

**MINUTES OF THE
REGULAR MEETING OF THE AMES CITY COUNCIL**

AMES, IOWA

JULY 26, 2022

REGULAR MEETING OF THE AMES CITY COUNCIL

The Regular Meeting of the Ames City Council was called to order by Mayor John Haila at 6:01 p.m. on July 26, 2022, in the City Council Chambers in City Hall, 515 Clark Avenue, pursuant to law. Present were Council Members Gloria Betcher, Amber Corrieri, Tim Gartin, Rachel Junck, and Anita Rollins. Council Member Bronwyn Beatty-Hansen and *Ex officio* Member Bryce Garman were absent.

CONSENT AGENDA: Mayor Haila said that the City Attorney had requested to pull Item No. 18: Awarding a contract for Architectural Services to SVPA Architects Inc., of West Des Moines, Iowa, for the WPCF Administration Building Renovation Project in an amount not to exceed \$86,100, as a few components still need to be worked out.

Moved by Corrieri, seconded by Betcher, to approve the following items on the Consent Agenda.

1. Motion approving payment of claims
2. Motion approving Regular Minutes of July 12, 2022
3. Motion approving Report of Change Order for period July 1 - 15, 2022
4. Motion certifying Civil Service candidates
5. Motion approving new Class E Liquor License, Class B Wine Permit, Class C Beer Permit and Sunday Sales - Kwik Star #1158, 1910 Isaac Newton Drive, Pending favorable Department of Inspections & Appeals Inspection
6. Motion approving new Outdoor Service Privilege to Class C Liquor License and Sunday Sales - Time Out Ames, 120 Kellogg Avenue, Pending Final Inspection
7. Motion approving ownership update for Class C Liquor License with Class B Wine Permit and Sunday Sales - Hy-Vee Market Grille, 640 Lincoln Way
8. Motion approving ownership update for Class E Liquor License with Class B Wine Permit, Class C Beer Permit (carryout beer), and Sunday Sales - Kum & Go #1215, 4506 Lincoln Way
9. Motion approving ownership update for Class A Liquor License, Sunday Sales and Outdoor Service - Green Hills Residents' Association, 2200 Hamilton Drive, Suite 100
10. Motion approving the renewal of the following Beer Permits, Wine Permits and Liquor Licenses:
 - a. Special Class C Liquor License with Sunday Sales & Outdoor Service - Botanero Latino, 604 East Lincoln Way - Pending Dram Shop Insurance
 - b. Class E Liquor License with Class B Wine Permit, Class C Beer Permit (carryout beer), and Sunday Sales - AJ's Liquor II, 2515 Chamberlain
 - c. Class C Liquor License with Catering Privilege, Outdoor Service, and Sunday Sales - Cyclone Experience Network, 1800 S. 4th Street
 - d. Class C Liquor License with Class B Wine Permit and Sunday Sales - Hy-Vee Market Grille, 640 Lincoln Way
 - e. Class E Liquor License with Class B Wine Permit and Class C Beer Permit (carryout

- beer) - Fareway Meat Market #189, 3720 Lincoln Way
 - f. Class C Liquor License, Sunday Sales, Outdoor Service & Catering Privilege - Sweet Carolines, 316 Main Street
 - g. Class C Liquor License with Outdoor Service, Catering Privilege, Class B Native Wine Permit, Outdoor Service and Sunday Sales - The Mucky Duck Pub, 3100 S Duff Avenue
 - h. Class E Liquor License with Class B Wine Permit, Class C Beer Permit (carryout beer), and Sunday Sales - Kum & Go #1215, 4506 Lincoln Way
 - i. Class C Liquor License with Outdoor Service and Sunday Sales - El Azteca, 2120 Isaac Newton - Pending Dram Shop Insurance
 - j. Class C Liquor License with Outdoor Service and Sunday Sales - Es Tas Stanton, 216 Stanton
 - k. Special Class C Liquor License with Sunday Sales - New Hickory Holding Company, 1404 S. Duff Avenue
11. Requests from Octagon Center for the Arts for Octagon Art Festival on Sunday, September 25, 2022
- a. Motion approving a blanket Temporary Obstruction Permit and a blanket Vending License for the Central Business District
 - b. RESOLUTION NO. 22-398 approving closure of the following streets from 5:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.
 - i. Main Street, east of Clark to just west of Duff Avenue
 - ii. Douglas Avenue between 5th Street and Main Street
 - iii. Kellogg Avenue between south of the alley and Main Street
 - iv. Burnett Avenue between south of the alley and Main Street
 - c. RESOLUTION NO. 22-399 approving waiver of fee for blanket Vending License
 - d. RESOLUTION NO. 22-400 allowing usage of electricity and approving waiver of costs of electricity
12. Ames Grand Prix:
- a. Ames Main Street Criterium on Saturday, August 27, 2022:
 - i. Motion approving blanket Temporary Obstruction Permit for the closed area
 - ii. RESOLUTION NO. 22-401 approving closure of Main Street between Clark and Douglas Avenue, Douglas Avenue between Main Street to Sixth Street, Sixth Street between Douglas Avenue to Burnett Avenue, Burnett Avenue between Sixth Street and Main Street, Fifth Street between Burnett and Clark Avenues, and Clark Avenue between Fifth and Main Streets from 3:45 p.m. to 11:15 p.m.
 - iii. RESOLUTION NO. 22-402 approving closure of 187 metered parking spaces from 2:30 p.m. to 11:15 p.m. along the race route and approving suspension of parking enforcement
 - b. ISU Research Park Circuit Race on Sunday, August 28, 2022:
 - i. Motion approving blanket Temporary Obstruction Permit
 - ii. Motion approving blanket Vending License
 - iii. RESOLUTION NO. 22-403 approving waiver of fee for blanket Vending License
 - iv. RESOLUTION NO. 22-404 approving closure of Collaboration Place between South Riverside Drive and University Boulevard, Plaza Loop, University Blvd

from Collaboration Place to Airport Road (northbound lane only; southbound lane to remain open to traffic), Airport Road from University Boulevard to South Riverside Drive (one eastbound lane only; the road will remain open to both east - and westbound traffic), and South Riverside Drive (southbound lane only; northbound lane to remain open to traffic) from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

13. RESOLUTION NO. 22-405 confirming appointment of City Clerk
14. RESOLUTION NO. 22-406 approving Quarterly Investment Report for period ending June 30, 2022
15. RESOLUTION NO. 22-407 approving Memorandum of Understanding with Story County to apply for grant funding under the 2022 Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Assistance Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program and authorize application for that Grant
16. RESOLUTION NO. 22-408 approving renewal of contract with EMC Risk Services, LLC, of Des Moines, Iowa, to provide third-party administration of the City's Worker's Compensation and Municipal Fire and Police "411 System" claims for August 1, 2022, through July 31, 2023, at a cost not to exceed \$55,000
17. RESOLUTION NO. 22-409 waiving Purchasing Policies' formal bidding requirements and extending an engagement with Ahlers and Cooney, P.C., of Des Moines, Iowa, in an amount not to exceed \$25,000 for legal services related to application of *Iowa Code* Chapter 20
18. RESOLUTION NO. 22-411 approving Change Order No. 1 to Power Line Supply of Williamsburg, Iowa, in the amount of \$25,661.81 (inclusive of Iowa sales tax) for the Padmount Switchgear
19. RESOLUTION NO. 22-412 accepting completion of 2019/20 Multimodal Roadway Improvements (13th and Clark)
20. 2020/21 CDBG (Infrastructure) Improvements [Baker Subdivision]:
 - a. RESOLUTION NO. 22-413 approving Change Order No. 5 in the amount of \$43,819.23
 - b. RESOLUTION NO. 22-414 accepting completion

Roll Call Vote: 5-0. Motions/Resolutions declared carried/adopted unanimously, signed by the Mayor, and hereby made a portion of these Minutes.

PUBLIC FORUM: Mayor Haila opened Public Forum.

Richard Deyo, 505-8th Street, #2, Ames, said that he has a petition and would like people in the audience to sign it. It stated, "We the undersigned honor the rights, duties, and responsibilities of those who wear no clothes as a public expression of their rights through these rights and responsibilities." Mr. Deyo believed that people's rights, duties, and responsibilities should be honored. He commented that he can't be naked in his own apartment and there should be places where people can be naked. Mr. Deyo mentioned that he can't spend his money that has "Please let us be naked" written on it because the businesses can't give that money to other people. He said he would be happy to trade one of his dollars for a regular dollar if anyone was interested.

The Mayor closed public forum when no one else came forward to speak.

DISCUSSION REGARDING FY 2023/24 ASSET PRIORITIES: Assistant City Manager Deb

Schildroth explained that ASSET has a total of six volunteers; one member was present (Michael Lazere). She said that the ASSET funding priorities is an important tool for the volunteers to use when they go through the ASSET recommendations. She mentioned that on June 21, 2022, the City Council held a Workshop to discuss inclusion and diversity when establishing ASSET funding priorities for FY 2023/24. At that Workshop, the Council approved expanding the statement in Priority #2 “with an emphasis on low to moderate income” to be inclusive of all three categories and service areas. Another change that was approved was removing the descriptor “quality” from “quality daycare.” City staff met with the City’s ASSET volunteers on July 11, 2022 to review the priorities and Council’s recent modifications. The volunteers recommended these additional changes: 1) clarifying emergency shelter; 2) re-inserting “quality” in “quality daycare” as the term refers to national standards and best practices in the areas of teaching and assessment, developmentally appropriate curriculum, and staff competencies; and 3) reprioritizing medical and dental services above financial literacy and education programs.

Council Member Betcher asked if the volunteers had any difficulties with the recommendations from the Council. Mr. Lazere voiced that there were no concerns from the volunteers. Ms. Schildroth said that as more data becomes available and shared with the Council there may be more changes to the priorities.

Moved by Betcher, seconded by Rollins, to approve the City of Ames ASSET Priorities for the FY 2023/24 Funding Cycle.

Vote on Motion: 5-0. Motion declared carried unanimously.

FITCH FAMILY INDOOR AQUATIC CENTER PROPERTY UPDATE (POTENTIAL ALTERNATE SITES TO IDOT PROPERTY): Parks and Recreation Director Keith Abraham said that on July 12, 2022, City staff presented a report regarding the potential acquisition of the property at 122 North Oak Avenue for the construction of the Fitch Family Indoor Aquatic Center. The Report detailed environmental contamination documented on the site, potential costs to address the contamination, and the costs to acquire the property from the Iowa Department of Transportation (IDOT). The Report explained that the purchase price would be \$2.9 million for the IDOT property, and the City could potentially face up to approximately \$1 million in additional costs for construction alterations and mitigation measures related to the contamination.

Director Abraham mentioned that there had been some questions about how often an indoor pool is utilized. He looked at three years prior to the pandemic (2016-2019) and the average attendance was around 49,000 visits per year. Director Abraham reviewed the process that staff went through when looking for alternative sites. At the July 12, 2022, meeting the City Council directed staff to explore whether any other alternative sites to construct the Indoor Aquatic Center exist, either within or in the vicinity of the City’s current Downtown Reinvestment District Urban Renewal Area. Staff was able to identify 13 potential locations in or near Downtown. Of the 13 locations, City staff believed only three would be potentially feasible as an alternative to the 2.9 acre site at 122 North Oak Avenue. Those three sites were: 1) Brookside Park; 2) O’Neil Park; and, 3) City Hall Parking Lot M. Director Abraham reviewed the pros and cons of each of the three potential sites.

Council Member Gartin mentioned that Brookside Park is leased to the City from Iowa State University (ISU) and wanted to know if the terms of the lease would allow the City to construct an Indoor Aquatic Center. Director Abraham indicated that the land east of Ioway Creek is owned by the City.

A meeting was held on Monday, July 18, 2022, via Zoom to discuss the option of O'Neil Park and over 300 letters were posted on doors. There were approximately 40 attendees. Director Abraham summarized the top comments from the neighborhood and indicated that the Staff Report has all the comments listed in more detail. Director Abraham noted there were several options for the Council to choose from depending on what site they decide to go with. Of the three potential sites, staff felt that O'Neil Park appeared to be the most feasible site to construct the Indoor Aquatic Center in a cost-effective manner; however, a key challenge with the O'Neil Park site is the loss of the park for the neighborhood.

Council Member Betcher said that there was not any mention of why CBD Lot X was not looked at further for a potential site. Director Abraham mentioned that this area was not looked at further because it will be part of the Lincoln Way Development. The CBD Lot had been earmarked as part of the development for a parking structure. Ms. Betcher asked how many parking spaces were in the CBD Lot if the Indoor Aquatic Center was to go there. City Manager Steve Schainker commented that the CBD Lot X had around 125 parking spaces. Ms. Betcher said she wanted to know how many spaces were in the entire CBD lot. It was determined that information was not available at that time.

Council Member Betcher inquired if any of the other sites would require remediation similar to the IDOT site. Director Abraham said there was a possibility; however, there was not any in depth research done. Assistant City Manager Brian Phillips indicated that there were three sites that he would be concerned about from an environmental standpoint. Those three sites were: 1) Former Power Plant Coal Yard site; 2) Former Water Treatment Plant site; and, 3) East Main Street.

Council Member Gartin stated that the City is focusing on the Reinvestment District for a financial reason and asked Director Abraham to provide more information regarding the downside of putting the Indoor Aquatic Center Pool outside of the District. Director Abraham said that the Iowa Economic Development Authority (IEDA) offered a program that set aside funding for communities to apply for. Any community that has a Reinvestment District was welcome to apply. The Program will give any sales tax that is generated from any new development in the Reinvestment District back to the City by rebate. The City submitted a preliminary application in February 2021 to the Iowa Economic Development Authority (IEDA) and the City was given a preliminary award of \$10 million. Director Abraham reminded everyone that there is over \$10 million that has been pledged for this project and bonds will need to be issued to cover the \$21 million debt. He noted that even if awarded \$10 million and the District only received \$8 million in revenues then that is all the City will get; the \$10 million is not a full guarantee. Assistant City Manager Brian Phillips commented that it was important to note that the Reinvestment District Program requires that the area can't be larger than 75-acres. It is possible to amend the District to include new areas and decrease other areas.

Council Member Gartin asked about what kind of outreach was done. Director Abraham said the Council directed staff to look at sites within close proximity to the Reinvestment District and if that site was within a neighborhood, then meet with the neighbors. Staff found O'Neil park met the direction from City Council and that is why there was a neighborhood meeting in that area. A meeting was not held for the Brookside Park area because staff felt the site was not a viable option. Mr. Gartin said he had not seen any articles in the Ames Tribune regarding the possible change of pool locations and he was concerned that people are unaware of the change. He noted the Council is going to be asked to balance the needs and concerns of a neighborhood against the benefits to the community without the community receiving any notice.

Council Member Gartin mentioned that an important concern for the community was the indoor walking path. He clarified that the Council had to drop the walking path option due to finances. Mr. Gartin wanted to verify if the Indoor Aquatic Center was placed on the IDOT site then there would not be a walking path. Director Abraham stated that the base bid would be the aquatics portion and the multipurpose space/walking track would be bid as an add alternate. He indicated it would depend on how the bids came in and if there was enough funding. Mr. Gartin mentioned that if the Indoor Aquatic Center was built on the IDOT site there will probably not be a walking track; however, with the savings from not having to purchase land from the IDOT then the walking track could be done if the pool was developed at O'Neil Park. Director Abraham reiterated it would depend on how the bids came to see if there was a chance to do the add alternate or not. Mr. Gartin felt that an indoor walking track should be an amenity that the community should have. He inquired if walking tracks were an amenity that communities the size of Ames would have. Director Abraham mentioned that many areas do have one as a lot of people look for where they can go during the winter months or inclement weather and still walk.

Council Member Gartin asked what the best estimate was for the price of remediation. Director Abraham said the worst case scenario would be around \$1.2 million. He noted that the best case scenario would be around \$350,000.

Council Member Gartin inquired about the general nature of how often O'Neil Park was used. Director Abraham said he would not be able to say as there are times it is empty and there are times the park is very busy.

Council Member Betcher commented that she thought the purpose of the Reinvestment District was for urban revitalization and a catalyst for redevelopment of downtowns; when she thinks of urban revitalization, she thinks of brown field sites and not city parks. She wanted to know how to argue that shifting the location to the park fits with the Reinvestment District goals. Mr. Phillips explained that he did not know all the ins and outs of the Reinvestment District Program, but a key component is economic development and encouraging people to come to this area of Ames to be connected to the Indoor Aquatic Center site, Downtown, the Plaza, and other amenities. He indicated the goal is to encourage commerce. Ms. Betcher asked if the projects needed to be contiguous to Downtown. Mr. Phillips said that was a conversation that needed to be had with the IEDA, and the City will have to show that the Indoor Aquatic Center is connected. City Manager Steve Schainker explained in the

literature from the Iowa Reinvestment District it states, “the Program is designed to assist communities in developing transformative projects that improve the quality of life, create and enhance unique opportunities, and substantially benefit the community region and State.”

Council Member Junck asked if there had been any preliminary conversations about if the City would be allowed to amend the boundaries at this point or if the \$10 million would be at stake if the City didn't go with the IDOT site. Mr. Phillips stated that staff has spoken with the IEDA, and any amendments would be subject to approval by its Board and there is an amendment process to go through.

Council Member Corrieri inquired about the timing of the project with the various sites that were being recommended. She noted that 12 months have already gone by with reviewing the IDOT site and they don't want to push the project back any further. Director Abraham said from the project standpoint, staff would need around nine months for the design before it would go out for bid, which could take around a month, and then construction would take around 18-months. Overall, it would be over two years before the project would be completed. Director Abraham indicated that the IDOT site would be the quickest site to move forward with. If the O'Neil site was selected, then an environmental study would need to be done and meetings will need to be had with RDG regarding the designs; this could add a few months to the overall project. Mr. Phillips stated that staff had indicated in the Staff Report that time is of the essence as the City is approaching the point where a decision needs to be made regarding the IDOT site because the IDOT intends to put the site up for auction if the City is not going to purchase the property. It was pointed out that the City is expecting to issue bonds for the project and that will need to be done within the next month or two.

Council Member Betcher wanted to know if changing the Indoor Aquatic Center location would affect the bonds. Mr. Phillips stated that it would, but staff will need to speak with the Bond Council and the Finance Director to understand all the implications.

Council Member Corrieri asked if the Council decided on the IDOT site and did the remediation would that add more time to the project. Mr. Schainker stated that is unknown as staff is not 100% sure what will be found during construction.

Council Member Rollins asked if any timing would affect the \$10 million award. Mr. Phillips didn't think it would, but staff is waiting on a few documents to finalize the application. If the boundaries are going to be changed then staff would need to wait. Mr. Schainker stated that once the application is finalized and approved, and the largest component of the Lincoln Way project is started, then that is when the clock starts, so it is not necessarily linked to the Indoor Aquatic Center.

Mayor Haila opened public input.

Susie Petra, 2011 Duff Avenue, Ames, stated that 13 years ago the City closed Carr Pool. The League of Women's Voters worked to try to find an Indoor Pool location. A lengthy study was done, and everything was dismissed when ideas were voted down. She said that approximately two years

ago the City started looking at the IDOT site and she was appalled that the City didn't have its own City Assessor look at the site. Ms. Petra mentioned that it has taken nearly two years just to find out that the site is contaminated. She commented that citizens would like a pool that is available for recreation, swimming lessons, and rehab. Citizens would also like to have an indoor walking track. She commented that she was surprised when she reviewed the list of 13 potential sites. Ms. Petra said a few suggestions were "laughable," some may be contaminated and require remediations, and others were too small. She said she felt there would be other sites that would be better to look at even though they would be outside the Reinvestment District. Ms. Petra indicated that the City owns the former Edwards School property; it is huge, nothing would need to be demolished and trees would not have to be removed. She also mentioned the former Carr Pool location to be used. Another site was the Ontario site where nothing would need to be demolished. She hoped the Council would not choose the O'Neil Park site. Ms. Petra asked that wherever the Council decides to put the Indoor Aquatic Center to consider permeable paving.

Judy Lemish, 327 S. Maple, Ames, explained that she is a water exerciser along with several of her friends. She commented that the City has failed to build an Indoor Aquatic Center. It gives her pause about the trust that she puts into the City of Ames to come up with a decision. She felt the City was in a big hurry to get the aquatic center done, and she said that making any decisions quickly often leads to problems, failure, and regrets. Ms. Lemish referred to the noticing process that was done for the neighborhood. She said that it is summer time and a lot of the neighborhood is gone and the door notices that were received didn't give them a lot of time. She stated that the City of Ames, in its hurry, didn't do its own evaluation of the IDOT site. She said any homebuyer would get an inspector of their own before making any decisions and she felt that the City should have hired someone to do an inspection. Ms. Lemish commented that the IDOT knew there was contamination of the site back in 1994 and wondered why there aren't any public records of the contamination. She said that the citizens are left with a "pathetic" list of sites that could possibly be used with O'Neil Park being in the cross-hairs regarding the decision to put in a pool. She felt the City was taking "the easy way out." Ms. Lemish noted that she had an alternative idea. She said that instead of preserving the "Linc development" area between Clark and Kellogg, that the City should build an Indoor Aquatic Center there. Ms. Lemish felt the City should "look outside the box." She also felt that the old middle school site would be a great place for an Indoor Aquatic Center as well.

Sarah Davis, 1220 Park Way, Ames, said she wanted to add that there is not enough information. She appreciated all the information so far, but felt there was not enough understanding of the consequences of the decision. Ms. Davis mentioned everything felt hasty. She explained that undeveloped land is more precious than presently developed land that could be recycled and reused.

Kim Moss, 430 Lynn Avenue, Ames said she agreed with the previous speakers. She felt that preserving green space, as much as possible, needs to be at the forefront of every decision made by the Council. Ms. Moss commented that she is excited to have an Indoor Aquatic Center developed, but not when having to take away green space. She encouraged the Council to allow more time for additional feedback and to save the green spaces.

Jeri Neal, 916 Ridgewood Avenue, Ames, said that she is assuming that the Council will stay within the Reinvestment District and not go with the IDOT site. She supported the option of placing the Indoor Aquatic Center in City Parking Lot M. Ms. Neal explained that the construction of structured parking over the current parking lot is a “big ticket” item that the City can and should rethink. She explained that the world is already moving into a climate challenged economy and sizing down the traditional approaches to parking and investing in a reimagined future made sense to Ms. Neal. She can’t imagine a future where more and more people won’t choose walking, shared transportation, or bicycling. Ms. Neal commented when looking over Brookside Park and O’Neil Park she didn’t see a provision anywhere about creating an equal amount of new green space elsewhere. She stated that community vitality is enhanced by purposeful and plentiful green spaces. Ms. Neal said the City can’t pave over green spaces without creating new or equivalent green spaces. She asked the City to look at repurposing hard surface locations to better fit the City’s fast approaching future needs.

Tam Lorenz, 311 S. Maple, Ames, mentioned that she was speaking on behalf of herself and maybe some under-represented park users who do not live in the Oak to Riverside Area. She commented that she voted for the Healthy Life Center and didn’t object to the placement of the Indoor Aquatic Center on the IDOT site; however, the latest maneuver to stretch the Urban Renewal Zone farther south in the City and the possibility of destroying O’Neil Park brought Ms. Lorenz in to speak. She said that O’Neil Park does not serve just the Oak-Riverside neighborhood, but other surrounding neighborhoods as well. She commented that the proposal to replace O’Neil Park with an aquatic center shines a bright light on two City-wide issues and values that are at risk. The first is the inclusion of low-income citizens and the benefits of living in Ames. The second is the reduction of the Ames carbon footprint through carbon sequestration. Ms. Lorenz said that covering acres of no-fee for use of green space with two acres of concrete brings into question the City’s dedication to the civic value of increased carbon sequestration. She mentioned that even if the City builds a carbon neutral building it can’t replace the current natural carbon and water absorption natural space. Ms. Lorenz recommended keeping the IDOT site or the site north of Target. She asked the Council to not consider O’Neil Park as an appropriate spot for the Indoor Aquatic Center.

Merlin Pfannkuch, 1424 Kellogg Avenue, Ames, questioned why the indoor track could be built at O’Neil Park and not at the IDOT site. He said he was baffled by the Council’s approach to the Indoor Aquatic Center. Mr. Pfannkuch wanted to know why the City would want to anger an entire neighborhood by suggesting O’Neil Park as a site, 18 months after identifying the IDOT site. He asked why other sites weren’t looked at during the past 18 months. Mr. Pfannkuch commented that the Council Action Form says that “time is of the essence” so a decision must be made quickly. He wanted to know if it was about saving citizens maybe \$2 million dollars. Surely, the City would have known there was some contamination given the location. He said he can’t defend the IDOT appraisal nor can he attack it as he doesn’t know how the \$2.9 million was arrived at. Mr. Pfannkuch wanted to know why the Council was worried about spending \$2 million for the IDOT site since they already approved a General Obligation (GO) bond to pay for it. He mentioned that, just this spring, the Council gave the owners of the properties at 2105 and 2421 Dayton Avenue a tax break of \$2.6 million to install infrastructure for a small lot industrial development. Mr. Pfannkuch noted that there never was a formal review as to why the Healthy Life Center failed and no pertinent questions have

been asked in the Residential Satisfaction Survey. He believed one word summarized the City's approach to having an Indoor Aquatic Center and that is "bumbling." He asked the Council to not take away O'Neil Park.

Richard Deyo, 505-8th Street, #2, Ames, stated that some items should be deferred until conversations are had with the Parks and Recreation Commission.

Debbie Lee, 214 S. Maple Avenue, Ames, said that for many years she had encouraged her neighbors to engage with city government. She has worked to provide neutral background information to encourage participation in City meetings, and put a face on government by asking Electric representatives and City staff to join their neighborhood picnic. She explained that the pursuit of return of tax dollars through a state program has resulted in the discovery that one state agency, IDOT, ironically an Oak-Riverside neighbor, responded with a bureaucratic wall for a project that is for community good. Ms. Lee stated that a state program seemingly devoted to revitalizing community areas could result in the elimination of a City park in an established residential area. She recognized that the Council has worked on the Reinvestment District for a long time, but to the community it has happened really fast. Many in the neighborhood are still in shock as they thought the park was protected by the O'Neil Family Agreement when the land was donated to the City. Ms. Lee commented that right now, the governmental process felt more like a tsunami wave than a participatory process. She recognized that everyone has a goal for providing an Indoor Aquatic Center for the community. However, if the O'Neil Park site had been considered during the normal search and review process, then she would believe that she would begrudgingly accept, but that is not what happened. She said the O'Neil site is only on the table only to meet the constraints of the Reinvestment District Program. Ms. Lee commented that she was heartbroken that the path to an Indoor Aquatic Center had taken this turn. Infill should be about repurposing developed sites and not about paving over the green spaces that remain. She urged the Council to take a step back and look at other ways to improve the community.

Ellyn Grimm, 217 S. Hazel Avenue, Ames, said she has lived in the neighborhood for about 12 years ago and she has spent a lot of time with her children in O'Neil Park. She wanted to echo everything that has been said tonight. She commented that it feels like the response was easy and convenient to a difficult situation. She challenged the Council to not take the easiest and most convenient way and consider the implications and the cost. Ms. Grimm explained that she attended the zoom meeting and it came apparent to her that she has awesome neighbors and she met the majority of them at O'Neil Park. She stated when her nine-year old son found the notice on their door he came to her crying as he didn't want to lose the park. Ms. Grimm said that the neighborhood is not wealthy or centrally located and she felt that they often get overlooked. She had a hard time believing that if O'Neil Park was located in a wealthier neighborhood, they would not be having this conversation. She felt there were some inequities that were coming up during the discussions. She encouraged the Council to take their time in making a decision.

Jackie DeLay, 129 S. Russell Avenue, Ames, stated she is from the O'Neil neighborhood. She commented that when she first heard about the Indoor Aquatic Center being at the IDOT location

she was thrilled. Suddenly, they were hearing that the IDOT site was no longer going to happen and that it would be O'Neil Park instead. The feeling changed from being thrilled to disappointed as something is going to be taken away from the neighborhood. Ms. DeLay didn't think the City should take away green spaces. She felt the original site was being dismissed too quickly, but something needs to be done to make the site appropriate. She urged the Council to not give up on the site so quickly.

Bambi Yost, 212 S Hazel, Ames, stated that O'Neil Park is not somewhere she frequents; however, she would like to propose another location. She suggested that the Depot site be utilized as it is currently being underutilized. She stated the site would be a mixed-use as the site has synergy, parking, and it fits within the Reinvestment District. It wouldn't compete with new development in the area either. Ms. Yost also recommended going back to the IDOT site as the site needs to be remediated regardless of who owns the property.

The Mayor closed public input when no one else came forward to speak.

Mayor Haila said that he wanted staff to answer the question from Mr. Pfannkuch regarding the indoor walking track. Director Abraham explained it was a matter of finances as to why they would be able to possibly construct the indoor walking track at the O'Neil Park location versus the IDOT site. He stated with the estimates they have from the IDOT site there would not be enough funds to build it; however, at the O'Neil Park site since the City wouldn't have to purchase the land, it will give the City extra funding to build the indoor walking track.

It was noted by the Mayor that the Council had received a lot of emails and his recommendation was to take everything under advisement for now. He asked for confirmation on how the public will know when a decision will be made. Director Abraham noted that there are multiple ways for the City to announce information. The City can advertise on the City's Facebook pages, City website, and an email blast. Staff will send out information this weekend from the last two Council meetings, provide links to the information, and let everyone know that this topic will come back on August 9, 2022. If anyone wanted to get more information, they can email Director Abraham at keith.abraham@cityofames.org and he will add them to the list.

Council Member Betcher asked that given the City's concern regarding the IDOT site, is there any reason to believe that the City could not successfully remediate the contamination. Director Abraham stated a number of things that could be done. He noted that there is no way to ever get rid of all the contamination as the source is still there, and there is no guarantee that everything can be remediated. He stated that the City can probably minimize the contamination.

Council Member Gartin wanted to address a couple comments that were made with respect to the process that staff and Council went through. He appreciated the fact that the process seemed "fast" for the neighborhood, but that does not mean that staff had short-changed the due diligence process. He said to characterize the staff as "bumbling" or "rushed" could not be further from the truth. Mr. Gartin commented how he was proud of the staff with the way they have handled all the "curveballs"

that were handed to them.

The Mayor referred anyone to the last the City Council Meeting to review the Staff Report for Item 25 regarding information on the IDOTs site contamination, as this is an important decision. He asked that everyone respect staff as they are working really hard.

Mayor Haila recessed at 8:12 p.m. and reconvened at 8:21 p.m.

STAFF REPORT ON NON-COMPLIANT FRONT-YARD PARKING AND DRIVEWAYS:

Planning and Housing Director Kelly Diekmann said that an enforcement action brought this item forward. He noted that the basic background was that the City has had front yard parking and paving standards for almost 40 years. The standards address issues of illegal parking and paving of areas in front yards, often an issue in areas with high levels of single-family home rental conversions. It should be noted that a major force for these front yard parking changes was influenced by residents in neighborhoods where there was an increasing number of conversions from owner-occupied units to rental units. Because their conversions lacked sufficient off-street parking, cars in the rental units would park in the front yards on grass, making ruts in the front yard, and thereby disturbing the character of the neighborhood. Director Diekmann explained that the City relies upon the front yard parking terminology for parking enforcement of the act of parking a car as well as design standards in the Zoning Code for where paving can be placed. The City's zoning standards require two paved off-street parking spaces for every single-family and two-family dwelling unit. Parking can be provided either covered or uncovered, but it must be located on a driveway in front of a garage or on a driveway that leads to a parking space in the side or rear yard.

Staff conducted an in-depth review of single-family residential parking areas throughout Ames to identify those that are non-conforming compared to the current Zoning Code standards. Additionally, staff reviewed changes to the Zoning standards for parking in previous years to help determine if some of the driveways that do not conform to the present Zoning standards would have complied at the time they were constructed or modified. Through the in-depth review, staff has identified six process improvements that could be made. The first improvement would be to the application process. Staff has revised the application to become both an "Access and Driveway Paving Permit," so that includes the curb cut and/or the on-site expanse of paving. The new comprehensive permit requires a review by the Traffic Engineer, Zoning Enforcement Officer, and Planning Division. It was also suggested that the \$50 curb cut fee be increased to \$100 to cover the cost of inspection as well as the curb cut. The second process improvement was to make *Code* changes to clarify driveway standards. Staff identified at least 450 non-conforming existing front yard paving and driveway. Staff categorized the driveways into five categories which are: 1) Flared side parking areas; 2) Flared side parking - no side yard; 3) Parking in front of the house; 4) Flared side parking - corner lot; and, 5) Looped or Double Driveways.

Non-Conformity Type 1: "Flared Side Parking Areas:" These are parking surfaces that have been added to an existing, otherwise compliant, driveway. The surface does not lead to a parking surface behind the front yard and therefore are non-compliant. Type 1 non-conformities have adequate room

to expand behind the front yard but have not done so. Staff is recommending adopted a Text Amendment that would allow Type 1 non-conforming parking areas to legally exist. This would make the 253 non-conforming parking areas compliant and would allow for this type of parking area to be added to other residential properties.

Council Member Betcher asked about discussions that were had regarding discouraging car ownership and discouraging the paving of permeable surfaces. These changes seemed to go against the Climate Action Goals by encouraging paving. Director Diekmann noted that the discussion regarding discouraging car ownership did not come up. He stated that less paving would be expected and would save some parking due to the current standards.

Non-Conformity Type 2: “Flared Side Yard Parking - No Side Yard:” Type 2 non-conformities are similar to Type 1 non-conformities, where a parking space has been added to the side of an existing driveway in the front yard. However, the difference with this non-conformity is the lack of enough space to provide a compliant parking space beyond the front yard. Staff’s review showed that there were approximately 56 properties that have additional paving adjacent to the driveway that does not lead beyond the front yard due to insufficient room. Staff recommended adopting a Text Amendment that would allow properties with insufficient room for an additional parking area beyond the front of the house to pave additional parking area when sited towards the adjacent side property line.

Non-Conformity Type 3: “Parking in Front of House:” Type 3 are parking areas that extend towards the center of the house (some extend fully to the structure and some end in the front yard) rather than towards a garage, side yard, or areas that provide an additional parking space situated perpendicular to the existing driveway. Some of the spaces are adjacent to existing driveways and some serve as the only driveway or off-street parking. Staff found approximately 51 properties that fit into the Type 3 category. It is staff’s recommendation to adopt a Text Amendment that would allow existing areas to remain and to allow for parking areas to be added adjacent to the driveway as long as the maximum driveway width does not exceed 20 feet. This Text Amendment would allow properties to have at least two off-street parking spaces regardless of the number of garages or distance between the driveway and adjacent property line. New construction would still need to comply with requirements for required parking to be located outside of the front yard.

Council Member Gartin wanted to know if there were many properties that had Type 3 parking. Director Diekmann noted that there are not many properties that have this configuration. He noted that the properties where Type 3 will be seen is on a single-car garage that has the standard setback of five-foot setback. Mr. Gartin asked what area of town some of these houses may be located in. Director Diekmann noted there were a few along Duff Avenue. He also wanted to be clear that for locations that have a detached garage that is in the rear of the yard, this parking standard would not apply. Mr. Gartin asked how many locations did not have a curb cut already. Building Inspector Sara VanMeeteren indicated that there were very few houses that don’t already have a curb cut. She noted there may be alley access but not a curb cut. A good question for the Council would be if a household had alley parking would the Council allow for a front driveway curb-cut for the sole purpose of putting a paved parking space in front of a house that doesn’t lead to anything.

Non-Conformity Type 4: “Flared Side Parking - Corner Lot:” Type 4 category is for properties that are corner lots. The *Municipal Code* treats corner lots as having two front yards and one side yard, as opposed to a typical lot that has a single front yard and two side yards. There are approximately 56 corner lots that have non-compliant parking categorized as Type 4. There are many different considerations involved in drafting a text amendment to allow parking on corner lots. Staff believes that allowing for paving in a street side adjacent to a sidewalk is an undesirable environment for pedestrians and the aesthetic of the streetscape. Therefore, staff recommends setting a date by which all Type 4 non-conformities in existence may continue and require all new parking installed after that date to comply with the current *Code*, with no changes. This would allow the 56 non-conforming parking areas to remain as-is but would prohibit new Type 4 parking areas from being installed in the future.

Council Member Betcher questioned what the *Code* said before it got changed in 2000 about where parking was permitted on a defined side. Director Diekmann stated that the owner of a corner lot got to pick their front yard and the other side would become a street side-yard.

Non-Conformity Type 5: “Looped or Double Driveways:” Type 5 non-conformities are parking areas that loop in front of the house and/or have two curb cuts. Some of the driveway areas lead to approved parking and some do not. Driveway loops that do not lead to approved parking beyond the front yard cannot be used for parking under the current *Code*. Staff found 38 properties that can be categorized as non-conforming. Staff understands the desire for two curb cuts, but finds it necessary to establish parameters to avoid the entire front yard from being paved. Staff recommends adopting a Text Amendment that would allow two curb cuts on lots that have at least 150 feet of frontage as long as the curb cuts can be located at least 75 feet apart. This Text Amendment would allow the 38 non-compliant parking areas to remain and would allow the same type of parking areas to be installed moving forward. With this frontage standard it is likely only a corner lot could qualify for a looped driveway.

Council Member Gartin asked if the recommendations were approved, would there be a time where someone might ask for a Variance, especially on properties that are difficult to turn around on and residents have to back up onto a busy street. Director Diekmann said that on certain high speed streets the *Code* does specify to allow for an exemption to put in a turnaround. He noted there are very few streets that allow this.

Council Member Gartin inquired as to how other peer communities are handling front-yard parking and driveways. Director Diekmann said that other cities have made certain allowances. Mr. Gartin asked if any contractors have been notified about the recommended changes. Ms. VanMeeteren commented that the permitting process will be different for the contractors and will be a learning curve.

Council Member Betcher asked if there have been any complaints from neighbors of non-conforming driveways. Ms. VanMeeteren said there have not.

City Manager Steve Schainker stated that staff needs to get a recommendation on the houses that have an alley and are requesting a curb cut. Director Diekmann mentioned that it was linked to Type 3. The question was for an allowance of up to 20 feet of parking in a front yard of a home that already has compliant rear-yard parking.

Council Member Gartin stated that if a property already has access, he would feel less likely to add additional parking. He said a lot of the time those garages in the back are small.

Council Member Betcher stated she is normally opposed to paving more over grass, and if people already have parking accessible from the alley, she did not think the Council should be encouraging paving anything in front of the house.

Council Member Junck asked how much time would be added to the process to do an inspection since this was not previously done. Ms. VanMeeteren commented that staff will consider this type of inspection as a footing/foundation inspection and it is a two-hour notice. The hope is to go out when the area is framed before the cement is poured. Ms. Junck asked if the inspections would cause more time for staff. Ms. VanMeeteren said that she anticipated it would only take an additional 30 minutes for the inspector.

Moved by Gartin, seconded by Corrieri, to approve Items 1-6 as presented by staff in the Staff Report which state:

1. Adopt a Text Amendment to codify the permit and inspection and establish a \$100 fee to cover the costs of the process.
2. Adopt a Text Amendment that would allow Type 1 non-conforming parking areas to legally exist and allow for paving sited towards the adjacent side lot line. This would make the 253 non-conforming parking areas compliant and would allow for this type of parking area to be added to other properties.
3. Adopt a Text Amendment for Type 2 non-conforming parking areas that would allow all properties with insufficient room for an additional parking area beyond the front of the house to pave additional parking area when sited towards the adjacent side lot line. This would make the 56 properties compliant and allow for this type of parking area to be added to other properties.
4. For Type 3 situations, allow for all existing properties with front yard parking to be allowed and adopt a Text Amendment that would allow front yard parking for all properties when added adjacent to an existing driveway and the total width does not exceed 20 feet. This Text Amendment would make 51 properties compliant and allow properties to have at least two off-street parking spaces regardless of the number of garages or distance between the driveway and adjacent property line. New construction would follow current requirements.
5. Set a date by which all Type 4 non-conformities in existence may continue and require all new parking installed after that date to comply with the current *Code*. This would allow the 56 non-conforming parking areas to remain as-is but would prohibit new Type 4 parking areas from being installed in the future.

6. Set a date by which all Type 5 non-compliant double or looped driveway parking areas to remain and adopt a Text Amendment that creates new limitations on multiple driveways by limiting two curb cuts to lots that have at least 150 feet of frontage so long as the curb cut can also be located at least 75 feet apart.

Vote on Motion: 5-0. Motion declared carried unanimously.

Moved by Gartin, seconded by Betcher, to direct staff to not allow for an exception of a Type 3 non-conformity, if there is already a compliant required parking in the rear yard.

Vote on Motion: 5-0. Motion declared carried unanimously.

Moved by Junck, seconded by Betcher, to not allow any looped driveways that do not lead to any parking.

Vote on Motion: 5-0. Motion declared carried unanimously.

APPROVING A REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP) TO SOLICIT FOR A PARTNER DEVELOPER IN CONNECTION WITH THE DEVELOPMENT OF LOW-INCOME HOUSING TAX CREDIT (LIHTC) UNITS IN THE BAKER SUBDIVISION: Housing Coordinator Vanessa Baker-Latimer stated that on December 22, 2020, as part of the City Council goal to create more affordable housing for both owner-occupied and rental households, the City Council entered into a Partnership Agreement with Prairie Fire Corporation and Builder’s Development Corporation to submit a 9% LIHTC application to the Iowa Finance Authority (IFA) for 36 multi-family housing units in the Baker Subdivision (321 State Avenue). In late September 2021, staff learned that the City’s 9% LIHTC application was not funded due to the large group of disaster set-aside projects that absorbed most of the funding allocation. However, staff was informed by the developer that 4% LIHTC funding was available, and that the Governor’s priority was to allocate an additional \$100 million to affordable housing that the State was eligible to receive through the US Treasury. Unfortunately, the final US Treasury guidelines did not permit for the State to use the funds as they hoped. In December 2021, it became apparent that the Agreement among the City, Prairie Fire Corporation, and Builder’s Development Corporation that was predicated on a 9% LIHTC award was no longer valid.

At the April 12, 2022 meeting, the City Council directed staff to proceed with utilizing \$1.8 million of the City’s HOME allocations and update the Developer’s Agreement with Prairie Fire and Builders Developers Group to submit an application to IFA for a 4% Low-Income Housing Tax Credit to develop a minimum of 30 units in the Baker Subdivision. However, in June 2022, staff was notified by Prairie Fire that they intended to introduce a new partner from Minnesota into the project, and it was explained that the new company would bring property management and construction management experience to the project. Staff was also informed that the new partner “Titan” would take over as the major developer and guarantor role, and that Prairie Fire and Builder’s Development Group would take on a reduced co-developer role. In accordance with the City’s Purchasing Policy, staff believes that this change in partnership/ownership would require the City to resolicit proposals for the project.

Staff prepared an updated Request for Proposal (RFP) to solicit for a new partner developer to pursue a 4% LIHTC application utilizing the \$1.8 million incentive from the available City's HOME allocations. Staff believed that pursuing the 4% credits, rather than the 9% credits, is the better option to assure that the units are developed faster because it is a non-competitive process. Ms. Baker-Latimer explained that there will be a requirement that a minimum of 10% of the units be set aside for Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher participants. She explained that under Section 4: "Developer Minimum Responsibilities/Requirements" a Developer's Agreement will be entered into to prepare the 4% LIHTC application, that includes the terms for the developer's construction and operation of the project, the City's participation in the project, transfer of land for the development of the project, and anticipated start date of the construction. Also, the Agreement shall be completed with the City of Ames within 45 days from the date of acceptance of the proposal by the City Council. The application shall be submitted to the Iowa Finance Authority (IFA) on or about 60 days after a Developer's Agreement has been signed. Under Section 6: "Competitive Requirements and Scoring" Ms. Baker-Latimer said that additional points will be given based on the percentage of affordable housing units for either Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher participants or households with income at 50% or less of the Ames Metropolitan Statistical Area Income Limits beyond the required 10% for Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher participants.

Ms. Baker-Latimer mentioned that the revisions to the RFP were reviewed by Legal, Purchasing, Public Works, Electric, and Planning and Housing. Staff also met with the Old College Creek Neighborhood Association and they supported the City with having to develop a new RFP.

Ms. Baker-Latimer reviewed the timeline of the project and it was the hope that this item would be brought back to the City Council on October 25, 2022.

Council Member Rollins asked if there was an opportunity under Section 6 of the RFP to add additional scoring related to the Climate Action Plan (reflective surfaces, lighting). Ms. Baker-Latimer commented that they could add an additional section for bonus points if the developer adds solar, energy efficient windows. She could meet with the RFP team to find out what extra points could be added.

Council Member Gartin stated that as more requirements are added, there will be more tradeoffs. He has been advocating for more units and he is afraid the tradeoff would cause the City to serve fewer people. Mr. Gartin wanted to know with the requirement for Section 8 housing, will there be some developers that won't want to apply due to the requirement. Ms. Baker-Latimer explained that when she looked at some of the applications that were previously funded those applications were for even lower homeless housing. Also, the developers are familiar with Section 8 and besides the vouchers it comes with funding.

The Mayor asked if a developer wanted to go for the 9% will that developer still be considered, or would it be for the 4% only. Ms. Baker-Latimer stated she doesn't believe that they can add a mixed development.

Mayor Haila opened public comment.

Stephen Bond, 2555 Eisenhower Avenue, Ames, said he wanted to lend his support for low-income housing. He understands there was a hiccup concerning the project at the old middle school grounds and he is sure staff is taking care of everything. Mr. Bond said the more people that can be helped the better. He would prefer a higher density, but knows the City will do its best job.

Tara Brown, 225 S. Kellogg Avenue, Ames, said she is the Director of Shelter Services for The Bridge Home. She explained that The Bridge Home is a non-profit organization that has served the Ames area since 1985. The Bridge Home aims to stop the cycle of homelessness that many in the community are struggling to get out of. However, it is not an easy task to take on when there is no affordable housing for their clients to utilize. Ms. Brown stated she was present to push for the development of the Baker Subdivision. Specifically, she wanted to express its support for a more high-density affordable housing development that includes units that could be used for supportive housing. Ms. Brown commented that now is the time to take a step back and re-evaluate the project and strongly recommended that the Council considers increasing the number of units that are available for the City to a minimum of 100 units. She said that last year The Bridge Home had over 100 clients on their waiting list for supportive housing. Supportive Housing, as defined by HUD, “as permanent housing in which housing assistance and supportive services are provided to assist households with at least one member who is chronically homeless with a disability in order to achieve housing stability.” The Bridge Home has successfully operated its Supportive Housing Program for over a year. Ms. Brown said that The Bridge Home wants to partner with the Baker Subdivision. She asked everyone to take a stand and declare “enough is enough” and to no longer allow a single individual in Ames to go to sleep in the street.

Lauris Olson, 1705 Buchanan Drive, Ames, stated she was present on behalf of Home Allies. She commented that she did not have a preference for the number of units as The Bridge Home would know more of that information. Ms. Olson believed that the 4% LIHTC option is the best way to go. She had a couple recommendations for the RFP. Ms. Olson asked, for the pre-screening, if the group that does the pre-screening also includes one or two committee members for diversity, input, and a different perspective. She felt there needed to be a balance between the expertise and a newer group to give a different perspective. Ms. Olson advocated to have the evaluation committees include a developer and someone who works with low-income people. She asked when looking at the final RFP to set some caps. Ms. Olson asked the Council to offer more affordable units.

The Mayor closed public input when no one else came forward to speak.

Council Member Gartin asked what the pre-screening group was that Ms. Olson referred to. Ms. Vanessa Baker-Latimer noted that the internal staff makes sure that all the requirements are met, but a lot of the input came from the neighborhood and the community. She stated the RFP is a public document and welcomed any feedback.

Moved by Betcher, seconded by Rollins, to adopt RESOLUTION NO. 22-415 approving a Request

for Proposals (RFP) to solicit for a Partner Developer in connection with the development of Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) Units in the Baker Subdivision.

Roll Call Vote: 5-0. Resolution declared adopted unanimously, signed by the Mayor, and hereby made a portion of these Minutes.

HEARING ON PROPOSED ZONING TEXT AMENDMENT TO REDUCE MEDICAL PARKING RATES FOR BUILDINGS LESS THAN 50,000 SQUARE FEET AND UPDATE MEDICAL OFFICE DEFINITIONS:

City Planner Justin Moore said that two options were being recommended. The first option was to lower the standard for buildings under 50,000 square feet in all areas of the City to four spaces per 1,000 except for the Hospital Medical Area and the Downtown Gateway Commercial district. Those two exclusions would have a parking rate of five spaces per 1,000 square feet. The second option was to reduce all medical service parking to four spaces per 1,000 square feet for all buildings under 50,000 square feet in all zones across the City.

Mayor Haila opened public input.

Linda Feldman, 1111 Stafford Avenue, Ames, stated she wanted to get clarification as to why parking is being reduced for the main central area for Hospital/Medical. She said that in 2011, McFarland Clinic received approval to have a building built on Carroll Avenue, and this caused the loss of homes and parking. Ms. Feldman mentioned it was awful between the neighborhood and the Hospital/Medical. It was agreed upon to have a roundtable discussion and they worked on developing a committee of five neighborhoods that surround the area to meet on a regular basis to try and work out some “vision” that everyone could agree on. She commented that the committee had not met since March 2020, due to the pandemic. One of the agreements that came out of the discussions was that anything that would affect their neighborhood again would trigger the Hospital/Medical personnel to contact the committee to have a meeting. She was surprised to see a Zoning Text Amendment change request and this had not been discussed with the Committee yet. Ms. Feldman said she would not be in favor of lowering the parking any more than what it already is. She explained that she would be supportive of what is being requested out on Dayton Avenue, but does not support any changes to the parking requirements in the Hospital/Medical Zone in the central area. She stated that the streets are already full of vehicles parking on the street.

The Mayor wanted to clarify that Ms. Feldman was against reducing the parking at the Hospital and the main McFarland clinic along 13th Street, but not in other areas of the community. Ms. Feldman noted that was correct.

The public hearing was closed when no one else came forward to speak.

The Mayor asked Director Diekmann to explain why the parking is being reduced. Director Diekmann explained that the City Council had referred a letter to staff from Mary Greeley Medical Center (MGMC) regarding a requested change in the required parking for Medical Office uses. MGMC wanted the parking rates to change for a new surgery center that they want to build on Dayton Avenue. The Mayor stated that the Hospital did not initiate the request, but something that

the City Council was doing to try to reduce some of the dependency on vehicles and not have as much paving. He said he doesn't believe the Hospital or McFarland clinic broke faith. Mayor Haila stated that if the standard gets reduced from seven spaces per 1,000 square feet to five spaces, could the main McFarland building build more without increasing parking. Director Diekmann indicated that the main McFarland clinic is five spaces per 1,000 as the clinic is already over 50,000 square feet.

Council Member Betcher commented that she was under the impression that the "Ring of Neighborhoods" were already contacted.

Council Member Rollins asked if the request tonight was time sensitive at all. Director Diekmann stated it is not tonight, but it will be within the next six weeks. Mr. Schainker asked if the Council could amend the proposed ordinance by allowing the change to be made for the area outside of the Hospital Medical and Downtown Gateway Commercial district and strike the rest of it until a decision could be made. City Attorney Mark Lambert said that all it would take would be a motion to approve what Mr. Schainker had mentioned and then approve the ordinance on first reading as amended. The amended ordinance would come back for the second and third readings.

Moved by Gartin, seconded by Betcher, to approve Option 1a and 1c in the staff report which are:

- 1a: Reduce medical parking to four spaces per 1,000 square feet for areas outside of the Hospital Medical Area and Downtown Gateway Commercial district.
- 1c: Revise the definitions to replace the term "clinic" with Medical Service Facility.

Vote on Motion: 5-0. Motion declared carried unanimously.

Moved by Gartin, seconded by Betcher, to approve on first reading the ordinance as amended.

Roll Call Vote: 5-0. Motion declared carried unanimously.

Moved by Betcher, seconded by Rollins, to have the City Manager meet with the "Ring of Neighborhoods" in the Hospital Medical Zone to re-establish contact and to address neighborhood concerns.

Vote on Motion 5-0. Motion declared carried unanimously.

AUTHORIZING THE IMMEDIATE TOWING OF VEHICLES ON SATURDAY, AUGUST 20, 2022, FROM MIDNIGHT TO 11:50 P.M. IN THE DESIGNATED AREA OF BEACH AVENUE WEST TO STATE AVENUE AND LINCOLN WAY SOUTH TO MORTENSEN AVENUE FOR CERTAIN ILLEGAL PARKING VIOLATIONS: Police Chief Geoff Huff said that on July 12, 2022, the City Council approved an ordinance to allow for the immediate towing of vehicles parked illegally when authorized by a City Council Resolution (Section 18.34 of the *Municipal Code*). The resolution that authorizes such towing must designate certain types of illegal parking subject to tow, along with specific dates, times, and geographic area subject to immediate towing. Chief Huff stated that staff is requesting a resolution authorizing the use of the immediate Towing Ordinance for certain areas and times on Saturday, August 20, 2022, from midnight to 11:59 p.m. in the following geographic areas: 1) Lincoln Way between Beach Avenue and State Street; 2)

State Street between Lincoln Way and Mortensen Avenue; 3) Mortensen Avenue between State Street and Beach Avenue; and 4) Beach Avenue between Mortensen Avenue and Lincoln Way. He further explained that the authorization to tow illegally parked vehicles for the following violations: 1) Alternate side parking violations; 2) No parking on one side of the street violations; 3) Yellow line violations; and, 4) Fire Hydrant violations. It was noted that staff does not intend to tow for overtime parking violations, absent a public safety risk. Chief Huff explained the different ways that the public will be notified and educated about the change.

Council Member Betcher stated on the list of violations that there is nothing about blocking sidewalks with vehicles and wanted to know if that was a safety concern. Chief Huff stated it is not, it is more of an inconvenience for the mobility impaired, but it has not been an issue for this event.

Moved by Corrieri, seconded by Betcher, to adopt RESOLUTION NO. 22-416 authorizing the immediate towing of vehicles on Saturday, August 20, 2022, from midnight to 11:59 p.m. in the designated area of Beach Avenue west to State Avenue and Lincoln Way south to Mortensen Avenue for certain illegal parking violations.

Roll Call Vote: 5-0. Resolution declared adopted unanimously, signed by the Mayor, and hereby made a portion of these Minutes.

HEARING ON MAJOR SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR 1699 APPLE PLACE: Director Diekmann stated he was present if there were any questions.

Mayor opened public hearing and closed it when no one came forward to speak.

Moved by Betcher, seconded by Corrieri, to adopt RESOLUTION NO. 417 approving the Major Site Development Plan for 1699 Apple Place in the Old Orchard Mobile Home park.

Roll Call Vote: 5-0. Resolution declared adopted unanimously, signed by the Mayor, and hereby made a portion of these Minutes.

HEARING ON REZONING, WITH MASTER PLAN, 798-500TH STREET FROM “A” (AGRICULTURAL) TO “FS-RL” (FLOATING SUBURBAN RESIDENTIAL LOW DENSITY): Moved by Corrieri, seconded by Gartin, to continue the hearing on the Rezoning, with Master Plan, of 798-500th Street from “A” (Agricultural) to “FS-RL” (Floating Suburban Residential Low Density) until August 9, 2022.

Vote on Motion: 5-0. Motion declared carried unanimously.

HEARING ON WATER TREATMENT PLANT FIVE-YEAR WELL REHABILITATION CONTRACT: The Mayor opened the public hearing and closed it when no one came forward to speak.

Moved by Gartin, seconded by Betcher, to adopt RESOLUTION NO. 22-418 approving the final plans and specifications and awarding a contract to The Northway Corporation of Marion, Iowa, in the amount of \$141,625.

Roll Call Vote: 5-0. Resolution declared adopted unanimously, signed by the Mayor, and hereby made a portion of these Minutes.

HEARING ON STORY COUNTY EDGE OF FIELD PROJECT: The public hearing was opened by Mayor Haila. It was closed when no one came forward to speak.

Moved by Betcher, seconded by Corrieri, to adopt RESOLUTION NO. 22-419 approving the final plans and specifications and awarding a contract to Hands On Excavating, LLC, of Radcliffe, Iowa, in the amount of \$240,389.42.

Roll Call Vote: 5-0. Resolution declared adopted unanimously, signed by the Mayor, and hereby made a portion of these Minutes.

HEARING ON BOILER TUBE SPRAY COATING & RELATED SERVICES FOR POWER PLANT: Mayor Haila opened the public hearing and closed it when no one came forward to speak.

Moved by Betcher, seconded by Rollins, to adopt RESOLUTION NO. 22-420 approving the final plans and specifications and awarding a contract to Integrated Global Services Inc., of Richmond, Virginia, in an amount not to exceed \$435,000.

Roll Call Vote: 5-0. Resolution declared adopted unanimously, signed by the Mayor, and hereby made a portion of these Minutes.

HEARING ON BOILER MAINTENANCE SERVICES CONTRACT FOR POWER PLANT: The public hearing was opened by Mayor Haila. It was closed when no one came forward to speak.

Moved by Rollins, seconded by Betcher, to adopt RESOLUTION NO. 22-410 approving the final plans and specifications and awarding a contract to TEiC Construction Services, Inc., of Duncan, South Carolina, in an amount not to exceed \$325,000.

Roll Call Vote: 5-0. Resolution declared adopted unanimously, signed by the Mayor, and hereby made a portion of these Minutes.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CITY'S PLANNING PROJECT REVIEW AND NOTIFICATION PROCESS AND APPROVAL PROCESS RELATED TO CHAPTERS 20 AND 29 OF THE AMES MUNICIPAL CODE: Moved by Betcher, seconded by Gartin, to pass on second reading an ordinance on the Proposed Amendment to the City's Planning Project Review and Notification Process and Approval Process related to Chapters 20 and 29 of the *Ames Municipal Code*.

Roll Call Vote: 5-0. Motion declared carried unanimously.

ORDINANCE INCREASING FINES FOR NUISANCE PARTIES ON CERTAIN OCCASIONS: City Attorney Mark Lambert said this was passed on all three readings at the last Council Meeting; however, there were not enough votes to suspend the rules. In order to suspend the rules, it required at least five votes and the vote passed at only four votes. Essentially the second and third votes were null and void.

Moved by Gartin, seconded by Rollins, to pass on second reading an ordinance increasing fines for nuisance parties on certain occasions.

Vote on Motion: 4-1. Voting Aye: Betcher, Corrieri, Gartin, Rollins. Voting Nay: Junck. Motion declared carried.

Moved by Corrieri, seconded by Betcher, to suspend the rules necessary for the adoption of an ordinance.

Roll Call Vote: 4-1. Voting Aye: Betcher, Corrieri, Gartin, Rollins. Voting Nay: Junck. Motion failed.

DISPOSITIONS OF COMMUNICATIONS TO COUNCIL: The Mayor indicated that there were six items to review. The first item was a memo from Chief of Police Geoff Huff that provided recommendations from Policing in Ames.

City Manager Steve Schainker noted the memo from Chief Huff was an update only and no action was required.

The second item was a letter from Charli Hanway, Ames Resident requesting the City Council to consider creating a pollinator habitat at the Ames Solar Farm.

Municipal Engineer Tracy Peterson explained that Public Works has been working with the Electric Department to plant pollinators at the Solar Farm.

Moved by Gartin, seconded by Junck, to ask staff to respond to the letter from Charli Hanway letting them know what the City is going to be doing.

The third item was an email from Sue Ravenscroft, Ames Resident, voicing her concerns regarding the proposed alternate locations for the Indoor Aquatic Center.

This was already discussed earlier, and no action was taken.

The fourth item was an email from Lorna Carroll, Ames Resident request to have a “Lights Out Ames” day to increase awareness of migratory birds and the implications of artificial nighttime lighting.

Municipal Engineer Tracy Peterson mentioned that the City of Ames has achieved three years of bird friendly certification. She explained there is a committee working on different action items and one of them is for having a “Lights Out Ames” day.

Moved by Gartin, seconded by Rollins, to ask staff to reply to Ms. Carroll letting her know that a process is already in place and how the committee will be proceeding.

The fifth item was a memo from Kelly Diekmann, Director of Planning and Housing providing an

update to a previous request from John Gade for the City to waive its platting authority within two miles of the Ames City Limits in the Urban Fringe area.

Moved by Betcher, seconded by Gartin, to place the memo from the Planning and Housing Director Kelly Diekmann on a future Agenda.

Vote on Motion: 4-1. Voting Aye: Betcher, Gartin, Junck, Rollins. Voting Nay: Corrieri. Motion declared carried

The last item was a memo from Damion Pregitzer, Traffic Engineer, providing information on the process and cost to rename the Ames Municipal Airport.

Moved by Betcher, seconded by Rollins, to place the memo from Mr. Pregitzer on a future Agenda for discussion

Vote on Motion: 5-0. Motion declared carried unanimously.

COUNCIL COMMENTS: None.

ADJOURNMENT: Moved by Betcher, seconded by Corrieri, to adjourn the meeting at 10:20 p.m.

Vote on Motion: 5-0. Motion declared carried unanimously.

Amy L. Colwell, Deputy City Clerk

John A. Haila, Mayor

Diane R. Voss, City Clerk