CITY OF LANSING

CITY COUNCIL MEETING

Call To Order:

The regular meeting of the Lansing City Council was called to order by Mayor Mike Smith at 7:00 p.m.

Roll Call:

Mayor Mike Smith called the roll and indicated which Councilmembers were in attendance.

Councilmembers Present:

Ward 1: Gene Kirby and Dave TrinkleWard 2: Andi Pawlowski and Don StudnickaWard 3: Jesse GarveyWard 4: Gregg Buehler and Tony McNeill

Councilmembers Absent: Kerry Brungardt

OLD BUSINESS:

Approval of Minutes: Councilmember Kirby moved to approve the regular meeting minutes of June 20, 2019 as presented. Councilmember Garvey seconded the motion.

- Councilmember McNeill stated hey Sarah on the Councilmembers present, that needs corrected right.
 - o City Clerk Sarah Bodensteiner replied yeah, I saw that, I will get it amended.
 - Councilmember Kirby state what.
 - City Clerk Sarah Bodensteiner replied you guys threw me off a little.
 - Councilmember Pawlowski asked so we need them amended.
 Councilmember Buehler stated yes, approve them as amended.
 - Councilmember Pawlowski stated so unmake your motion.

Councilmember Garvey withdrew his second. Councilmember Kirby withdrew his motion.

Councilmember Pawlowski moved to approve the regular meeting minutes of June 20, 2019, as amended. Councilmember Garvey seconded the motion. The motion was approved with Councilmember Studnicka and Councilmember Buehler abstaining from the vote.

Audience Participation: Mayor Smith called for audience participation and there was none. **Presentations**

COUNCIL CONSIDERATION OF AGENDA ITEMS:

Fence Request – 690 Creekside Place: Councilmember Trinkle moved to approve the fence request for 690 Creekside Place. Councilmember McNeill seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

Final Plat – Homestead Acres: Councilmember Trinkle moved to approve the final plat for Homestead Acres. Councilmember Buehler seconded the motion.

- Councilmember Kirby stated Matt, yeah, I do.
 - Mayor Smith replied questions, go ahead Matt.
 - Councilmember Kirby said state your name, address and serial number please. I know we discussed earlier about road fees. They should or should not apply here.
 - Community and Economic Development Director Matthew Schmitz asked are you asking for my opinion or are you asking for what the regulations say.
 - Councilmember Kirby responded alright let's go with what the regulations say.
 - Community and Economic Development Director Matthew Schmitz replied yes.

- Councilmember Kirby responded ok. So, these three houses will all face Mt Calvary Road.
 - Community and Economic Development 0 Director Matthew Schmitz replied correct.
 - Councilmember Kirby asked and the remaining property.
 - Community and Economic Development 0 Director Matthew Schmitz stated the remaining ten acres will remain un-platted as it is today. They could be developed at some point in the future.
- Councilmember Pawlowski asked they could build one house on it.
- Community and Economic Development Director Matthew Schmitz stated they could.
- Councilmember Kirby asked is there going to be a need for a road to 0 go through there at some point or are we going to end up paying for a road down the road. That was by accident.
- Councilmember Trinkle stated you made a funny.
- Community and Economic Development Director Matthew Schmitz responded whether or not the road extends I think is really up to the governing body to decide what they would like to see there. The Planning Commission has reviewed it, they don't feel like there is a reason to stop the development in order to obtain a road through there. Staff, myself, Mr. Vandall, we meet with the developers when they first came in and started looking at this. Mt Calvary is a collector, this road Sycamore I believe it is that would go through there is not a collector, that's a local street. We have cul-de-sac's on local streets and dead ends. That's a normal function of planning. If it was a collector street then the answer would be unequivocally yes it needs to extend, but the future traffic or the transportation plan would show a collector street a little bit further to the south of Sycamore coming across some of that other property that hasn't been developed yet to intersect with Mt Calvary. Mt Calvary is a collector or would be developed to that standard.
- Councilmember Kirby stated well, alright. Now, I'll take your opinion. 0
- Community and Economic Development Director Matthew Schmitz replied based on my experience, perimeter street fees are generally collected when there is a subdivision going in that has public improvements in it, meaning they are going to build a street inside the subdivision and we want to make sure or a city wants to make sure that when that street is built, the streets that intersect are also improved. In this case, there is no public street being built, there is no infrastructure being installed in order to service these three homes. So that puts a question in my mind as to whether they are really necessary or not but it's not my place to decide that either.
 - Councilmember Kirby stated I'll just in general make a comment. We talk about this every 0 time. Somebody wants something waived. Are we going to do it or not going to do it. Are we going to do it for this guy or we going to do it for that guy. If we do it for this guy, we got to do it for that guy kind of a thing which I'm just, this isn't directed at you.
 - Community and Economic Development Director Matthew Schmitz replied understood.
 - Councilmember Kirby stated just a comment that I'm going to throw out there. So, I'm fine, thank you.
 - 0 Mayor Smith responded thank you Gene. Any others? Andi.
- Councilmember Pawlowski stated it appears to me. Well, first of all, when we ran the sewer line and dead ended it near Sycamore Ridge Dr, the intention of that was so that when development happened to the west, we'd be able to service it. Of course, we'd have to run the sewer that whole way to get there. When I first saw this come up, I was kind of excited because I thought we're going to have a road to get because I mean, honest to God, you can only go west in Lansing on Eisenhower or 4-H Road, there's nothing in between, well hillside but it goes back out to 4-H so it doesn't go anywhere. And then when I saw the plat I was frankly, pretty disappointed just personally.

•

But it looks like they developed three lots so they can get the most bang for their buck which is fine. I wouldn't blame them for that, but it seems to me like the city has an interest here too. So, my personal feeling is I don't like to waive fees. I'm not completely thrilled with this plat but that's not my decision by itself. So, I'm with Gene, if it's part of our code I think we need to follow it. Do you have an opinion?

- Councilmember Garvey asked so you wanted a shortcut, that's what you wanted, to get 0 through.
 - Councilmember Pawlowski replied well it's not just a shortcut, it's the only cut.
 - Councilmember Garvey responded but there's not going to be a road, any road improvements here at all to the subdivision. So, I mean, but you're going to charge a fee for something we're not going to do.
 - Councilmember Pawlowski stated well we are going to do that at 0 some point. We're going to do that road so who is going to pay for that, us. Everybody else in the city will end up paying for it.
 - Community and Economic Development Director Matthew Schmitz replied right so to clarify, the perimeter street fees that would be collected for this would be to improve Mt Calvary Road.
 - Councilmember Garvey stated ok, gotcha.
 - Community and Economic Development 0 Director Matthew Schmitz stated they would not be to put a connector in or to connect Sycamore. It would just be for the improvements for Mt Calvary.
- Mayor Smith asked Tony did you have something.
- City Attorney Greg Robinson asked we still have to pay for half.
 - Community and Economic Development Director Matthew Schmitz responded yeah so, the 0 street fees we calculated are based on half. The property owners on that side get assessed, for lack of a better term, half of the street fees.
- Mayor Smith stated Matt I think Tonv had.
 - Councilmember McNeill asked so if they go the other direction with the rest of the acreage 0 and decide to put homes on there and extend that road out, cul-de-sac or whatever you would do there, then they would pay the perimeter street fee to help put in that cul-de-sac.
 - Community and Economic Development Director Matthew Schmitz responded they would have to pay the cost to install the cul-de-sac but there wouldn't be any perimeter street fees because there aren't any perimeter streets that front the property on that side.
 - Councilmember Pawlowski replied but the way this is drawn up they could put, tell me if I am wrong, they could stick one house on that remaining acreage and not pay any fee.
 - Community and Economic Development Director Matthew Schmitz 0 responded that is correct.
 - Councilmember Garvey stated I guess when I think of the street fee, I think about if you're putting in a subdivision you're going to improve, add a bunch of traffic, a lot of excessive amount of traffic which is going to impact the street. This is three houses.
 - Councilmember Pawlowski responded that wasn't the intention of the ordinance though.
 - Councilmember Garvey stated but that is 0 what I think about.
 - Councilmember McNeill stated really the only thing I got that I don't like about it. I mean it's not my property either. For long range city

planning, this doesn't really make sense to dead end that acreage there when we have a planned road that was going to connect that road. We'd have future sewer going in there so we could service. I mean. in that ten acres, you could put how many houses if you put a road through there.

- Community and Economic Development 0 Director Matthew Schmitz responded you can figure three homes per acre on small lots.
- Councilmember McNeill replied really, you'd have a pretty large development there.
- Community and Economic Development Director Matthew Schmitz responded it just depends on how you structure it. Then you got to take the road out too.
- Councilmember McNeill stated then you have the rocks at that one \cap end, it kind of ends that development. There's nothing that's going to go through there. That's the only thing I think for a long-range planning, it doesn't make a ton of sense.
- Community and Economic Development Director Matthew Schmitz stated that's what makes this hard. You're balancing development today versus long term planning for the city.
- Councilmember McNeill asked we don't have cost for what that sewer extension but it is in the Master Plan.
 - Wastewater Utility Director Tony Zell responded I do not have cost this evening but the 0 Sewer Master Plan does show a line extending to the west up Sycamore Ridge Dr and dead heading at what would be the east property line of this fifteen acres or whatever but I don't have those costs with me this evening. And the three lots that are being built are on the fringe of the seven-mile water shed boundaries. So, there is a ridge there that breaks, where it would naturally flow to the west versus flowing to the east.
 - Community and Economic Development Director Matthew Schmitz replied it runs down the middle of the seventeen acre track roughly.
 - Councilmember Pawlowski stated Sycamore Ridge on the other side flows. Wastewater Utility Director Tony Zell replied correct, it flows to the 0 west.
- Mayor Smith asked Gregg, did you have something.
 - Councilmember Buehler asked I may have missed it, have they asked for these fees to be 0 waived or are we just, I mean, I don't see it in there but like I said maybe I missed it.
 - Joe Herring of 315 North 5th St stated Mayor and Council, yes absolutely we are asking for these fees to be waived. It wasn't brought up until the last meeting we had with the Planning Commission that these fees could possibly be considered by this Council. We were unaware at the pre-application meeting in all fairness. We did look at improving a road through there. We're coming from a chip fill or maybe asphalt ditched road going to another ditched road extends into a third ditched road. To look into feasibly to do that, and have the risk of having to put in curb, gutter, sewer and storm sewer, you're looking at upwards \$425,000 just for that fee and that doesn't include the city's portion of taking that extra guarter of a mile of sewer from Sycamore Ridge, the beginning of Sycamore Ridge and extending it west to the property. That sewer wasn't there, if that sewer manhole had been built, I probably wouldn't have this conversation with you right now because the hook up would be mandatory. But the sewer line is not built. I don't know how far it is to be built but it's just 18 acres out of the Master Plan. That's for connectivity the Comp Plan which approved Holiday Hills, Mary, Ida are all going to extend west, are going to be your main collectors to

the roads going west. So, this road is like Matt said, it is a local road to do that and is the city going to pay for that sewer, that first guarter mile.

- Councilmember Pawlowski replied yes. We pay for all the rest of them.
 - Joe Herring responded alright. So that was the question. These are all guestions that we had at the development meeting. There were a bunch of if's. When it came down to it there's some easements that define the property, all the roads out there are, you know, ditched roads, no sanitary sewer, no sewer. It doesn't stop development in any way shape or form of the city in the future. It just stops this track from being developed but it is their track. We are definitely asking to waive the fees and approve the plat as is. They've owned the property for 63 years, it's been farm ground for 63 years plus it was farm ground before that. We'd just like to sell their ground in this manner.
 - Councilmember Garvey responded thank you.
 - Joe Herring replied thank you for your time. •
- Mayor Smith asked any other questions for Matt. We have a motion to second, Sarah, on this. o City Clerk Sarah Bodensteiner responded we do.
 - Councilmember Pawlowski asked what exactly is the motion.
 - City Clerk Sarah Bodensteiner stated the motion is to approve the final plat for Homestead Acres.
 - Councilmember Pawlowski asked and how does it deal with the fees. \circ Does that deal with the fees?
 - City Administrator Tim Vandall responded that wasn't part of the motion.
 - Councilmember McNeill replied the plat, I mean the fees not included.
 - Councilmember Buehler asked so would 0 that be two separate motions then or would they have to come back and request a formal waiver for that.
 - Councilmember McNeill responded I want to say they're requesting the fee be waived.
 - City Administrator Tim Vandall stated we need that in a separate motion.
 - Councilmember Pawlowski asked so we have a motion on the table.
 - Councilmember Buehler asked so we have a motion to approve the final plat.
 - Councilmember McNeill stated let's make sure we understand with \cap the fee situation is before we vote.
 - Councilmember Kirby responded I think we should deal with that first.
 - Councilmember McNeill replied there is no fee because they're not putting a road in.
- Councilmember Buehler responded we need to put a road in. The fee is? 0 Councilmember Pawlowski replied for the underdeveloped road in the front.
 - Councilmember Buehler stated to help improve the other road, Mt Calvary Road, that is what 0 the fee will be used for.
 - Councilmember McNeill stated I mean it's going to turn right off the road kind of like DeSoto into the houses, right, a driveway. So, I mean, what are we talking about.
 - Community and Economic Development Director Matthew Schmitz responded so the fees we talked about, the perimeter street fees would be half the costs to improve Mt Calvary Road where those three homes sites, those two in a half acre tracks front Mt Calvary.

- Councilmember Pawlowski replied so the theory is you put that 0 money in a fund and when Mt Calvary is developed you have whatever figure this was that we have because isn't this the same code we've had for twenty years or fifteen years. We never change that fee. It's a per foot fee.
 - Community and Economic Development Director Matthew Schmitz responded fees haven't been updated since 2012.
 - Councilmember Pawlowski replied right, so, but it's a per foot fee and it goes into Beth's magical little box of money and it just sits there until we develop Mt Calvary Road. That's the theory behind it, we charge that.
 - 0 Councilmember McNeill asked so we charged for that development, the new one, the Willows, Maples/Willows, those three homes that face DeSoto Rd.
 - Councilmember Pawlowski responded I don't know. They put all the streets in.
 - Councilmember McNeill replied you're on 0 the Council man, come on.
 - Councilmember Pawlowski responded they put all ٠ those streets in.
 - Councilmember Buehler asked so when Domann built those three houses on DeSoto right down at the end of Holiday and there's those three houses that as you go up north towards Eisenhower, did they pay perimeter street fees for DeSoto Rd. That's what he is asking.
- Councilmember Pawlowski replied and that I don't know. That would 0 have been in the development agreement, right?
- Councilmember McNeill stated that would be a similar comparison.
- City Administrator Tim Vandall stated the statement earlier that there is some separate fund for it, if there was money put away for that it's not, it wasn't put into a separate fund. I'm not aware of any type.
- Councilmember Buehler asked there's not a perimeter street fee fund. 0
- Community and Economic Development Director Matthew Schmitz responded not that I am aware of. City Administrator Tim Vandall replied no. 0
 - Councilmember Pawlowski responded there is somewhere.
 - Mayor Smith asked ok, back to your question Tony and Gene. Should we have the fee waiver going first? Tim. How should we march with this?
 - City Administrator Tim Vandall stated we already have a motion on 0 the floor for the plat. So, I would say if there is a motion for the fee waiver that would go second.

The motion was unanimously approved.

- Mayor Smith asked ok, do we want to address that now Tim.
 - o City Administrator Tim Vandall responded it's up to the governing body.
 - Councilmember Buehler responded do we want a formal, in writing request.

Councilmember Studnicka moved to waive the perimeter street fee for Homestead Acres. Councilmember Trinkle seconded the motion.

Councilmember Pawlowski asked are we going to do that from now on. Should we just take it out of our code. Because I think we should if we're not going to, if we're never going to do it, we just need to take it out of our code.

- Councilmember Studnicka responded Matt just said they are going to pay part of that fee to improve the road in front of those three houses.
 - Councilmember Pawlowski replied no he didn't.
 - Councilmember Studnicka responded he just said it.
 - Councilmember Buehler stated that is what the fee we collect is for. Community and Economic Development Director Matthew Schmitz stated if the governing body votes to waive the fee then they would not pay anything to help improve Mt Calvary. If you vote to keep the fee in place, then they would have to pay approximately \$114,000 and some change towards improving Mt Calvary. That money would then go to, I believe, the general fund.
- Councilmember McNeill asked so for three frontages, \$30k.

0

- Community and Economic Development Director Matthew Schmitz responded so it's \cap calculated, it's 597.12 feet, that's how long those three frontages are. They're 199 and some change on each one. So that is the total length and then your fee is calculated based on that so because that is classified as a collector which would have a sidewalk on it on one side, the fee is \$114.049.92.
 - Councilmember Pawlowski asked is there a different fee if it's not a collector.
 - Community and Economic Development Director Matthew Schmitz replied yes if it was a local street with a sidewalk the fee would be \$97,330.56.
- Mayor Smith stated ok we got a motion to second, Anymore? Go ahead Andi,
 - Councilmember Pawlowksi stated I think we need to consider this. I think we need to think about this a little bit and maybe do a little investigation on historical and I think it's time we make a decision about this because I am tired of waving it. If we waive it, you know the same thing with the park fees, if we're going to keep waiving the stupid things then just take them off the books. But by the same token, we can't keep complaining about not having money to do any of the streets, if we keep waiving all the fees.
 - Councilmember McNeill responded but you could also say, where does the money go. It's like ok, we collected it from somebody somewhere but if that road isn't improved forever and we're improving other roads because those are more priority, then you're just back in the same position.
 - Councilmember Pawlowski stated we collected street fees from a guy building duplexes and told him at the meeting we would never improve the street but we were going to collect the street fees from him anyway.
 - Councilmember McNeill replied that doesn't sound right. 0
 - Councilmember Pawlowski responded well that is what we did.
 - Councilmember McNeill replied no, I'm just saying, it doesn't make sense.
 - Councilmember Buehler stated but then 0 again, I see Andi's point because at the same time, the next person says well you waived their fees so why don't you waive our fees. You waived their park fees, why don't you waive our park fees. So, then we don't get anything for the parks and we don't get anything for the streets and then we complain that we don't have money to put curbs and gutters and stuff on streets in certain areas.
 - Councilmember McNeill responded vou kind of have to look at when has that road been last improved. Is there a sidewalk on that road.

- Councilmember Buehler replied see we 0 don't know any of that stuff.
- Councilmember McNeill responded is there a • sidewalk on the collector street.
- Councilmember Pawlowksi replied it hasn't been in the city that long.
- Councilmember McNeill responded there's not. \circ
- Councilmember Buehler replied there's no sidewalk there.
- Councilmember Pawlowski stated it hasn't been a city street for that long. It was part of the annexation.
- Councilmember McNeill responded what are you talking about, it's been there since I've been 0 here. 15 years, that's quite awhile.
- City Administrator Tim Vandall stated if you guys want, staff can investigate this a little bit more since I feel like we kind of have questions from you guys about this now.
 - Councilmember Buehler stated I'm really, Tony's point I agree with, the three houses on 147th 0 going north towards Eisenhower, if those were, if we collected those streets fees from Domann and those guys when they built that.
 - Mayor Smith responded I don't believe so but we need to check.
 - City Administrator Tim Vandall replied I can look into that. If we did, it wasn't put into a separate escrow fund.
 - Mayor Smith stated I don't think it was. 0
 - Councilmember Trinkle stated I don't ever remember talking about it.
 - Councilmember Garvey stated right now they're building the houses where we do lot split out in the county on the way to Bernard Park. They're putting in three or four houses along there. They're probably not paying any fees for that county road there at all, are they. That's not in the city limits of Lansing.
 - Councilmember Pawlowski responded 0 because they are in the county.
 - City Administrator Tim Vandall replied that's not in the city limits. I don't know what their fee schedule is.
 - Councilmember Trinkle stated oh they are 0 paying for it.
 - Mayor Smith responded one way or another. Ok, we got a motion to second. Do we want to withdraw or what do you folks want to do. We can vote this one down
 - Councilmember Studnicka stated I withdraw my motion.
 - Councilmember Pawlowski stated I move we table. 0
 - Councilmember Garvey responded he has to withdraw his second first.
 - City Clerk Sarah Bodensteiner replied yeah, he needs to withdraw the second.
 - Councilmember Garvey responded withdraw your second Dave. 0
- Councilmember Trinkle stated I guess if that's what the Council wants to talk about some more. I just assumed, we're not building a subdivision. We're building three houses.

Councilmember Trinkle withdrew his second Councilmember Studnicka withdrew his motion.

Councilmember Garvey stated I guess my question to is, if they had done a lot spilt of this right, and said ok I'm going to build a house here. A year later, build a house here and a year later build a house here, we wouldn't be talking about this, would we.

- o Councilmember Pawlowski responded they can't do that.
 - Community and Economic Development Director Matthew Schmitz replied but you can only do a lot split on a property one time. Same way if, under the new Unified Development Ordinance, they would come in and do what's called an Administrative Plat. They get one shot at that for that piece of property. So, if they came in and did this under Administrative Plat, they could have done this, we wouldn't have even had this discussion. There's no public improvements. It meets the qualifiers but because this was started before the UDO was passed, it came through the whole process. Plus, I kind of had a feeling there was going to be this discussion so I wasn't willing to take that and approve it.

Councilmember Pawlowski moved to table the discussion on the perimeter street fee until further information is provided. Councilmember Buehler seconded the motion.

The motion was approved with Councilmember McNeill, Councilmember Studnicka and Councilmember Trinkle voting against the motion.

City Administrator Tim Vandall stated we'll research the questions you guys asked and bring it back. Mayor Smith stated we'll address that again.

Structure Removal Cost Share Policy Update: Councilmember Kirby moved to approve the Structure Removal Cost Share Policy. Councilmember McNeill seconded the motion.

- Councilmember Kirby stated it's been a great benefit for Ward 1.
 - Mayor Smith replied yes it has. \circ
 - Councilmember Kirby stated several new houses are going up because of this. They improve the area. The tax base is working.
 - Councilmember McNeill asked basically extending the policy, right.
 - Mayor Smith responded yes. 0
 - Councilmember Kirby stated has worked real well.
 - Councilmember McNeill stated extending the timeframe.
 - \circ City Administrator Tim Vandall stated its money already allotted for.
 - Councilmember Kirby responded Morgan Street, Eisenhower.
 - Mayor Smith stated it's worked well.

The motion was unanimously approved.

Structure Removal Cost Share Request – 124 E. Kansas Ave: Councilmember McNeill moved to approve the structure removal cost share application with the bid from Linaweaver Construction for the accessory structure located as 124 East Kansas Avenue. Councilmember Buehler seconded the motion.

- Councilmember Kirby asked looking at these pictures here. Is this a house?
 - City Inspector Becky Savidge replied no it's an accessory structure. It was a two-car garage.
 - Councilmember Studnicka stated it's by the Activity Center isn't it.
 - Councilmember McNeill responded it's in the big, you get a better picture in that big packet they had.
 - Councilmember Pawlowski asked that's the one that the house was \circ a repo.
 - City Inspector Becky Savidge replied no. It's right next to it.
 - Councilmember Kirby asked but there is a house on it.
 - City Inspector Becky Savidge responded 0 yes, and the property owner is here.

- Councilmember Kirby asked so what they are asking for is to do a separate structure other than the actual living guarters.
- City Inspector Becky Savidge replied 0 correct.
- Councilmember Pawlowski asked and that's okay with our policy.
- City Inspector Becky Savidge stated yes.
- Councilmember Kirby replied I'm good.
- Mayor Smith responded I'm good with it.

The motion was unanimously approved.

Executive Session - Acquisition of Real Estate: Councilmember Buehler moved to recess into executive session to discuss land acquisition pursuant to the acquisition of real estate exception K.S.A. 75-4319(b)(6) for 15 minutes, beginning at 7:28 p.m. and returning to the Council Chambers at 7:43 p.m. Councilmember Pawlowski seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

Councilmember Kirby moved to return to open session at 7:43 p.m. Councilmember Trinkle seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

REPORTS:

Department Heads: Department Heads had nothing to report.

City Attorney: City Attorney had nothing to report.

City Engineer: City Engineer Matt Harding wished everyone a Happy 4th of July.

City Administrator: City Administrator Tim Vandall had nothing to report.

Governing Body: Councilmember Pawlowski, Councilmember Garvey, Councilmember McNeill,

Councilmember Trinkle and Councilmember Kirby wished everyone a Happy 4th of July.

Councilmember Buehler commented a great job was done on the fireworks and provided a fun fact, on this day in 1964 Lyndon B Johnson signed the Civil Rights Act.

Councilmember Studnicka asked why the fireworks started at 10:30pm.

- Councilmember Garvey commented technical difficulties.
 - Community & Economic Development Director Matthew Schmitz stated it was suppose to start at 10:00pm. The show was completely computer controlled. 10% was not accepted by the computer so it was delayed 20 minutes to ensure we wouldn't lose that 10% of the show.
 - Councilmember Studnicka suggested in the future we plan to start around 9:30pm. He has gotten a lot of calls about it starting so late and also noticed several families with small children left early because it started so late and didn't get to see the show.

Councilmember Studnicka asked the show was still 30 minutes like normal but we were suppose to get extra because the fireworks at Lansing Daze was cancelled.

- Community & Economic Development Director Matthew Schmitz replied there was extra included that wouldn't have been there without the money from Lansing Daze.
 - Councilmember Trinkle stated same length just more stuff. 0
 - Councilmember Studnicka stated he was not pleased with the show. He thought we had put on better shows in the past compared to this year.
 - Councilmember Garvey replied they did post of Facebook on why the show was late. They did a good job informing people why it was late.
 - Councilmember McNeill responded even scheduling it for 10:00pm is 0 late. People bring the kids at 5 and they ride the rides, play games, they are tired and then they wait and wait for the fireworks. As soon as it gets dark, we should start shooting them off.
 - Mayor Smith stated he knows Matt had no control over the computer and he noticed there were some new things added

into the show. Next year the Friday before will be July 3rd so maybe not as many complaints.

- Councilmember Kirby asked if the issue with the • fireworks was announced at the show.
 - Community & Economic Development 0 Director Matthew Schmitz stated it was announced by the DJ that there would be a 15-20 minute delay.
 - Councilmember Kirby stated good . because he did see a number of people leave but he also read it was a great show so he just wanted to make sure it was announced.
 - Mayor Smith commented things happen. 0
- Community & Economic Development Director Matthew Schmitz responded he does want feedback so they can improve for next year.

Councilmember Trinkle also provided a fun fact, the total weight of bacteria living in the human body is 4.4lbs.

ADJOURNMENT:

Councilmember Kirby moved to adjourn. Councilmember Pawlowski seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved. The meeting was adjourned at 7:49 p.m.

ATTEST:

Michael W. Smith, Mayor

Sarah Bodensteiner, City Clerk