

**CITY OF NEW BERLIN
PROCEEDINGS OF THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE
TUESDAY, March 23, 2010**

Approved 4/27/10

A Public Hearing was held with regards to the proposed Industrial Development Revenue Bond Financing to Benefit Process Displays, Inc. Project on behalf of Westridge PDI, LLC. Mayor Chiovatero read the rules for the public hearing. There were no questions or comments as to the purpose or clarification on the project. There were no comments in favor of the proposed project. There were no comments in opposition of the proposed project.

Alderman Wysocki questioned the public benefit relative to this application.

Mayor Chiovatero explained that this is currently a New Berlin business that is relocating and practically doubling in size which will include additional jobs. The Public hearing was closed at 7:07p.m.

ROLL CALL: Mayor Jack F Chiovatero called the meeting to order at 7:07 PM. Present were Aldermen Hopkins, Wysocki, Seidl, Harenda, Moore and Ament. Alderman Poshepny had an excused absence. Also present were: City Clerk Kari Morgan, City Attorney Mark Blum and City Engineer J.P. Walker.

This meeting was noticed on Friday, March 19, 2010 in accordance with the Open Meetings Law.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion by Alderman Ament to approve the March 9, 2010 Committee of the Whole minutes as printed. Seconded by Alderman Harenda and carried unanimously.

The following items will be considered for approval or denial by the Aldermen with a recommendation to Common Council on the Consent Agenda.

UTILITY AND FINANCE

Motion by Alderman Moore to approve the Water Utility claims in the amount of \$60,960.06, Sewer Utility claims in the amount of \$4,917,460.55, and Bi-weekly claims in the amount of \$414,329.61. Seconded by Alderman Hopkins and carried unanimously.

LICENSES/PERMITS

- **Massage Establishment License for the 2010-2011 year to Leah Ratliff, 14702 W. National Avenue**
Motion by Alderman Moore to approve the massage establishment license for the 2010-2011 year to Leah Ratliff, 14702 W. National Avenue. Seconded by Alderman Hopkins.

Alderman Wysocki questioned the zoning at this location and if it would allow for this activity?

The motion was amended to include that the approval will be contingent on this location having the proper zoning.

Motion as stated above carried unanimously.

- **Massage Therapist License for the 2010-2011 year to Leah Ratliff**
The council addressed this motion first. Motion by Alderman Ament to approve the massage therapist license for the 2010-2011 year to Leah Ratliff. Seconded by Alderman Moore and carried unanimously.

MISCELLANEOUS

Consideration of final Resolution 10-07 Regarding Industrial Development Revenue Bond Financing to Benefit Process Displays, Inc. Project on behalf of Westridge PDI, LLC.

Motion by Alderman Hopkins to approve Resolution 10-07 regarding Industrial Development Revenue Bond Financing to Benefit Process Displays, Inc. Project on behalf of Westridge PDI, LLC. Seconded by Alderman Seidl.

A representative for the project responded to Alderman Wysocki's inquiry and stated that there would be additional jobs with this project.

Motion to approve the Industrial Development Revenue Bond carried unanimously.

Resolution 10-08 Authorizing Staff to Submit an Urban Non-Point Source Grant Application to WDNR for

Ryerson Road.

Motion by Alderman Harenda to authorize staff to submit an Urban Non-Point Source Grant application to WDNR for Ryerson Road through Resolution 10-08. Seconded by Alderman Hopkins.

Alderman Wysocki questioned if this obligates the City to do the project in 2013.

City Engineer J.P. Walker stated that they will have a window of opportunity to use the funds if granted and if they are unable to fulfill that obligation, they will have to either give the funds back or negotiate a new window of opportunity.

Motion to adopt Resolution 10-08 as stated above carried unanimously.

Direct the City Attorney to draft an ordinance that will require the City of New Berlin to purchase automobiles and light duty vehicles and equipment having at least 51% of the monetary value of the parts manufactured in the United States, and 51% of the vehicle manufactured in the United States, or in the case of public safety vehicles, 51% of the monetary values of part manufactured in the United States. Motion by Alderman Hopkins to direct the City Attorney to draft an ordinance as indicated above. Seconded by Alderman Harenda on 3/9/10; REFERRED TO FINANCE COMMITTEE 3/9/10; REFERRED BACK TO COUNCIL 3/11/10 & AMENDED BY FINANCE COMMITTEE

Alderman Wysocki provided the report from the March 11, 2010 finance committee meeting in which the recommended action was to recommend adoption of the requested action with the amendment removing "equipment".

Motion by Alderman Wysocki to amend the original motion made on March 9, 2010 to drop the word "equipment" in the requested action statement. Seconded by Alderman Harenda.

Alderman Seidl questioned the word "equipment" being dropped.

Alderman Wysocki explained that they need to have a better understanding of what "equipment" would be covered.

Alderman Moore requested two issues be discussed at the finance meeting including the impact if all cities adopted a resolution like this and how this would impact the North American Free Trade Agreement.

Alderman Wysocki stated that they did discuss the potential impacts that they knew of.

Alderman Moore requested this be sent back to the Finance Committee since his questions were not answered.

Mayor Chiovatero explained that they do not have the resources to do the kind of financial analysis Alderman Moore is requesting.

Alderman Ament stated the finance committee had lengthy discussions based on the information available to them.

Motion carried as stated above with Alderman Moore abstaining.

Request that the New Berlin City Council direct the authorization in the reduction of municipal forfeitures for enforcement actions taken by the court and the City Attorneys Office with regards to Municipal Code Chapter 267-9. Request that Council direct the City Attorney to petition the Municipal Court for a reduction of these forfeitures. Additionally request that Council direct staff and City Attorney to develop a specific policy on this matter and present to Council at a future date for approval.

Alderman Harenda: The requested action is simply this, that the New Berlin Common Council direct the authorization in the reduction of municipal forfeitures for enforcement actions taken by the court and the City Attorneys Office with regard to Municipal Code Chapter 267-9. Forfeitures have been set at \$240 for after the fact compliance of well testing and permit approval and \$50.00 for after the fact compliance but with a well closure. Request that the Common Council direct the City Attorney to petition the Municipal Court for a reduction of these forfeitures from \$240 to \$50. Additionally request that the Common Council direct staff and the City Attorney to develop a specific policy on this matter and present to the Council at a future date for this body's approval. So I bring forth.

Mayor Chiovatero: Motion by Alderman Harenda is their a second? Seconded by Alderman Hopkins. Is there

discussion?

Alderman Harenda: The rationale is that the fiscal impact is unknown but maybe the city attorney can offer any insight on that but... Every five years the City of New Berlin Inspection Department notifies home owners who have retained their private well after hook up to municipal water that they are required to renew their well permit. This permit has a five year cycle. The State and the City requires one safe water test every ten years, every five years and every ten years an inspection of the well to make sure there are no cross-connections between the existing well and a municipal water supply system. The permit is good for five years. The fee for the permit is \$52, which also requires the safe water test for renewal. If the well is unsafe or failing, the home owner is required to permanently abandon the well with the assistance and cost of a licensed well driller or pump installer. The last time the City went through this permit process was 2004. In 2004, there were numerous complaints from residents on this matter. It appears this has occurred in 2009 as well, and has spilled over into 2010. The main problem appears to be the initial notification of the permit renewal as action taken by the City if compliance is not met by the homeowner. A second notification prior to issuance of citations may have been helpful in most cases. The initial public notification was in the January 2009 City Leaflet. A copy of the notice is attached. On March 9, 2009, individual letters were mailed to approximately 832 homes, notifying them of the permit renewal and giving them a compliance date of July 1, 2009. They had two options: one being to collect a safe water sample and pull the renewal permits and/or close the well. A copy of the letter is attached for your reference. An additional three months were given to comply beyond that point, with 594 residents bringing their wells into compliance. On October 22, 2009, the City Attorney's office was notified and directed to issue approximately 188 citations. The citations were not mailed until January 6, 2010, since there was significant processing required as well as hand preparation of each individual citation. To date, 80 residents have abandoned their wells, 690 have been issued permits for renewal, and 62 people have yet to comply. I have received numerous complaints on the process, as well as the amount of forfeiture for late compliance. After the citations had been issued and the court dates were set, the City allowed residents to still collect a safe water sample and pull the renewal permit. If they made the decision to maintain the well, the resident was fined the citation was set at \$240. If the resident closed out the well, the resident was – the citation was set at \$50. Numerous complaints have been received by several Aldermen, the Mayors office, and staff. Many of the complaints were that residents did not receive the original letter in March of 2009. There was never a second mailed before the City issued municipal citations. To alleviate these current issues, as well as any in the future, a specific policy should be developed and approved by this body to give clear direction to Staff and the City Attorneys office. As I remember back in 2004 when this occurred it was a headache at the time and staff had worked through many of the various issues here and some of the policies were set in place by city staff and given direction to the City Attorney's office to follow through on certain things. At the end, the same issues occurred. Suggestions I have I guess with respect to the process itself is initiating some type of secondary notification possibly requiring a notarized or a certified letter going out to these people to make sure they did receive it so we have it on file that they received the initial notification and if they fail to bring the well into compliance or bring it up to date – we basically set up a specific timetable if you don't do it you got two options close the well out which there's a cost to that or basically do the safe water test and basically pull the permit and if they wait long enough then we're going to give them some options beyond that and set some type of forfeiture or additional fines if it is after the fact permits are pulled similar to what we do with other permits in the city. I have received a number of calls from residents on this and the City Attorney can talk about how they came up with this and the valid, it's valid basically with respect to coming up with the dollar amounts it's just that this is an issue that seems to pop up every five years and hopefully we can alleviate this in the future and give direction to Mark's office on what needs to be done as well as city staff because it's not something that happens every year. There are a lot of people that do hook up to municipal water systems over time and then basically if they are required to, they dispose of the well but more people are maintaining those second wells to water the lawn their flowers, whatever it may be to reduce costs. So that is my requested action, there is some request regarding the action that we understand that Mark can add to that – it's not simply that we can reduce it at this level, actually his office would have to petition the municipal court to do that because of the process because not all the money comes to the City of New Berlin I guess so that would be something his office would do at our direction.

Alderman Hopkins: I back everything that Alderman Harenda has said. I too received complaints and I – I'm not speaking for him, but I know the Mayor's office has received complaints because some of the people in my district told me that they called. They did say that they never received the first letter and I can't verify that one way or the other but I would hope that in the future that we at least send them a certified letter and in this particular case for the people who have been affected I would have that we could reduce this to \$50 from \$240.

Mayor: You understand Aldermen that it's not up to us to reduce it.

Alderman Hopkins: Yes, but we can petition the court too.

Alderman Wysocki: Just as a point of information – City Attorney apparently the Municipal Code that we are citing here doesn't have a dollar amount for the fine. Can you tell us how that fine amount is set?

Attorney Blum: Well, if you'll indulge me, I'd like to at least back up a little bit as to how we got to where we are and I think that might then help answer your question. This process has been a frustrating one for my office and I know for city staff as well and in fact the Mayor was just showing me a copy of a memo from Bob Segress from 2007 and at that time we had drafted a possible ordinance that all existing wells would have to be abandoned, but, and obviously that never went anywhere, but when this occurred in 2004 the direction that we had received was that you would either have to if you don't get the safe well test after being notified to do so that you be directed at that point to either abandon the well or you'd be facing municipal citations and we weren't given an option as far as letting people get safe water tests and being able to continue and so when this whole situation came back up again this past year, I asked that same question – Is that the same marching orders that we have moving forward? The response was "yes" and so when we received the initial calls after the citations were issued, we advised those that called that their choice was either to pay a forfeiture or they would have to abandon their well. So some people did in fact follow through with that however we got a large volume of calls, let's just put it that way. I took some, my partner Tom Schmitzer who is the prosecutor took some and a lot of people were saying that they did not receive the notification, I think a large function of that is that it was the notification by the Department of Community Development that had occurred in the prior March so there had been a significant lag time between when the notification went out and when the citations were issued. But it became clear that a lot of people were saying "look, we just didn't receive the notification of it." So we went back then to City Staff and the Mayor and talked about this and the thought was we should give people the opportunity to connect up to the well as an option to get a new permit and that would satisfy their obligation. The problem is that a large number of people were told that they had to abandon the well or face it through the citation and or conviction of the citation and so a lot of people followed through and abandoned their wells thinking that was the option because that's what they were told. So when we were faced with a situation then of allowing people to basically turn in their paperwork late, get their permit after the fact, it didn't seem fair just to go ahead and dismiss their tickets as we had done with the people that abandoned their well because the people that abandoned their well had spent over \$1,000 at least in going ahead and going through that process. So to try and make this situation somewhat fair and I fully admit that it's a difficult situation to try and make fair we came up with asking for court costs in the sum of \$240. The \$240 is just because it fit on the bond schedule, but to answer your question Alderman, there is no forfeiture or dollar amount for court costs. We dismissed the tickets, but in doing so we said if you did not abandon your well, you had to pay the \$240 in court costs otherwise you would just have your ticket dismissed if you had abandoned your well. So that's – it was an attempt on our part to try and make sure that the people who had complied with the original direction, you know, were not treated unfairly which is what we thought would happen if in fact they weren't given somewhat of a better deal in terms of the court costs in the dismissal than those that got their well tests done after the fact. So that's how we got to where we are today and now the answer to the question about process. These were all run through the municipal court, stipulations were signed and orders approved by the municipal judge agreeing to the dismissal with the payment of these court costs. What we would have to do is to go back and petition the court to reopen all of these cases and then ask the municipal judge to agree to reduce the amount of court costs and then the municipal court clerk's office, assuming the judge agreed, would have to prepare checks and send those out. Obviously in terms of the motion and the effort from my standpoint that's part of your retainer and so there is no charge to the city for me to prepare that. However, the municipal court clerk staff will have to spend time in going through each one of these and find out who it is that's involved, issuing a check and distributing that. I have no idea what their costs would be to go through that process but I'm sure it's not going to be insignificant so that's the information I can provide you at this point.

Mayor Chiovaturo: Well I just want to add to that real quick ... I came out with a memo that came out in January 2007 from Bob Segress and it was to myself and Greg Kessler and we passed this on to the City Attorney to look at. The City Attorney did draft up a memo, but the reason that Bob Segress had brought this forward is because of the last time it happened - it was kind of a mess and he had made some suggestions to make it a little more tolerable and to make people aware that they have a well and that they got to maintain it. So what had happened is that it got put into a file and because Bob Segress had left, it got forgotten about and I knew there was something out there so we found it. I looked around and I found it. So I apologize to the City Attorney that I'm just handing this to him now because he's probably got to re-review it but I'll hand it to him and he'll be looking through it. There might be some suggestions in there that help, it won't correct what happened in the last six months but it might correct the future too. So I'll let him go back and take a look at that and maybe he can make a report to council based on these suggestions or suggestions about future actions that we need to take to make sure that we don't get in a situation where these people seem to be unaware that they have a well and that they have to get these permits on a 5 year basis. According to the chapters, there's some things in here that ... "the city engineer will determine if there's a private well that even has to

be maintained," well that could be a difference of opinion based on the homeowners outlook and the city attorney's outlook. I'm sure he's not even aware of that, well see, he's shaking his head so... but these are some good suggestions, I just read them really quick when I found this and we could provide copies to everybody too - mainly so you guys can review it while the City Attorney's reviewing it.

Alderman Moore: I do understand that the fairness aspect to this is concerning to me and those that have paid the \$240 should not be the only ones that would pay the \$240 if this should be changed mid-stream. It would seem to me most logical to go along with the suggestion about certified mail or possibly more than one letter, say a second letter after a month or two and maybe even a third letter. I'm a little bit concerned that there were 188 people that did respond then all of a sudden with the second with the citation that they all of a sudden did respond which gives me to believe that maybe they just tossed the notice aside back in the spring so...

Mayor Chiovatero: Well I think what happened Alderman Moore so you kind of understand is that I don't think you had a situation like this happen in your district.

Alderman Moore: That's correct.

Mayor Chiovatero: But what happened is the first notice went out in U.S. Mail and they went to the properties so we don't know if the property owner got it or in the case of several properties, the person living at the property in the case they were being leased or rented and in that case, that person wouldn't care and may have discarded it. But the thing is, the second letter went out certified mail so that was the difference. There was a suggestion that when Alderman Harenda and I were talking about this the suggestion he had was well let's raise the fee \$5 so we make them all go out certified by mail, even the notices and that way we know, people have to sign for them that they got the notice or not, but I will tell you I've talked to several of these people, several of them I've talked to two or three times and they started to admit that they did get the letter but they didn't realize what happened, it got stuck in a pile, they forgot about it they thought it was so far off, some thought well I'll get a second notice or I'll get another reminder and they never did and so you know, it's kind of, it was very contentious - believe me because I know I've been on the other end of the phone listening to these people and I didn't have any explanation. I called the City Attorney and he gave me what I thought was a very reasonable explanation as to why he came up with the fine because don't forget if we do knock these fines down, there are people who closed their well, who maybe would have thought that well for \$50 I'll keep the well and for \$240 I might as well close it so how do you deal with those people if they would have rather kept their well and not close it.

Alderman Moore: But you've got 80 residents who have abandoned their wells because of this. We've got many people that have...

Alderman Harenda: I don't know if the 80 people were total over the last time, this could have been over a period of time. It's not 80...

Attorney Blum: The renewing of the permits, some of those were renewed before hand and some of those were renewed after the fact so then we have a breakdown of that.

Alderman Harenda: So it's really not "apples to apples."

Mayor Chiovatero: There's a couple things that transpired that kinda muddied the waters. What we'll do is I'll get a couple copies of this to everyone unless you want to copy...

Attorney Blum: Sure, I can tell you that his initial suggestion is that this be a ten year inspection cycle. This is not the end of the story, you have to have 5 years for the test but you also have to have it inspected to make sure there's no cross connections. And so that he's saying or this ordinance revision would change that out to ten years. It also has a reference to the City engineer making a determination of the need to maintain the private well and this is suggesting that it be eliminated and that the utility staff would do that, so in any event, there's I think what... And the other item here is to have the permit fee reflect the city's actual costs. Other than \$50 if it's going to cost us more money to do the inspections or to process it or to deal with the administration than the actual cost of it would be increased to make sure that the actual time being spent would be reflected. Those are the major things that are being suggested here.

Alderman Ament: It looks like we kind of have two things here we're dealing with. One is first of all to direct the City Attorney to go ahead and request - make the request to the court and then the second leg of that is between now and the next time we need to get at some way of solving this so it's not so confusing not only for the residents but even for

us and the City Attorney and staff. I have no problem with going ahead and having the City Attorney request that of the court, in fact I think it's a good idea, there's gotta be some way to resolve that but when we go forward into this... I've had several residents that told me that they called the DNR and I don't know where this is, I tried to get that information and I was not successful at it, but a couple of them told me that they talked to the DNR and the DNR does require the inspections for the cross-connections but it's only the city that requires the water test. I don't know if that's true or not other than what I was told when they contacted the DNR, but I would think as we go forward with this, we need to find that out as we come up with a policy or a way of doing this exactly what the DNR requires if we required something over and above that, you know, it may be something we want to consider timing out with that inspection for the cross-connections or maybe it's not even required – I don't know, but like I said we have two different issues here but the question I would have is what body would, in here, Alderman Harenda here it states that the Common Council direct staff and the City Attorney to develop a policy. Do we want staff and the City Attorney to do that, how are you thinking on it?

Alderman Harenda: Well, I guess the standpoint is that one, the biggest as the City Attorney pointed out is the notification process, we can do more there to notify the residents of the upcoming renewals. Second, if we have people that are going to ignore those notifications we set up a policy to either close the well out or if it's going to be a after the fact permit we set up a specific fine for that, or citation, not say citation but a fine to do that. I know from the DNR standpoint, if the well is inactive and it's not being used for a 12 month period they are supposed to close it out legally. Doing a safe water drinking test to make sure it is a potable well is kind of a given, we don't want people out there sprinkling their lawns and kids are drinking out of the hose if it's not safe drinking water there. I know staff's intention or staff's feeling would be just to close those wells out when they hook up to municipal systems but a lot of people are utilizing this as a cost saving method measure especially with the increases in the water rates and utility if they are doing something outside. Not that they are wasting water, but they look at utilizing that for sprinkling a garden or whatever effect is that. This body has control over that so we set up a policy, timetable, permit, the DNR has certain jurisdiction, but a lot of this is within our municipal boundaries what we want to see done.

Alderman Ament: Well I understand that, but one point is first of all I had my well for thirty some years and it's never been tested so I have a little problem understanding what's the difference. I'm not required to have that well tested, why they have to every 5 years and maybe that is part of it if it can be extended to ten years or eliminated, I don't know, my biggest question was though who or how do we start the process or do we want a committee to do this or are you looking at the staff to start developing something with the City Attorney and bringing it back to us? I guess that's what I was looking for. How so that it doesn't just get put on the shelf again, how do we start the process of fixing this?

Alderman Harenda: Well my suggestion is that the information that the Mayor has uncovered be passed on to Mark and have him take a look at that and have discussion with Greg Kessler's office and then bring something... I'm not looking for a complex policy, it should be pretty basic. I think keep it basic and to the point it makes it easier for Mark's office to deal with these things in the future so we don't get in these complex discussions and I'm getting calls, the mayor's getting calls Marks getting calls unless he's got suggestions...

Attorney Blum: Well I can tell you that I will not issue, if I am City Attorney four years from now, I will not issue a ticket for this until this has been brought here and you guys have vetted the process and you understand what we're going to do and you sign off on it. I can – I'll promise you that because, well, enough said.

Alderman Ament: Well that's exactly why I want to make sure that we are clear as to how we're going to start this you know and I was here during 2004 so I'll share the blame on not making sure that this was fixed before this came up again and so I want to make sure we don't do that again and if that's the route you were thinking Alderman Harenda, I think it's a good idea - just want to make sure it gets off the ground and we get going on it so it doesn't get forgotten.

Mayor Chiovarero: In this memo from Bob Segress it seems like there were some state statutes that so require wells to be tested so I'm sure the City Attorney can do some homework looking at this. So we've got two issues here – one I think we can get the City Attorney and staff to work on looking into the future but for now... Is there... Yeah there was a motion to direct the City Attorney to request if the municipal court could look at refunding. Any other discussion on that?

Alderman Moore: Some people have paid the \$240, is that correct?

Mayor Chiovarero: Correct.

Attorney Blum: And some people are still on time payments that haven't made the payment yet.

Alderman Moore: And some people have abandoned their wells because they didn't want to pay the \$240, is that correct?

Attorney Blum: Well, they abandoned their wells because they were told that that was the only choice. Either that or you pay a forfeiture and be prosecuted for that. And so did we say \$240 to them at that point in time? What we said is either you abandon it or we are going to seek a forfeiture, and the forfeiture we would seek is a per diem forfeiture running back from the date their last permit expired to the present. So it would be a lot more than \$240 that they were looking at if in fact these had gone to trial.

Alderman Moore: In any case this is sort of an after the fact motion and it seems to me to be inappropriate to deal with what's already past when what's important is to deal with the future.

Mayor Chiovatero: I think it's up to the Municipal Court to decide if they will follow through with our request or not. They can just say "no, it was fair." But I guess that's what we're talking about. Do we want to send that letter and ask the court to review this and look at it and if so he's going to have to be aware that if he does, it's going to cost his court a lot of time and energy.

Alderman Moore: And we're going to have even more people complaining.

Mayor: Well, you know as far as closing the well, I did find out through one of the people doing their homework found out that the county puts money aside every year for well closures and his suggestion was when our timetable comes up if we continue with this timetable like we are that we notify the county in advance so they can put some money aside to help residents close the well. It's not a whole lot of money, but it's something, it's better than footing the whole bill. So I thought that was a great suggestion and made notes of it but in the meantime we got this.

Alderman Moore: My suggestion is to move the whole aspect together rather than separating out and asking the municipal court for the reduction because that's past stuff that is just going to open a different barrel of worms.

Mayor Chiovatero: Any other discussion? We have a motion on the table. Seeing none, please vote.

Clerk Morgan: Motion carried with Alderman Moore opposing.

Mayor Chiovatero: Ok, with that what we'll do is - I'll get copies of this to everybody and I'll get a copy to J.P. too, I don't know if you're even aware of this from Bob Segress and we'll deal with that at another time.

DEFERRED, REFERRED & TABLED ITEMS

Direct the City Attorney to create an ordinance that authorizes the City Clerk to allow public forums to be held in the Council Chambers at City Hall as long as a city function has not been previously scheduled and which includes the provisions presented. No action this item was referred to Communications Committee 2/9/10.

No action taken. Mayor Chiovatero explained that the March Communications Meeting was cancelled at the February meeting due to scheduling conflicts.

ADJOURN

Motion by Alderman Hopkins to adjourn at 8:04p.m. Seconded by Alderman Ament and carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted:

Kari Morgan
City Clerk