. ISP C (Fortenberry) Mr. Fortenberry did not attend, but reported that he had spoken
with Doug Thomas who told Mr. Fortenberry that there was nothing of great import being considered for discussion.

12. MULTICULTURAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (McRoy) Ms. McRoy reported that nothing had really happened. By-laws were discussed; the affirmative action position which is in the budget was discussed. Personnel is working on a committee to get questionnaires together on the process, and they hope to have someone in place by December.

Ms. Brinkman informed Council that the MAC board members had a concern about members who were not attending the meetings. They have initiated a policy in the by-laws that if a member missed three meetings over a years time, the member would be automatically removed. She noted that this would not affect the member who’s term is expiring this month since the by-laws with the change were just adopted. However, this member had not attended a meeting all last year. It was noted that if this member chose not to serve another term, Mr. Fortenberry knew someone in the Vietnamese community who would be pleased to serve on the MAC Board. Ms. Brinkman asked that the Administration Office be given the name of the individual and they would follow up on that information.

Ms. McRoy asked if Council could have two spots on the MAC Board so if Mr. Fortenberry wanted to serve, he could (as was discussed briefly at the beginning of this discussion). She noted that there were no white males on the Board. [There was some lighthearted commentary, but nothing was decided).

13. PARKING COMMITTEE (Camp) Mr. Camp reported that there had been a meeting. They went over the number of permits that had been requested and the changes in lot allocations. They also went over the report on the studies that have been done.

* - Carried over from September 4, 2000
**- Carried over from September 11, 2000

OTHER MEETINGS REPORTS: None

III. APPOINTMENTS/REAPPOINTMENTS - Ms. Brinkman asked if the current format of appointments notification was working for the Council. All of the Council members indicated that it was.

IV. MEETINGS/INVITATIONS - Noted Without Comment
V. COUNCIL MEMBERS

JONATHAN COOK - No Further Comments

ANNETTE McROY - No Further Comments

CINDY JOHNSON - No Further Comments

JERRY SHOECRAFT - No Further Comments

JEFF FORTENBERRY - Mr. Fortenberry had two issues he wanted to discuss. One was 84th and Old Cheney and 70th and Pine Lake. He felt putting 70th and Pine Lake on pending was reasonable. The 84th and Old Cheney project however seems to be accomplishing multiple objectives now. He stated that he did not like to run these behind Staff, but they’ve worked on this a long time and there is serious interest in this. He noted that he had mentioned this to the Mayor as well.

The other issue, regarding the nudity ordinance, is something that has bothered him - that being the issue of ‘pasties’. He believed getting into a box like that was just silly. He stated that he had not reviewed this material, but there are cases from other municipalities that have passed on clothing requirements that have held up in court. Mr. Fortenberry passed the material out to the Council Members. Ms. Johnson suggested that the Attorney’s Office have copies. Mr. Roper indicated that he believed his office had a copy. (Community Defense Website material).

Ms. Johnson offered to take money out of her discretionary funds if necessary to have this researched by the group. Mr. Roper stated that he had talked to this group on Friday. They are apparently two attorney’s undertaking this Defense. Basically they charge $90.00 an hour. They will write an ordinance for $5,000.00. Then, if they have to defend it, that would be an additional charge. Mr. Roper requested that the two attorneys send a resume which would be forward on to his office. He noted that one of them is actually speaking to the State Bar Association in Omaha this October. Mr. Roper thought that he would let them speak for themselves on how much further Council might want to go beyond ‘pasties’. If Council wants to ask them that question, Mr. Roper will let them articulate what their answer would be.

Mr. Roper asked if that was the City’s main concern? Is that what we’re looking for. When he talks to these people, what information does he want from them exactly? Discussion continued on definitions and the courts delving in to that level of deliberation on violation of freedom of expression, but Mr. Fortenberry thought, certainly in liquor establishments, you are allowed to have regulations regarding clothing. Mr. Fortenberry stated that it just seemed to him if the City were going to do something in that regard that we don’t want to get boxed in by the seemingly...

Ms. Seng asked if everyone had heard about the topless car washes being conducted in the City. She noted that the police were out dealing with it. Mr. Fortenberry commented that the issues were a little broader than just juice bars and liquor licenses.
Mr. Roper asked for direction on what the Council was looking for. Did Council want the Defense group to write an ordinance? Do we want them to.... Ms. Johnson asked how much clothing can we legally put on the women? Mr. Fortenberry noted that in the public nudity ordinance, there would be a definition of “nude” if someone didn’t have a specified amount of clothing on. It would affect things like topless car washes and things that could creep up here during the summertime.

Mr. Roper stated that when he gets the material from the group, he would share it with Council.

COLEEN SENG - Ms. Seng commented that she’d like to discuss the Wednesday Joint Meeting with the Omaha City Council at Mahoney Park. She commented that they have received an agenda that Mr. Shoecraft worked out. She commented that she felt Council needed a little preparation on that first item regarding the airport facility between the two Cities. Ms. Seng asked Mr. Brinkman if she would be at the meeting. Mr. Brinkman noted that she and Ms. Harrell and Mr. Bowen would all be there to make sure that Council has some back-up, if that’s okay with the Council members. Ms. Seng indicated that she thought they really needed that ‘back-up’ there.

Ms. Brinkman asked what kind of information Ms. Seng wanted. Ms. Seng was not sure, but felt a presentation of some kind that would lead the two groups into the discussion would be appropriate.

The second item is one that Jon put on about the Technology Crescent between Lincoln and Omaha. She felt these first two items were really linked together and felt that the Lincoln Council needed to have a good discussion on these topics, once again, with Omaha, on how we can cooperate on some of these issues. She felt Lincoln’s Council needed the Administration’s support to lead off with something so that we can follow up with it.

Mr. Fortenberry stated that the two groups had discussed the airport last year in sort of cursory way... Ms. Seng said, yes and they laughed at us. Mr. Fortenberry thought that the only way that a realistic thing was going to be done between Omaha and Lincoln on any issue would be to put representatives together that could form a kind of advisory body, or a committee, that would be charged by the Cities to look at that issue, because us discussing it in a 15-20 minutes segment, will be fruitless.

Ms. Brinkman stated that she knew that Ann had been working on the airport issues with Lincoln’s own airport and how we haven’t been able to do anything. But obviously, the Gallop thing necessitates a lot regarding this discussion as well. How we do that with the Omaha City Council in a constructive way is important. She added that she thought they could probably put something together. She noted that she would try to work with the others and talk to Council about it before the presentation. She felt it would lead into a broader discussion of whether or not we should do something on a regular basis.

Mr. Fortenberry stated that it would probably not be between the two Councils...that is never going to happen. But, if we raise the issue of concern, then we want to have it looked at. Then, secondly, can we have an implementation plan to look at the issue. Because we’ll be looking at the same issue next year if we just talk about it for 20 minutes.
Mr. Camp commented that he liked Mr. Fortenberry’s idea of getting a group of Staff plus maybe one Council Member from each City Council, and have an on-going dialogue and work on these issues. He asked if this is something that everyone feels comfortable suggesting, so that we can say “this is our proposal”. Would you mind doing that?

Another thing that was talked about last year that Public Works and the Planning Departments are working on is common design standards for road work. That is a very mundane issue, but there, hopefully, with the continued dialogue, it might be a little more structured.

If we had this proposal set in motion, perhaps we could get quarterly reports from the Committee on the progress they’re making so there is a way we can evaluate it.

Ms. Seng commented that we do need to get our staff together and they should be working on some stuff for this meeting. There’s been all this time when there’s been all this division. We really need to bring Staff together. She noted that there was a time when the City Staff and the Lincoln Public Schools did not work together. That is one reason that we ought to get together with the School Board...as boring as the meetings might be...to make sure that the two entities Staffs can work together.

JON CAMP - No Further Comments

ANN HARRELL - No Further Comments

JENNIFER BRINKMAN - No Further Comments

DANA ROPER - No Further Comments

ADDENDUM:

Meetings/Invitations - Noted without Comment

Miscellaneous - Margaret Griesen’s Request for Photo of Council for her class at Morley Elementary School. Council Members determined that it would be advisable to have a supply of such pictures available for distribution to the public upon request, at no charge to the individual or group requesting the picture. [CIC has been contacted for the negative and Council Staff will order a supply of photos for distribution to the public upon request]

VI. REQUESTS OF COUNCIL FROM MAYOR - Ms. Brinkman noted that one item, the EMS, Inc. contract, was listed for vote today on the formal agenda. She noted that she had sent Council members out a packet, and apologized for getting it sent so late. She pointed out that there is also one more typographical change made this morning. She again apologized for the confusion. She offered that if anyone had any questions to please let her know and she would be going up talk
to Chris about the contract, too. The memo she had sent indicated what the changes were. When
you get six different groups in a room, you get six different views for improvements.

She wanted to assure Council that they had met with the hospitals last Wednesday and have
incorporated the changes that they wanted. The most significant one was that the hospitals asked
the City that it increase its contribution on the yearly basis to $100,000 rather than the language
as it used to be which indicated “up to $100,000”. So, Administration had indicated that the Mayor
is willing to do that, and she hoped the Council would be supportive of that change as well.

Ms. Johnson asked if that matched the hospital’s share? Ms. Brinkman noted that St.
Elisabeth’s is putting in $55,000, Bryan is putting in $110,000 and the City is putting in
$100,000. She felt there had been concern because, with the City anticipated to take on a bigger
role in emergency service, and the fact that EMS, Inc. is really doing a lot of over-sight of city
employees, they felt is was important for the City to make a larger contribution than originally
planned. She noted that the City was more than willing to do this.

They also had a concern that the idea of a self-supporting system for medical over-sight be
looked at. There is language in the contract that says at the end of this four year period, we are
hopeful that we will have identified a way to support this without contributions from each of the
parties. That is certainly something that the hospitals are interested in, so EMS, Inc. should be
charged with doing a study to figure out how we go about doing that. That’s the plan.

Mr. Camp asked about the funding for a specific position on the EMS, Inc. Board. Ms.
Brinkman noted that funding had most likely been approved in the budget passed by Council in
August under the Personnel item.

Ms. Brinkman also mentioned a brief meeting she had held this morning on the City-related
State legislation issues. She brought some forward this morning that she felt Council would be
interested in for discussion at the joint Omaha/Lincoln Council meeting on Wednesday. She
explained that she would be hosting some meetings in the upcoming months, through December,
one a month on the second or third Monday, at approx. 8:30 a.m. These meetings will last from
one-half hour to 45 minutes. (This morning’s meeting was the first of these).

These meetings will be attended by the City staff who are monitoring legislation or are
working with the legislature and the City Lobbyist on legislation that will affect the City. This will
be an attempt to learn who is getting contacted by the legislature, what is being watched, so everyone
is aware of what those issues are.

Ms. Brinkman invited any Council Members who want to come to the meetings and be a part
of those discussions, to attend. Ms. Brinkman reiterated the schedule for meetings when the
legislature is not in session and explained that during the legislative session the meetings would be
held on a weekly basis on Monday mornings at 8:30 for a half an hour so the legislative agenda can
be reviewed as to what hearings are coming up, who will be going over to attend those hearings, who
will be talking to the legislature, etc. This will help us all know exactly what’s going on. Ms.
Brinkman stated that she had a difficult time following the legislative schedule last year without a
procedure like this in place. She noted that there are so many City issues out there that this would
be a good way to track them. She encouraged Council Members to come and be part of these meetings.

She stated that if any Council members would like the City Lobbyist or any member of the Mayor’s Staff come and talk with them about these legislative issues, they’d be glad to do that at a Pre-Council.

Ms. Ann Harrell added that the Mayor did approve a list of those to be on the Duplex Licensing Task Force. She noted that she has sent out a letter inviting those people to a meeting this Friday that will be a “get-acquainted/get-organized” meeting. She explained that she had not made up a list to distribute to the public yet (or anyone else) because she hadn’t heard back from all of these people that they were all officially willing to serve. Some of them were volunteers in various capacities, representing either organizations or themselves; but some of them have not yet responded and it’s been a number of weeks. The RSVPs are starting to come in now. As soon as Ms. Harrell knows who all are committed to serving, she will get a list together for Council’s packet or by next Monday after their first meeting.

The groups being represented are home builders, the Board of Realtors, and some neighborhood representatives and some low-income renter advocates. Also, Ron Perry from the Building and Safety Department will be there as a facilitator.

Mr. Cook noted that he had seen a list earlier and wondered if there had been any additional industry representation beyond the Omaha Board of Realtors? Ms. H. Harrell stated that she did not know what list Mr. Cook may have seen, so she could not comment. The industry groups that were represented were the Board of Realtors, Home builders, REOMA...and she thought that was all. She indicated that she will get an updated list as soon as everyone has RSVP’d.

Ms. Harrell noted that they had tried to keep the Task Force small so that it would function smoothly. She believed there were 10-12 people on the Task Force. Mr. Cook stated that he had received a call from someone who felt the Task Force was not balanced enough, but, Mr. Cook observed, if the home builders have been added to it, that would be a positive step. Ms. Harrell commented that the funny thing is that both sides were very nervous about whether it was going to be balanced, noting that she tried very hard to make sure that it was a well balanced group.

Scheduling for the meeting was also discussed briefly.

VII. MISCELLANEOUS -

1. Discussion on the RFI process (Requested by Jerry Shoecraft). Mr. Shoecraft explained that anytime a Council Member does a Request for Information that will require any amount of extensive research on the part of Department Staff, the RFI process can’t be circumvented. We must go through the process - getting it assigned a number through the Council Staff, through the system and showing up on our Agenda so that everyone knows pretty much what the others are requesting. This reduces the chance for duplication of requests and also allows for sharing of responses. What has been happening is individual members have been doing phone calls or sending directors 3-page memos directly to the Departments instead of through the RFI process.
We need to go through the RFI process. This note is just so that each of you is aware of this procedural requirement. Any questions?

Mr. Cook stated that he assumed this did not affect the previous policy of making phone calls directly to a department in order to get some information that doesn’t require any extensive research. Mr. Shoecraft indicated that that was correct. Mr. Camp noted that he wasn’t sure where the dividing line goes. He noted that he had played telephone tag with staff members. He noted that he was concerned about the timeliness of the RFI responses. He felt the RFI process was cumbersome. From a constituent’s standpoint, it is a slow process. You don’t want to tie a response up for a week or two... that is unfair to the constituents. Mr. Shoecraft noted that, nonetheless, Council still must go through the RFI process so that the inquires can be tracked. Whether a personal memo is sent to any department... it must be tracked. We hope that in the future, responses to those RFIs will happen quicker, but we must be able to track it and have a number assigned to it.

Mr. Camp asked if we could work on a system with Council Staff to get the process speeded up; Mr. Camp reiterated that his concern is for the timely constituent response. Mr. Shoecraft commented that that is a separate issue - the response time of RFI from a Director. Mr. Shoecraft stated that the RFI needs to be tracked so everyone knows what concerns are being investigated - this to eliminate duplication of inquiry and to keep everyone on the same page.

If only a simple response is required, a phone call is appropriate. If it will involve a great deal of research, it will have to go through the RFI process. This also allows the Administration to keep track of Council’s concerns.

Ms. McRoy suggested, that to speed the RFI process up, maybe the Directors should put RFIs as a top priority for their Staff rather than putting them off for weeks.

Mr. Camp mentioned that he had been denied information on a specific incident that he had inquired about and had been told that he could not see the information until it had been presented to the Mayor’s Office. Mr. Camp stated that he felt there was a control issue involved here. Ms. Harrell stated that the reason it had to go through the Mayor’s Office is because they were making a decision to put in additional traffic controls and they wanted the Mayor to sign off on that before they proceeded. The Mayor read that material late last week and distributed it to all of the Council Members today... which is the next time he saw you.

Mr. Camp stated that he didn’t even get to see the traffic study, which he had requested. He felt, if anything, it would have been a courtesy because he had been involved in the issue. He felt it was bad PR on behalf of the City when these skirmishes take place on who gets access to information.

Ms. Harrell commented that in this case, a logical process was followed. She noted that Mr. Camp had asked Staff to make a policy change with regard to traffic control in an area where a constituent raised a concern. The Staff did take a look at it; they went to their Director; their Director approved it; then it was included in a memo to the Mayor, who then approved it; who then distributed it back to the elected officials - coincidently other elected officials were here at that time who have some interest in a particular subject matter that was at hand. Now that the elected officials have all seen it, Staff, as requested at the Council meeting that day, will meet with the constituent and explain what happened and how the decision was reached.
Mr. Camp stated that he would like to participate in the decision process. He noted that the process that Ms. Harrell just described circumvented the City Council.

Ms. Harrell stated that Staff had been asked to make a quick decision and expedite the results. Mr. Camp stated that Staff also told him that he could not see any of the information...at your direction.

Ms. Harrell stated that she thought they were expecting to get an answer from the Administration first on the choice they'd made. Mr. Camp noted that he was not given the information. Ms. Harrell stated that she thought Mr. Camp was, maybe, making more of it than perhaps there was. It's appropriate for the Staff to get the Mayor's permission before proceeding.

Mr. Shoecraft stated that just for FYI - in the future, any RFIs that require extensive amounts of research, must get it tracked into the system, so it gets assigned a number through Joan. Then it goes up to the Departments...that's the bottom line. Arguments can be made another day about this other issue. This discussion is about the RFI process.

VIII. MEETING ENDED - Approximately 12:53 p.m.