

**MINUTES OF PUBLIC HEARINGS AND REGULAR TELEPHONE
CONFERENCE/VIDEO MEETING**

June 9, 2020

MONTGOMERY CITY COUNCIL

CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Sara Countryman declared a quorum was present and called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

Present:	Sara Countryman	Mayor
	Kevin Lacy	City Council Place # 1
	Randy Burleigh	City Council Place # 2
	T.J. Wilkerson	City Council Place # 3
	Rebecca Huss	City Council Place # 4
	Tom Cronin	City Council Place # 5

Absent:

Also Present:	Richard Tramm	City Administrator
	Susan Hensley	City Secretary
	Alan Petrov	City Attorney

INVOCATION

T.J. Wilkerson gave the Invocation.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO FLAGS

PUBLIC HEARING(S):

Convene into Public Hearings for the purpose of giving all interested persons the right to appear and be heard regarding the following:

1. **Convene into Public Hearing – By the City Council, acting as the Zoning Board of Adjustment, regarding a request for 5-foot side yard setbacks in lieu of the required 10-foot**

side yard setback for Hills of Town Creek Section Four, an 8-acre parcel located at the intersection of Emma's Way and Scenic Hills Court, as submitted by Chris Cheatham.

Mayor Countryman convened into the Public Hearing at 6:02 p.m.

Mr. Tramm said this item is referenced by Section 98-122 of the Zoning Ordinance and requires a side yard of not less than 10-feet in R1-Single Family Residential. Mr. Tramm stated the developer is requesting a five-foot variance to allow for a five-foot side yard. Mr. Tramm said at the May 26th meeting, Council approved variances for smaller lot sizes than required by the Ordinance for the 30-lot addition to the Hills of Town Creek subdivision and stated five-foot side yards are typical for smaller lots like what has been built at Hills of Town Creek Sections Two and Three and what is being proposed here for Section Four. Mr. Tramm said a legal notice was posted on the City's website, published in the Courier and 19 letters were sent to surrounding property owners with copies of the legal notice, a zoning map, and a preliminary plat of the property. Mr. Tramm advised the recommendation for this item is to receive public comments for consideration. Mr. Tramm said this is an agenda item for action tonight.

Rebecca Huss asked if Mr. Tramm received any comments via email or any other form. Mr. Tramm stated no he did not receive any he was aware of unless something came in at the last minute that Mr. McCorquodale knows of that he does not. Mr. McCorquodale stated he did not.

Mayor Countryman asked if there was anyone on the phone that would like to speak up in the public hearing.

There were no other comments.

Adjourn Public Hearing.

Mayor Countryman adjourned the Public Hearing at 6:03 p.m.

2. **Receive Final Report** - from the Planning and Zoning Commission regarding a rezoning request for Hills of Town Creek Section 4, to rezone from B-Commercial to R-1 Single Family.

Mr. Tramm stated the Planning and Zoning Commission held two public hearings to receive comments and attached is their Final Report of Findings and Recommendations. Mr. Tramm said the action for this is to receive that from the Planning and Zoning Commission and we must have that action before we hold the public hearing.

Rebecca Huss moved to receive the Final Report of Findings and Recommendations from the Planning and Zoning Commission resulting from their two public hearings regarding a rezoning request for the Hills of Town Creek Section Four, an 8-acre parcel of land located at the intersection of Emma's Way and Scenic Hills Court. Kevin Lacy seconded the motion, the motion carried unanimously. (5-0)

3. **Convene into Public Hearing – Regarding a rezoning request from B-Commercial to R-1 Single-Family: for an 8-acre parcel of land located at the intersection of Emma's Way and Scenic Hills Court, currently zoned B-Commercial to be rezoned R-1 Single-Family, as submitted by Chris Cheatham.**

Mayor Countryman convened into the Public Hearing at 6:06 p.m.

Mr. Tramm stated this is a request for a 30-lot addition for Hills of Town Creek subdivision near Montgomery High School. Mr. Tramm said the property is currently zoned as B-Commercial and is proposed to be rezoned as R-1 Single-Family Residential. Mr. Tramm said 19 property owners within the 200-feet of the affected property were notified by mail and a legal notice was published May 19th and May 26th. Mr. Tramm advised the action item for the actual zoning will be on June 23rd to allow for proper posting timeline and stated tonight's activity is to receive public comments for consideration. Mr. Tramm said he has received no comments to date by mail or email.

There were no other comments.

Adjourn Public Hearing.

Mayor Countryman adjourned the Public Hearing at 6:07 p.m.

VISITOR/CITIZENS FORUM:

Any citizen with business not scheduled on the agenda may speak to the City Council. Prior to speaking, each speaker must be recognized by the Mayor. Council may not discuss or take any action on an item, but may place the issue on a future agenda. The number of speakers along with the time allowed per speaker may be limited.

- State or type your name at the time of making your comment.
- Limit comment to a maximum of three minutes.

There were no comments made.

CONSENT AGENDA:

4. Matters related to the approval of minutes of May 26, 2020, Public Hearings and Regular Meeting.

Rebecca Huss stated she did not have any comments other than a spelling change that she discussed with Ms. Hensley and thought the minutes were very well done. Mayor Countryman agreed.

Rebecca Huss moved to accept the minutes as presented. Tom Cronin seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously. (5-0)

Rebecca Huss stated just to be clear the only item on the Consent Agenda was the minutes. Mayor Countryman said correct.

CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION:

5. Consideration and possible action regarding the Annual Financial Audit for the year ending September 30, 2019, as prepared by Belt Harris Pechacek, LLLP.

Mr. Tramm stated following the audit presented by Ms. Darla Dear, Regional Director with Belt Harris Pechacek, he discussed several recommendations going forward with Darla which included making more frequent bank deposits of funds, a process they had already identified and implemented previously after the last fiscal year ended, and to make changes to the way

Public Improvement District #1 reimbursement and the subject properties are tracked and will be separate from the general fund. Mr. Tramm said we do plan to incorporate the changes recommended. Mr. Tramm introduced Ms. Dear to give her presentation.

Ms. Dear thanked Ms. Hensley, Mr. Tramm, and other City employees that helped in providing information bringing the audit together, and without their help, it would be a very difficult job. Ms. Dear said they make it so easy and are great to work with.

Ms. Dear stated she would be going over the first three important pages of the audit. Ms. Dear said the opinion letter is the first thing they will go over. Ms. Dear said the City received an unmodified opinion, which is the highest level of assurance you can receive where there are no material misstatements and all disclosures have been made in the report. Ms. Dear congratulated the City on receiving the unmodified opinion. Ms. Dear stated that is the page they consider the most important out of the audit.

Ms. Dear said on pdf page 28 (report page 22) is the general fund revenues and total expenditures for the City. Ms. Dear stated the total revenues were \$3,678,582, total expenditures were \$3,692,277 with the transfers in and out gave the City a use of total other financing uses of \$12,120, leaving an ending fund balance of \$1,250,837. Ms. Dear said the staff did a great job on the fund balance and there was a little use of the fund balance this year, but still a nice healthy fund balance.

Ms. Dear said we will review page 65 (report page 59), which is the general fund budget to actual and the section we will focus on is going to be the expenditure where they compare the actual expenditures to the budgeted expenditures. Ms. Dear stated you will see three areas are starred to the right and those amounts are the expenditures that exceeded appropriations at the legal level of control. Ms. Dear said basically what that means is the budget that was passed by the Board, the expenditures in those areas were over budget and as far as what they would consider best policy, would be those are reviewed monthly and the budget amendments you can wait to do at the end of the year. Ms. Dear stated there are no repercussions to the City for that, it is just a control and compliance regulation issue. Ms. Dear said it just depends on the City's management and how you would like to handle that part of it as far as going forward. Ms. Dear stated they would suggest those are reviewed monthly and that budget amendments

are made following best policies for the City. Ms. Dear said as cities go, there are about 50% of them that realize there aren't any teeth behind this compliance requirement and 50% do not pass budget amendments and whatever the City is approved is the one they go with. Ms. Dear said it is up to Council and the City Manager how to proceed forward as far as this budget part. Ms. Dear stated if you go over budget, it will continue to be a management letter because it is a compliance requirement. Rebecca Huss asked Ms. Dear to be specific because Council looks at the budget at the second meeting of every month as it's available and usually discussed and then Council will do a budget amendment at the end of the year, so how is that different from what you are recommending. Ms. Dear stated that should be it and she did not know exactly, but there may have been some entries that were posted after that was done at year-end that made those expenditures go over budget in those areas. Rebecca Huss said that makes it difficult then if we as Council do one thing and management does one thing and then if the accounting side does something else we can't ever comply if we don't know what is happening on the back end. Ms. Dear said yes if there are any adjusting entries done after year-end, you can still go back to Council and say you needed to make an adjusted entry to accrue the payroll, whatever it is you had to do at year-end and tell Council you have gone over in that area and need a budget amendment. Rebecca Huss asked even if we are in the next fiscal year, we can always go back and amend the prior budget to avoid these asterisks. Ms. Dear stated yes that is correct. Randy Burleigh asked if those adjusted entries could have caused these issues. Ms. Dear said yes, it is possible. Rebecca Huss said there were some significant journal entries. Ms. Dear said she is going to look at the trial balance. Rebecca Huss said she thinks it is an important question to ask especially since it is the essentially largest footnote to our clean audit. Ms. Dear said in the general government grouping they made one journal entry of \$170 so in the general government area for the \$29,000 that was one that we would not have created. Ms. Dear stated in public safety, they made a journal entry to accrue payroll of about \$21,000, so you can see you are over by \$47,000 and they made a \$21,000 adjusting journal entry to accrue the last payroll that would have been posted in October.

Ms. Dear said regarding capital outlay, they made one small entry of about \$4,600 in the WatchGuard to increase that amount but believed that was an applied adjusting entry that Mrs. Branco had her make that was in the capital outlay area. Ms. Dear stated you are over by \$87,000 and that was a \$4,600 entry that was made into there. Rebecca Huss stated these are things we should have known about before and we could have done them ourselves before

year-end. Ms. Dear said yes. Kevin Lacy asked just so he's understanding correctly, once we get our budget together, at the end of the year if we move past it into the following year and we realize we went over \$87,000, all we have to do then is go back and adjust the budget and raise it to cover the \$87,000 and that's okay. Ms. Dear stated that is correct you would not have had any revenues, you weren't increasing your budgeted revenues, you are telling us from your example of the \$87,000 budget amendment that you're approving these \$87,000 out of our fund balance. Kevin Lacy stated because we already did. Ms. Dear said exactly. Kevin Lacy asked as far as the accountability part of it. Ms. Dear stated there are no repercussions it is a compliance requirement, but it has no teeth as far as what happens to the City. Ms. Dear said you have about 50% of the cities that don't see the point in passing a budget amendment and then you have others that don't want that management letter coming in there and they want to pass the budget amendment. Rebecca Huss said from a practical perspective it makes sense to have a political understanding of what is happening. Kevin Lacy stated it behooves us to stay on the same page. Ms. Dear said yes.

Randy Burleigh asked if the pension fund was in better shape from the prior year. Ms. Dear said you still have a net pension asset and think it decreased a small amount. Ms. Dear stated the net pension asset is \$88,006 for governmental activities and your utility or enterprise fund you have about \$10,000 and she believes that is a slight decrease in that asset, but you're still not recording a liability, so you're still in good shape in that amount because most people do not have net pension assets, they have net pension liabilities. Rebecca Huss asked who determines the sensitivity to the discount rate that you provide on page 53. Ms. Dear said TMRS does and they take all the information from TMRS which they provide from a package they download from them and all they are doing is taking their data and reports. Rebecca Huss stated the discount rates TMRS is using is ludicrous. Ms. Dear said yes, they have heard that before and said they do not have any control and all they are doing is taking their data on their pension.

Rebecca Huss asked if Ms. Dear would care to comment on the timing of the audit because this had been a problem for us in the past and this is the latest one we have ever had and the COVID-19 thing is not helpful, but even without it, it would have been exceptionally late versus our preferences. Ms. Dear stated they had our draft in March, so as far as your compliance requirement at the end of March 31st to have this in for the Securities and Exchange

requirements. Ms. Dear said as far as getting the information to them, as soon as you can get the books closed, they will be ready to hop in there so if that is in November then we will be ready to roll in November so we're waiting on the information from the City. Rebecca Huss asked if that was a problem on our side because when you look in June and you're almost ready to close your next fiscal year it's kind of a tick in the box rather than a treasured trove of useful information. Ms. Dear said yes and it was around March 15th or the first or second week of March that they had the audit ready to go and you just got hit with the COVID-19 and so they put off the presentation part of it, but as far as the compliance part of it, it was in. Ms. Dear said as far as working the information, they can do it a lot sooner. Rebecca Huss said February would be nice because then it's still pretty fresh and useful for anything we've learned that we should be doing differently to be able to apply to the current year and there is still a possibility that it is relevant. Ms. Dear stated she has thrown it out there for Mr. Laskey and will discuss with Mr. Tramm and Ms. Hensley that we come in and do an interim visit during the summer, it is included in the audit. Ms. Dear said they get the testing and review the budget to see if any areas are over and give recommendations on anything they see before you get to year-end. Ms. Dear said that way whenever year-end does come, the only portion they need is the financial information and they would get the audit out a little quicker than if they had to work in the requirements and the compliance portion of the audit. Ms. Dear said they are ready to roll if you all are. Mr. Tramm stated he is ready to work with Ms. Dear so we can do our end of getting it done earlier. Rebecca Huss thanked Ms. Dear.

Rebecca Huss moved to accept the Annual Audit for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, as presented. Randy Burleigh seconded the motion, the motion carried unanimously. (5-0)

6. Discuss issues related to services provided by Waste Management of Texas, Inc. under the Municipal Solid Waste Collection and Transportation Agreement and direct the City Administrator to take any necessary action following discussion.

Ms. Hensley stated Ms. Teri Woodson with Waste Management of Texas, Inc. was present.

Mr. Tramm stated he received some service-related issue questions from residents and he also had some questions from a couple Council Members, so he thought the best thing to do would be to bring Ms. Woodson a representative of Waste Management here to speak

do would be to bring Ms. Woodson a representative of Waste Management here to speak directly to Council to get some dialog and answers to the questions and to improve the service.

Ms. Woodson said when she received the email from Mr. Tramm, she was concerned and pulled the reports from their system and stated if the City or a resident calls in, they log every call. Ms. Woodson said she pulled a report of all missed pickups from January 2020 through June 4, 2020. Ms. Woodson stated the issue they are in right now is a lot of people are staying home and the volume of trash has increased 28% to 30% and they are running heavy every single day since this started and it's because people are eating all three meals at home. Ms. Woodson said some of our routes are running behind as far as we are supposed to be at someone's house at 10:00 a.m., but we are not getting there until 12:45 p.m. Ms. Woodson stated she knows that some of the calls that have come in are because they just haven't been there yet, but they did have 13 missed pick-ups for some reason and it's hard to know why, but we missed their homes. Ms. Woodson said their goal is once they are notified is to come back the very next business day, so it could be a Saturday because Saturdays are a business day for them, but if they call on a Friday or Saturday, it could push it to Monday. Ms. Woodson stated she went through each month, reviewed the calls and talked with their operations staff and management and they did see a pattern on a few addresses, so what she has asked them to do was every time a driver goes by that house they have to call into their dispatcher and log the time and date they are at that home and log the information in while they are sitting there because the GPS will give the exact location of where they are calling in from. Ms. Woodson said she has put that in place on several addresses and she can send an email to Mr. Tramm with those addresses if needed, and those are the things she can identify by looking at the log. Ms. Woodson said if a customer calls her, she is more than happy to talk with them. Ms. Woodson stated that she and an office manager went out to a resident's home and made special arrangements for a special needs resident recently because the resident was facing a big challenge. Ms. Woodson said with everything that has happened, Waste Management has not reduced your service, they have full staff running and they are very proud of our staff and until last week, we had not had any people call in sick at all since March. Ms. Woodson said last week they did have a few drivers call in and took personal days and they covered those routes also. Ms. Woodson said in your community, once a week trash, once a week recycling and the once a week bulk that we pick up, we service several services a month and it's 5,443 services

that we touch a residence in your community, which is not including your commercial handload and the frontload business we do for the school district and other businesses in your community, that is just your residents. Ms. Woodson stated annually, we touch your residents 65,000 times and says when you look at that, that's a lot of touches, and unfortunately we are not perfect, but we do think we have good protocols in place that when we make a mistake, we're able to recover. Ms. Woodson noted she worked very closely with Ms. Hailey Ciulla who is a pleasure to work with, she has a great attitude and her follow-up is amazing which she appreciates and said they have a great working relationship as far as keeping things straight and communicating with each other regularly. Ms. Woodson said she would be more than happy to take any questions or any suggestions on what you would like her to follow-up on or if you have an address and she can take the same steps with an address that you may be aware of that you think may need some extra attention and she would be more than happy to do that.

Tom Cronin asked what the regular trash day is in the City of Montgomery. Ms. Woodson stated the regular trash day is Wednesday and they do everything on that service day except the at-your-door special collection because it's household hazardous waste special that is done on a route so that is an additional service that is also provided for your residents. Tom Cronin asked if residents can also expect on Wednesday the recycling container to be picked up. Ms. Woodson stated yes. Tom Cronin stated last week he was told it was the next day. Ms. Woodson said due to the overwhelming volume, they were not able to empty the truck and drive into Houston to a regional recycling facility and could not get there and back as they ran out of drive time. Ms. Woodson stated they would be sitting on the highway on I45 at 5:30 p.m. and by the time they got back, they were out of hours, but they came back the next morning and finished the route. Ms. Woodson said it hasn't happened a lot but when that happened, she got with Ms. Ciulla the next morning and gave her a map where they were down so she could be prepared to let the residents know. Ms. Woodson said that it does unfortunately happen, but they come back the very next morning. Tom Cronin said something else he was concerned with was he was told by someone that the driver placed the container in the middle of the driveway once it was empty and asked if that is where it should be placed. Ms. Woodson responded no, it should be put back at the point of origin and stated she drove through his community a couple of weeks ago and saw most everyone's container was at the edge of the driveway on the sides or if they're able to put it right in front of the grass is where it should sit. Ms. Woodson said she did bring that up to their office manager to make sure they understand that is not acceptable.

Tom Cronin said with all things aside, since the City contracts with Waste Management, with the way he looks at it, this reflects on the City as this is a City service that we're providing and people are paying for and asked when they have a complaint, should they call the City, should they call Waste Management, should they call you because it feels like it isn't consistent. Ms. Woodson replied that everyone is different as some cities want their residents to call them. Ms. Woodson stated your City's advertisement has their phone numbers listed, but some residents are going to want to talk to people they see and know and have a relationship with. Ms. Woodson said they could do a mailer to your residents and say to please call Waste Management and they would be more than happy to take them. Ms. Woodson stated they have 75 people that take calls in Texas. Ms. Woodson said right now these folks are sitting at home working but have all the technology at their homes so they may take the calls and are monitored through their systems and even observed through their systems. Tom Cronin asked Mr. Tramm what he would prefer for the residents to call Waste Management or they call the City because again there is some inconsistency and he doesn't think it's fair that the City has to field service calls for Waste Management and then call them and have them get back to you and then you would get back to the resident so is there anything in place, a protocol. Mr. Tramm stated right now some of the residents call them directly and some call here, but it's usually easier for the residents to call us because they only have to remember one office and when that happens, we're aware of the issues that are going on and we're aware when we get that call and then we call Waste Management and yes there is some extra work there for us, but we're plugged into the problem. Mr. Tramm said when residents are calling Waste Management directly, they are probably getting the response quicker obviously from Waste Management, but we have no idea that number of calls. Ms. Woodson stated she could provide a quarterly report to the City of all the calls and again all calls even if it comes from the City are logged into their system. Ms. Woodson said she would be more than happy to provide that so you can stay in the loop of everything, even the calls they take directly. Mr. Tramm stated it would be good to receive that report. Ms. Woodson said by the end of this quarter she would have it prepared. Mayor Countryman asked if there is a more productive approach we can take and is the best approach to wait and just let people call in and let them know the next day they would receive service. Ms. Woodson stated it is hard to know when these incidents are going to happen. Mr. Tramm asked Ms. Woodson if it's possible at the end of the day when the company knows the truck will not be going back out that we could receive a call or an email at that point because if we know at the end of the day we may be able to put the word out in the community either that

evening or first thing in the morning that trash will still be picked up the next day. Mr. Tramm said he is sure there are cases where someone's trash was not picked up and they pull their can back because they are not aware that a truck is coming out the next day. Mr. Tramm said when it happened last week, he thought it was mid-morning when they found out and it is too late for some people to go put their can back out. Ms. Woodson stated an email is sent out to her every evening around 8:00 p.m. and on Wednesday nights she can send an email out and when she receives that email and has a definite yes, they aren't going to be back, we couldn't finish, she can send an email stating they will be back first thing in the morning or she can send an email saying everything is good. Ms. Woodson stated if that is what you would like to be done, she is more than happy to do that. Mr. Tramm stated he would appreciate her doing that and said if we know something wasn't picked up, if we get that word, we may have a short timeline but we may be able to put that either on the community sign or on social media, but at least be aware in the office for those people that call first thing in the morning that we could have a response for them. Ms. Woodson said she will put that in place and let them know when she finds out Wednesday night.

Randy Burleigh asked if you have two trash containers, are you charged full price for both containers. Ms. Woodson stated \$19.16 is what she charges the City and for an extra trash cart it's only \$13.99 and for an extra recycle cart it is \$6.20 and doesn't know if the City upcharges her charges to the residents, but that is what she would charge the City. Randy Burleigh asked if residents are given a discount for a second, third, or fourth container. Ms. Woodson said yes if they need that. Ms. Woodson stated a commercial handload is the same price as commercial businesses or the same prices as the residents. Randy Burleigh asked if commercial has two or three containers then it is all just one price. Ms. Woodson confirmed yes, the first one is \$19.60, and every container after that is \$13.99. Ms. Woodson said the commercial has the same pricing as the residents. Tom Cronin asked why commercial businesses cannot get a recycle container. Ms. Woodson stated yes, they can because the \$19.16 amount includes the recycling cart. Ms. Woodson said if someone does not have one, they may have told them previously to take it away as some didn't want it and just wanted two trash carts and didn't have room so they picked it up from them so they don't need to do it.

Ms. Woodson stated it's been a while and she would like to know if Council would like her to do a guideline alert to the residents as there are quite a few new residents in the community

and it's been two years since they have mailed one out. Mayor Countryman said she thinks that is a great idea. Ms. Woodson said she will prepare it and send it to Ms. Hensley for Mr. Tramm's final approval and update it to make sure everything is accurate. Rebecca Huss stated especially about the information regarding the special pickup for hazardous materials that has been a nice thing. Ms. Huss said they had a heavy trash weekend that was oversubscribed in a flash and thinks that was because people are home and starting to clean up and there is probably a lot of that sitting around. Ms. Woodson agreed and said she would make sure it is included.

7. Consideration and possible action regarding approval of the Agreement by and between the City of Montgomery and BGE Professional Services to perform the Limited Master Drainage Study for the Town Creek Watershed.

Mr. Tramm stated BGE was selected for the study following a review of eight firms that submitted under the qualifications request, and five firms were interviewed. Mr. Tramm said their professional services agreement was for the study to identify drainage work performed under GLO funding the City has approved following the Tax Day Flood. Mr. Tramm said there are four primary task items outlined and in looking at the tasks and talking with Mr. Roznovsky, he believes the items that are under Task 2 and 3 identified by BGE can also be performed under the GLO funding at a later time. Mr. Tramm stated Mr. Bill Kotlan with BGE is on this call if there are specific questions or if Mr. Kotlan has anything to say related to this specifically. Mr. Kotlan thanked everyone for considering them and congratulated Randy Burleigh on his new position.

Randy Burleigh stated on attachment A, #11 Site Visit states this paragraph does not obligate BGE to visit the site but asked if they will visit the site. Mr. Kotlan said that is boilerplate language but thinks it assumes they will do a site visit but in case they do not, it states they don't have to, but yes, they will be doing a site visit. Randy Burleigh stated he is curious because Town Creek is private property and asked how that would be handled. Randy Burleigh asked if you had to get the property owner's permission to survey that and do your study. Mr. Kotlan said if they need to survey the property we would and we are going to be doing a lot of the geometry of the creek based off lidar which is a process where somebody flies over the area and uses a machine to get the geometry of the property. Mr. Kotlan stated the places where they need to survey is where the creek crosses a road to get to culverts and those places are in

public right-of-way so they won't need to go there, but there is a possibility that they find something on lidar that doesn't make sense to them and we would need to go out and send the survey crew out on the private property and in that case we would get their permission. Mr. Roznovsky stated to clarify Mr. Kotlan's comment, he does think that the topographic survey is something that is going to need to be done and they have it in there as an hourly task because as they go through the lidar and then finding out what they need to go field verify with the survey crew is what Mr. Kotlan has in this so it's likely that a portion of that will need to be done for their study. Randy Burleigh asked if they take the data they receive and update the model because there was some concern about the models having old data as lidar had 2008 data in it and also flows from 1999, so you would take the new data and update the models. Mr. Kotlan stated that was correct and they will get the most recent lidar they can and will also look at even more recent aerial photographs and if we see places where the lidar and the photographs don't match up, that is where they will go out and do some surveying. Randy Burleigh stated there were some nice drone shots from friends in Watertown where they went over in time before the creek was modified in 2018 and before some of the ponds were built in that area. Randy Burleigh said he guessed the goal was to do a survey and give your recommendation for the City and Mayor Countryman will take it to Mr. Tramm and decide with the stakeholders what we do with it and hopefully, the stakeholder wants to go with the plan. Mr. Tramm said related to this study this is for the GLO funded items so the intent is to take these recommendations and the City Engineer is also the Project Engineer on the GLO funding and they will have to make sure that meshes into a plan that works under the GLO process. Mr. Tramm stated he believes there is over \$700,000 for the drainage portion of the GLO account. Mr. Roznovsky stated the dollar amount was correct and to Randy Burleigh's point, yes getting involved with the stakeholders and once the scope of what Mr. Kotlan has completed, a town hall would be necessary in his opinion because this focuses mostly on the Martin Luther King, Baja Road, McGinnis area of town, so having a town hall with them to go over what the plan is, and it is likely going to require their participation for future easements, etc. and access to their properties to get these improvements completed. Randy Burleigh said it is probably a good time especially with the proposed Town Creek Crossing and is also going to affect that waterway.

Kevin Lacy stated he had a question regarding cost estimates. Kevin Lacy said in regards to where it states the client should trust BGE's recommendations as far as the estimates go,

however, the estimates we were provided may vary from the actual costs incurred by the client, which is the City, so obviously you will put the estimate out there, the work begins and the costs are tremendously different from what the estimates are, there is a fail-safe in there so we can discuss it before it goes forward is that correct. Mr. Kotlan said the cost estimates they will be doing are pretty high-level cost estimates with not a lot of design being done as they are basically for budgeting and prioritizing and not in our scope, but in your design scope as soon as you get into design, they will be doing a more specific cost estimate for you probably in the preliminary design phase which will be narrowed down, but their goal is they might be a little high on all our cost estimates because we want to make sure you have enough money to get there, but we're not going to get down to the level of doing quantity take-offs. Mr. Roznovsky said just to give you a little bit of background, the GLO process has been going on for a while. Mr. Roznovsky stated there was an initial scope put together a few years ago and a high-level estimate then and what this does is this is the study that defines what the final scope is, that it works and that it has the backup to then submit to the GLO to get them to approve all this moving forward. Kevin Lacy asked what the next action is as Council. Mayor Countryman said to accept the professional services being presented.

Kevin Lacy moved to accept the services as presented by BGE Professional Services to perform the Limited Master Drainage Study for the Town Creek Watershed. T.J. Wilkerson seconded the motion.

Discussion: Rebecca Huss asked if they are to accept the service as is under the Board directing the Mayor and the City Administrator to sign the agreement. Mr. Tramm stated that was correct.

The motion carried unanimously. (5-0)

8. Consideration and possible action regarding adoption of the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MONTGOMERY, TEXAS AMENDING THE ZONING CLASSIFICATIONS AS DEFINED IN THE CITY CODE OF ORDINANCES CHAPTER 98, "ZONING," FOR LOT 16, AREA D, MONTGOMERY TOWNSITE SECTION FOUR FROM "R-1" SINGLE-FAMILY AND "B" COMMERCIAL ZONING DISTRICTS, AS FOUND ON THE CITY'S OFFICIAL

ZONING MAP TO "B" COMMERCIAL ZONING DISTRICT CLASSIFICATION; AND TO AMEND THE OFFICIAL ZONING MAP; PROVIDING A SAVINGS CLAUSE; PROVIDING A REPEALING CLAUSE; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE UPON PASSAGE AND PUBLICATION.

Mr. Tramm said this request is for the vacant lot with Pond Street frontage behind the Heritage Place building near the Valero fueling station. Mr. Tramm stated the property currently lies within two different zoning districts, partly in B-commercial on the eastern half, and R-1 Single-Family residential on the western half. Mr. Tramm said the owner has applied to rezone the entire property to B-Commercial and to construct an additional surface parking lot that will serve the Heritage Place development. Mr. Tramm stated public hearings for Planning and Zoning and City Council have been held previously with no comments received and adoption of the Ordinance would change the zoning classification as described here. Mr. Tramm stated this is an action item for tonight.

Rebecca Huss moved to adopt the Ordinance, as read, to rezone the property in question from the mix of B-1 Commercial and R-1 Single-Family to all B-Commercial. Tom Cronin seconded the motion, the motion carried unanimously. (5-0)

9. Consideration and possible action by City Council, acting as the Zoning Board of Adjustment, regarding a variance for 5-foot side yard setbacks in lieu of the required 10-foot side yard setback for Hills of Town Creek Section Four, an 8-acre parcel located at the intersection of Emma's Way and Scenic Hills Court, as submitted by Chris Cheatham.

Mr. Tramm said the public hearing for this item was earlier this evening. Mr. Tramm stated Section 98-122 of the Zoning Ordinance requires the side yard to be not less than 10-feet in the R-1 Single-Family residential districts. Mr. Tramm said the developer is requesting a 5-foot variance to allow for a 5-foot side yard on either side and as a reminder, City Council is acting as the Zoning Board of Adjustment on this item that requires a supermajority be in favor for the item to pass.

Rebecca Huss asked if in a previous approval, did they link the approval to the creation of a pocket park or does that need to take place with this one because she believes they discussed how small this area is with the lot sizes and she wasn't sure if they had already done that or if we need to do

that here, because she does not see the little park they had spoken about. Mr. McCorquodale said this is an older land plan and he does not have an updated one but the Engineers, Planning and Zoning and Council will all see the final. Rebecca Huss asked if it would be on the final. Mr. McCorquodale said yes. Mr. Roznovsky said they did the preliminary plat and the variance for the building lots was where they tied that one in for the pocket park, which was a condition.

Mayor Countryman asked if they were aware that City residents of this development, the development around here have gone to Mr. Cheatham and asked for a park and she is understanding that they were promised a park, and asked if this is the park that was promised or is that an additional one. Mr. Roznovsky said he does not know. Mayor Countryman said she thought Mr. Roznovsky might have some insight. Mr. Roznovsky said he can check but he is not aware of which ones they are talking about, but he and Mr. McCorquodale will regroup and figure that one out. Mayor Countryman asked if they do take action this evening, whether that is the park or is not the park if the residents were under the assumption that there is going to be a true park-like experience, they're unaware that potentially this could be the park-like experience, are we accepting something like that. Mayor Countryman said if they are dealing with the developer directly, she does not want to impede on that or lock them into something and they thought they were getting something else. Mr. Roznovsky asked to clarify, are you saying existing residents in the existing homes believe there is an additional park coming for them. Mayor Countryman said yes, they have fought for a park and she was told their fight was successful and that they were promised a park and her understanding was, it is going to be in this area and she thinks their idea was different than what she understood from a previous meeting where we discussed this, but for clarification, if we agreed on this does it lock down the potential that they won't get their park that they are trying to negotiate. Mr. McCorquodale said it sounds like those may be separate issues. Mr. McCorquodale said just to point out Sections 2 and 3, the developer was Stylecraft itself with their development arm and what Mr. Cheatham had done was sell the land to Stylecraft, and Section 3 there is no lot owner on it so it's being done by Mr. Cheatham the developer. Mayor Countryman said she needs to go back and discuss it with the resident and constituents in that area because she thinks they did go to Mr. Cheatham and not Stylecraft.

Randy Burleigh said while he was reading the paragraph below the variances where it states Section 2 & 3 if provided compensating open spaces and asked if that is not true. Mr. McCorquodale said Sections 2 & 3 both had compensating open space which was shown on the approved plat but this is right, this variance was for no compensating open space except amended by what Planning and Zoning discussed with them and Council affirmed. Randy Burleigh said then

the other park being talked about maybe considering the other open space. Mr. McCorquodale said it very well could be that residents from Section 2 & 3 believe that this is a park or something that's for them and said he doesn't know if the two issues are the same or not but we will find out.

Randy Burleigh said he had a question for Mr. Roznovsky about the square feet for each lot which includes lots 3, 4, 16, and 17. Randy Burleigh stated he went out there this week and looked at it and there is a big drainage ditch running right through where those lots will be and when it leaves the area on the west side it starts getting wider and wider. Randy Burleigh said this plat only shows the 30-foot drainage easement going across the four lots just mentioned and that's 15-feet on each lot. Randy Burleigh asked when they do the square footage of the lot, do they subtract the 15-feet that is on that lot for drainage easement and do the calculation that way or you include the drainage easement in that calculation. Randy Burleigh said some of those lots you will not be able to put a house on what is left unless you want to put them in the ditch. Mr. Roznovsky said that is correct and the 30-foot drainage easement is what is existing today that serves the neighboring development, so to answer your first question, the areas that are shown include the drainage easement so it's the lot you would own in fee, not necessarily what's encumbered by an easement or building owner. Mr. Roznovsky stated one thing that was discussed with L Squared early before they started the design is that it's something that needs to be looked at in how they are going to accommodate that so it still meets the function and you have a functional lot at the end. Mr. Roznovsky stated one thing that was suggested which we'll have to see when they get through the final stages is to make this a reserve instead of part of the lot and adjust it so it's a common green space that has to be maintained and would be maintained to serve its drainage function or they might change up the drainage path and fill that soil in, but they don't know at this point since they haven't completed the design yet. Randy Burleigh said especially lot 16 as you can see the bars aren't across that lot and the ditch does the same thing it spreads out across that lot and you can come in and fill it with dirt and try to keep the water in the little ditch, but what he would like you to see if you look at it close would be like if something happened when Lake Creek got here and they built it and Buffalo Springs water went right through the house. Mr. Roznovsky said correct and that was definitely something they pointed out in the preliminary plat stage and as they get through the design they will have to show how that's compensated, that it doesn't affect or reduce the amount of flow that can go through there and it also doesn't negatively affect the surrounding houses. Randy Burleigh asked if Planning and Zoning will get a chance to look at the final before we see it again. Mr. Roznovsky said yes, they will have to go back for their final plat approval and that will go to both Council and Planning and Zoning, as well as their plan approval since it's a new subdivision that will be looked at by Council and Planning and Zoning. Randy Burleigh asked

who owns the detention pond and where does it flow to. Mr. Roznovsky said the detention pond is not located in this section but is located in the platted area for the apartments so it's owned by Mr. Cheatham, but he does not remember the exact entity he has it under and then that outfalls onto the MISD site and then goes through the creek that runs down the middle of MISD and then ultimately back toward Town Creek.

Kevin Lacy asked Mr. Roznovsky what the advantage was to have the houses 5-feet closer to each other. Mr. Roznovsky stated it is a more usable area that they can put a larger house on a smaller lot. Mr. Roznovsky said the Ordinance says it is 10-foot setbacks on a 9,000 square foot lot so they are still trying to get more houses by reducing the setback and reducing the lot size. Kevin Lacy said a larger house, higher price point type situation. Mr. Roznovsky said correct.

Kevin Lacy asked if we ever found out about a sidewalk around the entire retention pond. Kevin Lacy stated Mayor Countryman was asking for a sidewalk, he was asking for a fountain, and Rebecca Huss wanted a couple more benches and if there was any more information regarding those requests. Mr. Roznovsky said he has not heard any additional information on that. Mr. Roznovsky stated they have not submitted any more additional plans and Mr. McCorquodale may know more, but he thinks they were waiting to get through all the variances before diving into the construction plans and also fund his escrow agreement to continue with the process.

Randy Burleigh asked if this was just for the 5-foot setback on the side yards and the other two variances were already taken care of or is this for all three. Mr. Roznovsky stated it was just for the setbacks and said the lot size and compensating open space was handled at a previous Council meeting.

Rebecca Huss stated she thinks it is also important to say that Planning and Zoning have looked at the entire City and this is one of the areas they envisioned higher density housing for the City. Randy Burleigh stated just for the record he agrees with having those areas in trying to make all those high density and normal areas all with the same ordinance and it would be great in the future if you had two ordinances. Randy Burleigh said one would be to dictate what goes on in the high-density areas and the other ordinance to cover the other areas. Randy Burleigh stated we have one ordinance where we are trying to contain everything in there and every time a developer comes in, he wants a variance and this is the first time where three variances once you get this how to have a small lot, the ordinance says you should have an open space and now we're giving an ordinance where you can do that. Rebecca Huss said she thinks it's hard if they are both classified R-1

residential and thinks they would need to come up with a different class altogether of residential to have two different zoning sets of ordinances or standards but it would be nice to have a standard that suited one type of density versus a standard that suited another type. Randy Burleigh said yes especially when you pack a lot of people in and they have very small yards and if they want to get out and throw a ball and do something there is no opportunity to go out in the street and do that versus being able to go to open space. Randy Burleigh said if you have a high-density area you should still have an open space to be able to go play in.

Mayor Countryman confirmed they are two different subjects and thanked Mr. McCorquodale for that to make sure we do not hurt the residents in the area.

Kevin Lacy moved to approve the developer's request of the 5-foot variance to allow for 5-foot side yards. Rebecca Huss seconded the motion, the motion carried unanimously. (5-0)

10. Consideration and possible action regarding approval of a revised site plan and an additional cottage design for Moon Over Montgomery, as submitted by Larry Jacobs.

Mr. Tramm stated back in December 2019 the City Council approved a special use permit for Moon Over Montgomery a short-term rental cottage project owned by Larry and Beverley Jacobs. Mr. Tramm stated the property is located on Clepper Street behind Jim's Hardware, north of the historic downtown area. Mr. Tramm said with the special use permit, three specific cottage designs were approved along with the preliminary site plan. Mr. Tramm said Mr. Jacobs is presenting another cottage design with a Victorian-era aesthetic and has a revised site plan available after evaluating options to present here. Mr. Tramm said when the special use permit was originally approved, it did not allow for a revised site plan or variations of cottage design to be approved by staff and had to come back to Council and so this is what is being presented this evening for approval. Mr. Tramm stated the recommendation is to approve the cottage design and revised site plan as presented, but also Council may want to consider whether or not it wants to authorize staff to have some discretion approving minor changes or if they want any change to come back to Council regarding the original as in with the special use permit requirement.

Randy Burleigh asked if they would be removing the first three options. Mr. Tramm stated Mr. Jacobs is intending to utilize the first three options that were approved, and he is adding a fourth

option. Mr. Tramm said the first three were previously approved and they are included in the packet and they are the three that are colored later in the item, as well as the original preliminary site plan. Mr. Tramm said the site plan that is in the packet that has red in the upper left corner marked revised site plan is the new site plan and the uncolored Victorian-style cottage is the one Mr. Jacobs is proposing to add. Rebecca Huss asked what the main differences are between the original site plan and the revised site plan. Mr. McCorquodale said they are reorienting some buildings. Mr. McCorquodale said there are still 14 cottages and there is still space in the same way and there were three near the road frontage and now there is four because Mr. Jacobs is getting further along into planning and he's planning on a four cottage Phase I, and then add the ones to the north later. Mr. McCorquodale said nothing in terms of an element has either been added to or taken away from the site plan. Randy Burleigh said this revised plan has two phases versus the first one, and also it looks like the retention pond looks a bit bigger or it may just be the drawing, but it looks bigger than it was in the first one and also there are just rocks in the parking area. Randy Burleigh asked if that was in the first one also. Mr. McCorquodale said in regards to the pond he thinks it's a little further along with the design of the project now to understand what kind of areas needed it so this is he guesses the accurate size of what the retention pond is. Mr. McCorquodale said they have not seen the plans and they are not that far along, but he suspects this is the actual size needed for the site. Randy Burleigh asked what about the rocks in the parking area for each cabin and isn't there a City ordinance against using rocks. Mr. McCorquodale said in terms of the parking ordinance right now in a commercial zone it states it either has to be asphalt or concrete, but that ordinance is part of a larger piece of the developmental ordinances that he would second what Councilman Huss and Councilman Burleigh were talking about earlier in terms of updating the development code of ordinances rather than a variance or a sustainable parking solution and we should have that as part of an ordinance that would regulate things like off-street parking. Mr. McCorquodale said in the beginning, Mr. Jacobs had talked about the gravel and if it is part of the construction documents, that is when they would be looking at a variance for it. Rebecca Huss said in terms of the original design, maintaining the trees was an important part of his plan and if you asphalt everything he would lose that aesthetic, so there is the practical purpose of retaining water and then there is also the definite aesthetic of saving trees. Mr. Jacobs said if you notice that was one of the things on the plan where they ended up with a little drive going around the two pecan trees because they felt they could space the cottages better and have a little circular deal and be able to divide the traffic a little better coming in and out as you go toward the back so there

would be kind of a relief area where people would circle those pecan trees and the black dots on the drawing represent the pecan trees, the larger trees they are trying to preserve. Mayor Countryman asked if there are other trees besides those three. Mr. Jacobs said there are some in the back they identified but they are doing the front section first and that is what they were honing in on making the entry and front drive. Mr. Jacobs stated in the previous plan all four houses were on the east side of the lot and the road came in and swung around and there were two houses fairly close to the street where the new drive comes in and now we have one and are thinking the Victorian will be the keynote cottage right there where people will see it from the street. Mr. Jacobs said it gives them more room to spread them out and keep the two pecan trees right in the front as a feature of it. Mr. Jacobs said they are selling the environment and come to Montgomery and enjoy the village kind of feeling going forward and thinks it is an improvement from the previous site plan. Mr. Jacobs stated they haven't increased the density or anything and concerning the drainage area, to Randy Burleigh's question earlier is that is where the geographic contours tell them where to be and depending on the amount of impervious cover, the engineers will get with Mr. Roznovsky and figure out if that will be a circular or a rectangular pond, but that will come with the engineering and final plans when they are submitted to staff or engineering review. Randy Burleigh asked if it would empty to the northwest. Mr. Jacobs said yes and that is Kevin Lacy's house right behind it who he has had numerous conversations with about making sure they are protecting him and has an easement tract from Jim's to get his water, sewer, and drainage out that way and hopefully it will improve the drainage in there on Kevin's property. Randy Burleigh stated when they built Kevin Lacy's place it was a nightmare of having the water go through there. Mr. Jacobs replied that is what he heard and was not aware of it personally but heard numerous recollections that was the case. Kevin Lacy stated it still gets spooky even now so obviously he is looking forward to seeing some good plans because he gets nervous. Mr. Jacobs said he met Kevin Lacy out on his property and there is a little wash that goes through the property line aimed at his garage and that is one of the things they are going to have to do some work with to make sure the water doesn't get that far and they divert it before it even gets in there. Mr. Jacobs stated he was very aware of that and looks forward to resolving that issue for Kevin Lacy's benefit.

Rebecca Huss said one of the things she thinks Council did not include last time that she thinks they should consider this time is staff having the ability to approve minor changes that have substantially similar language to it. Rebecca Huss stated they are looking at pretty drawings

but when it comes down to nuts and bolts of what's ADA compliant and which boards go here and there, and she doesn't want to see these drawings every meeting for the next two years as we approve each little thing and thinks it makes sense from a practical perspective to give staff the authority to live within the guidelines of these are the building Council has approved, this is what they should look like but we are not going to come out there with a measuring tape or a calculator and count the number of cedar shingles on the front of the Victorian and compare it to the drawing if it turns out they come in four-inch rather than 5-inch pieces that his architect drew and thinks it's important to include that just from a workflow perspective on those, a commercial perspective for Mr. Jacobs, a practical perspective for staff and flow perspective for City Council. Rebecca Huss stated she loves the buildings and thinks they are so cute. Mr. Jacobs stated his wife and daughter-in-law studied hard on this Victorian design and it is by far the most expensive one and they aren't going to abuse and make it Cinderella city with all those Victorians but does think it will make a neat attention-getter along the street without having too many of them. Mayor Countryman asked if it will still accommodate four people. Mr. Jacobs stated yes it would and one of the changes they contemplated was one of the ones that had a loft in it was going to get a larger number of people and thinks they probably aren't going to proceed with that and you won't notice the difference when they finish the floor plan, but yes you will be able to get at least four people in all of them. Mr. Jacobs said some will have two beds and some will have a bed with a hide-a-bed. Mr. Jacobs said his banker is anxious for him to ask for some money but he hasn't yet because they are still tweaking the plans and he has tri-fold boards with all the different colors of fabrics, blinds, cabinets and it's crazy the amount of time spent trying to make sure it's going to be popular and people are going to love it. Rebecca Huss asked what Mr. Jacobs's timeline was for rolling this out. Mr. Jacobs stated the bank is setting on hold to put his final package together and get the construction stuff ready and Mr. Mike Mathena the engineer is working toward final plans to give to Mr. Roznovsky for his review for the final drainage. Mr. Jacobs said they have final drawings for the cottages and have bid them out so they know what that cost is and the little bit of engineering that still needs to be done will be the holdup and doesn't think it will be much as Mr. Roznovsky and Mr. Mathena work very well in trying to get the sewer deal done and have worked out a good solution to it. Mr. Roznovsky agreed and said he thinks they have worked out a good solution.

Tom Cronin moved to approve the new cottage design and revised site plan as presented. Tom Cronin asked regarding the second item if it was something they need to have as an agenda item or will Mr. Tramm make sure his staff from now on will be notified that Council has given them additional discretion in making minor changes or is it something we need to act on. Mr. Tramm stated he thinks it is something they need to have affirmative action from the Council on because it was part of the original approval.

Tom Cronin restated his motion and moved to approve the new cottage design and revised site plan as presented and to authorize staff to have discretion in approving minor design changes that are substantially similar to those already approved by Council. Kevin Lacy seconded the motion, the motion carried unanimously. (5-0)

EXECUTIVE SESSION:

The City Council reserves the right to discuss any of the items listed specifically under this heading or for any items listed above in executive closed session as permitted by law including if they meet the qualifications in Sections 551.071(consultation with attorney), 551.072 (deliberation regarding real property), 551.073 (deliberation regarding gifts), 551.074 (personnel matters), 551.076 (deliberation regarding security devices), and 551.087 (deliberation regarding economic development negotiations) of Chapter 551 of the Government Code of the State of Texas. (There are no items at this time.)

COUNCIL INQUIRY:

Pursuant to Texas Government Code Sect. 551.042 the Mayor and Council Members may inquire about a subject not specifically listed on this Agenda. Responses are limited to recitation of existing policy or a statement of specific factual information given in response to the inquiry. Any deliberation or decision shall be limited to a proposal to place on the agenda of a future meeting.

Mr. Tramm stated this past weekend they had the City quarterly heavy trash pickup and had three dumpsters that were completely full before the end of the day Saturday, whereas normally there is a lot of people dropping off both Saturday and Sunday. Mr. Tramm said he thinks it was a combination of both the recent storm activity that left a lot of outdoor debris as well as people have been home for a couple of months and engaged in various household projects and cleanups. Mr. Tramm said he was looking at the possibility, if there are no objections from Council, of doing an additional heavy trash day in July midway through until the next quarterly pickup so we can catch up with the people who

didn't get to put their stuff in because people were turned away and so to prevent that from either overwhelming Waste Management household level and pushing them farther behind or run the risk of it ending up getting dumped at storage or left outside of homes. Mr. Tramm said he can go ahead and start to work to make that happen but wanted to make sure there were not any objections from Council.

Rebecca Huss stated her only comment would be that she heard that one household was responsible for filling an entire dumpster by themselves and unfortunately while she's not always keen on adding additional rules, it seems that like the animal ordinance, common sense is not prevailing and we might require some limitations on business waste and quantities of usage. Rebecca Huss said we had three dumpsters this time and we often only have two if somebody is going to use one half of the entire City's allocation for heavy trash that seems an unfair use of resources. Mr. Tramm said he agrees on that and starting from a staff level, we can try and put some reasonable restrictions in place and if we need to come back to Council to firm that up, he would be more than happy to do that as well. Rebecca Huss said common sense and care for your neighbors seem like it should be enough but perhaps not. Mr. Tramm agreed with her and said that somehow common sense is not as common as we might imagine. Rebecca Huss agreed. Mayor Countryman stated just to confirm, we are taking drivers licenses and utility bills to ensure they are City residents. Mr. Tramm said staff is out there and there is a sign posted that says either a driver's license or a current City utility bill, that way it may be a fairly new resident, but not yet have their driver's license changed over. Mayor Countryman said she knew we had posted on social media and she saw quite a few people that were tagged outside of the City, but she just wanted to ensure we were using this and our taxpayers were able to take advantage and not those outside the City. Mr. Tramm said he will make sure for the future times that we have that discussion to ensure that staff is checking those items not just that it is a sign that is posted out there. Rebecca Huss said she knows they do and they are really good about that and the driver's license is important because she doesn't think the apartment people pay traditional utility bills and thinks they pay to the apartment building so we need to stick to the driver's license. Rebecca Huss stated someone on Worsham Street used an entire dumpster. Mr. Tramm said he will discuss it with staff and make a point to keep reasonable restrictions in place and try to help enforce common sense on the common public.

Mr. Tramm stated he did have one other item and that is just a reminder that cybersecurity training is due this week and Ms. Hensley just earlier this evening sent out an email and for any of those who haven't done it yet to please get that done to meet the requirements and if you have any questions or

problems with that, you can let him or Ms. Hensley know. Mr. Tramm said the training itself is short and is not that difficult and we will be happy to help you through it if there is some equipment issue. Mayor Countryman asked if there was a test at the end. Mr. Tramm stated yes.

ADJOURNMENT

Rebecca Huss moved to adjourn the meeting at 7:39 p.m. Tom Cronin seconded the motion, the motion carried unanimously. (5-0)

Submitted by: *Susan Hensley*
Susan Hensley, City Secretary

Date Approved: *06/23/2020*



Sara Countryman
Mayor Sara Countryman