



# City of Jonesboro

Municipal Center  
300 S. Church Street  
Jonesboro, AR 72401

## Meeting Minutes Public Works Council Committee

---

Thursday, November 8, 2018

5:00 PM

Municipal Center

---

### 1. Call To Order

### 2. Roll Call by City Clerk Donna Jackson

**Present** 6 - Mitch Johnson; John Street; Chris Moore; Charles Coleman; LJ Bryant and Ann Williams

**Absent** 1 - Gene Vance

### 3. Approval of minutes

[MIN-18:098](#)

Minutes for the Public Works Committee meeting on October 2, 2018

Attachments: [Minutes](#)

**A motion was made by Councilperson Chris Moore, seconded by Councilperson Mitch Johnson, that this matter be Passed . The motion PASSED with the following vote.**

**Aye:** 5 - Mitch Johnson; Chris Moore; Charles Coleman; LJ Bryant and Ann Williams

**Absent:** 1 - Gene Vance

### 4. New Business

#### ORDINANCES TO BE INTRODUCED

*Chairman John Street said I am not going to read these in full because if I do we will be here for an hour and a half going through these so I hope you actually read them. I will abbreviate them to some extent. If there are questions, we can resolve those.*

[ORD-18:070](#)

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND CHAPTER 50 OF THE JONESBORO ORDINANCES TO ESTABLISH STANDARDS FOR THE JONESBORO DOG PARK

*Chairman John Street asked Animal Control Director Larry Rogers if he wanted to comment on the dog park. Chairman John Street also asked if Parks Director Danny Kapales was there to speak. Councilmember Chris Moore said hearing no discussion, on behalf of the Mayor's Office, I will make a motion to recommend to the full council since he was the sponsor. Councilmember Dr. Charles Coleman seconded the motion. All voted aye.*

**A motion was made by Councilperson Chris Moore, seconded by Councilperson Charles Coleman, that this matter be Recommended to Council . The motion PASSED with the following vote.**

**Aye:** 5 - Mitch Johnson;Chris Moore;Charles Coleman;LJ Bryant and Ann Williams

**Absent:** 1 - Gene Vance

[ORD-18:072](#)

AN ORDINANCE TO ESTABLISH STANDARDS FOR SMALL WIRELESS FACILITIES TO BE PLACED IN CITY RIGHTS-OF-WAY IN THE CITY OF JONESBORO

*Chairman John Street said this is fairly extensive if you read it. I think this is relative to 5G. Is it not? Ms. Cline, do you want to step forward and say anything? City Attorney Carol Duncan said I can tell you we worked on this extensively with both Engineering, Planning, Finance, IT, CWL. Everybody has looked at it extensively and have based it on ordinances that we found and liked from a variety of other cities from the state that have done similar ordinances. I don't know. We probably worked on it for six or eight months. So, I don't know if there are any questions on it. If you want to speak on it, go ahead.*

*Councilmember Chris Moore said he had one question before we vote. Was there an estimation on how many of those were going to be constructed because it was my understanding that they had to be constructed on a quarter mile grid pattern and that was going to end up being more than 1,000 of those in the city limits. Chairman Street said, Ms. Cline, you might have a number for that. I am not aware.*

*Ms. Rhonda Cline, Director of External and Legislative Affairs for AT&T, said, what is your question again? Councilmember Moore said what is the total number that you are estimating of construction of the small cell. Ms. Cline said I don't know that I have that right now. I can get it. Councilmember Moore said that your industry says that they have to be located on a quarter mile grid pattern. Is that correct? Ms. Cline said right. I have got some more information here that I can pass out to you guys that would make it more informational to you. We are willing to talk to our attorney and make any changes that we need to do. Councilmember Moore said my curiosity goes to the fact that based on the calculations from your industry, there may be as many as 1,500 of those, between 750-1,500 of those, constructed in the city limits. Ms. Cline said yes. Councilmember Moore said ok. Is that your understanding also? Ms. Cline said she was having a hard time hearing the question. Councilmember Moore said, is it your understanding that there might be well over 1,000 of those cell phone towers constructed in the city limits on the right-of-way. Ms. Cline said yes. Councilmember Moore said that was the only question he needed answered.*

*Chief of Staff Bill Reznicek said Chris to answer your question, the only thing I will add to that is to keep in mind that this ordinance was written for all cell providers, not just AT&T. Councilmember Moore said sure. Mr. Reznicek said there is no co-location typically with their installations. When I did the research, and as Carol has said, we have done a lot of research on this going all the way back to the early spring. One example that I pulled up, now given that we don't have the population density that Boston has, but we have the same equivalent square mileage, or approximately the same. In Boston alone, Verizon had, at that time in the spring, over 7,000 installations of their small cell antenna. Again, if you start to multiply that by the number of potential providers that you would have, obviously, Jonesboro is not going to have the densification that Boston does, but it is still going to have what this technology requires which is densification of the towers and the units as opposed to the current 4G technology. So, it something to keep in mind when looking at this ordinance. And, that was part of the reason that one of the things that we really drove home in this is the stealth technology that these units had to be aesthetically pleasing if these were going to be located throughout our city. Councilmember Moore said that is my understanding. The Municipal League had an excellent article that covered this exact*

subject and it provided that data from the technology, AT&T, Verizon, and basically, gave you a guideline on how many of those. And, one of their warnings were to make sure you have a comprehensive ordinance that covers the actual visual appeal of it because you are going to have a lot of them. That was my only question. I wanted to make sure we were talking about the same thing.

Councilmember LJ Bryant said I have a question for Mr. Reznicek. I was looking at that \$270 annual fee. So, to Councilmember Moore's point, if AT&T had 1,000 of these, hypothetically, they would pay 1,000 times 270. Mr. Reznicek said if they were in the right-of-way, annually, they would pay that. That is correct. In the initial application fee, you can have up to five per application. Applications are \$500. If you assume that they have saturated each application with five, then it is \$100 per unit. So, there is revenue to be seen on the part of the city as a result of the installation of these, but then there is also the ongoing maintenance of these facilities, mowing and things like that. So, we have to be aware that they will add some additional infrastructure in some form or fashion that will be required to some extent to have to work around maintaining the mowing and the weed eating and that type of thing. Councilmember Bryant asked if there was any restriction on how we spend the funds or will it just go into general. Mr. Reznicek said it would go under the general fund.

Councilmember Moore said that according to the Municipal League article, it looks like probably the number will be somewhere between 3,000-4,000. There will be 750-1,500 to start with and 3,000-4,000 eventually. It is line of sight and a short distance. They will come in and put in an initial grid in and then tweak it from there. Chairman Street said some National League of Cities have had articles out on that too. Some cities are opposing it or fighting it and they are arguing the cost of it and what they should be able to charge. I think some of it is still in litigation, but they basically indicated there is no way that you are not going to do it. The FCC has already ruled that yes, they can do it. I think they have some court cases establishing that. Ms. Duncan said they have. Councilmember Moore said, regulation was, I think, the key to that article in the Municipal League. I think and I am just going to paraphrase it, but I think having them on the public right-of-way so that the city could have control of them as opposed to having them on private property and then some standards on how they look. Obviously, if you have 4,000 of something in the city 20 feet high, there are going to be a lot of them and we are all going to look at them. We will have plenty of time to review the standards.

**A motion was made by Councilperson Mitch Johnson, seconded by Councilperson Ann Williams, that this matter be Recommended to Council . The motion PASSED with the following vote.**

**Aye:** 5 - Mitch Johnson;Chris Moore;Charles Coleman;LJ Bryant and Ann Williams

**Absent:** 1 - Gene Vance

[ORD-18:073](#)

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE MEMBERSHIP OF THE STORMWATER MANAGEMENT BOARD AS CREATED BY ORDINANCE 07:50

**A motion was made by Councilperson Charles Coleman, seconded by Councilperson LJ Bryant, that this matter be Recommended to Council . The motion PASSED with the following vote.**

**Aye:** 5 - Mitch Johnson;Chris Moore;Charles Coleman;LJ Bryant and Ann Williams

**Absent:** 1 - Gene Vance

**RESOLUTIONS TO BE INTRODUCED**

[RES-18:170](#) A RESOLUTION TO EXECUTE A TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICE AGREEMENT TO MAINTAIN A CONTROL DEVICE

**Attachments:**     [Traffic Control Device Agreement](#)

*Chairman John Street said that this is basically a traffic control signal at Cain and Nettleton. I am sure that is for the construction down there. Do you want to address that Mark? Mark Nichols, City Engineer, said that this is part of the Highway 18 overpass project. When traffic is routed around to Cain Street during the detour and the final construction, this intersection is going to be a lot more busy with more traffic than there is now.*

*Councilmember Dr. Charles Coleman said I need to ask you about 141 North across from Parker Park. The crosswalk there, would that be the same type of device that could be put there? Mr. Nichols said this is a full traffic signal at Cain and Nettleton. So, this is the agreement to maintain that indefinitely. But, we can look at that crosswalk. Councilmember Coleman said I wish you would. I was there the other evening and the cars going on 141 at that crosswalk across from Parker Park, several people almost got hit. I know it wasn't on the agenda and I apologize for bringing that in, but I think that needs to be looked at so people can safely cross.*

**A motion was made by Councilperson Chris Moore, seconded by Councilperson Ann Williams, that this matter be Recommended to Council . The motion PASSED with the following vote.**

**Aye:** 5 - Mitch Johnson;Chris Moore;Charles Coleman;LJ Bryant and Ann Williams

**Absent:** 1 - Gene Vance

[RES-18:172](#) A RESOLUTION TO THE CITY OF JONESBORO, ARKANSAS TO ENTER INTO A MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING WITH ARKANSAS NATURAL RESOURCES COMMISSION (ARNC)

*City Engineering Director Craig Light said this is the grant that we received for our five severe repetitive loss structures. It is a 100% grant to buy out these structures. This is the memorandum of understanding that basically says that we are going to own the property in perpetuity and that we are not going to allow anything to be built upon the properties. We are going to own them and maintain them forever once the houses are down.*

**A motion was made by Councilperson Mitch Johnson, seconded by Councilperson Ann Williams, that this matter be Recommended to Council . The motion PASSED with the following vote.**

**Aye:** 5 - Mitch Johnson;Chris Moore;Charles Coleman;LJ Bryant and Ann Williams

**Absent:** 1 - Gene Vance

[RES-18:176](#) A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF JONESBORO, ARKANSAS TO ENTER INTO AN AGREEMENT WITH CIVIL ENGINEERING ASSOCIATES, LLC TO PROVIDE ENGINEERING AND CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT SERVICES FOR THE CROWLEY'S RIDGE PARKWAY: CRAIGHEAD FOREST PARK TRAIL - PHASE III, ARDOT JOB NO. 100919

**Attachments:** [Phase III Proposal.pdf](#)

Chairman John Street said that RES-18:176 has been requested to be tabled indefinitely.

**A motion was made by Councilperson Mitch Johnson, seconded by Councilperson Chris Moore, that this matter be Postponed Indefinitely . The motion PASSED with the following vote.**

**Aye:** 5 - Mitch Johnson;Chris Moore;Charles Coleman;LJ Bryant and Ann Williams

**Absent:** 1 - Gene Vance

## **5. Pending Items**

### [ORD-18:060](#)

AN ORDINANCE TO PROVIDE FOR TRANSPARENCY AND ACCOUNTABILITY IN THE SELECTION OF PROFESSIONAL ARCHITECTS, ENGINEERS, AND SURVEYORS AND AWARDING OF CONTRACTS FOR CITY OF JONESBORO PROJECTS AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES.

Chairman John Street said ORD-18:060 was one that we had considered before and had some concern. I believe Councilmember Gene Vance had a question about the amount on the initial part and Councilmember Chris Moore had questions about specifying that the applicants be interviewed by Public Works. Is this necessary to read this or have you read this Councilmember Moore, the revised edition? Councilmember Moore said I have read it, but you will be speaking to the public. Chairman Street said, I will go ahead and read it.

Councilmember Moore said he would like some clarification on Section 6 about the amounts of \$5,000 to \$20,000. Is that for professional services or for the total cost of the project? Dennis Zolper, 603 S. Madison, said, I think we have been using the cost of the professional services. Councilmember Moore asked, in Section 5 and Section 6? Mr. Zolper said in Section 5 and Section 6. Councilmember Moore asked, that would be the cost of the professional services, not the construction costs? Mr. Zolper said not the whole construction cost. I think that professional services sometimes are based upon the construction cost, but the way this has been laid out, it is for the professional services or the fee for the professional. Councilmember Moore said the reason, counselor, that was relevant was because, and Mike can probably clarify, in Arkansas, what is the threshold for having to hire an engineer on a public project. Isn't it \$25,000 and that is mandatory? Mr. Zolper said, I do not know the answer to that question. Mike Cameron, 1612 Leaf Cove, said I think so. It is just general procurement laws in the state of Arkansas dictate that. Councilmember Moore said I think that is and maybe Craig or somebody can clarify that. Mr. Zolper stated that Craig said \$25,000. Councilmember Moore said, so, all projects where the construction costs are \$25,000 or more have to have a professional engineer already. Mr. Zolper said ok. Councilmember Moore said ok.

Chairman Street asked if there were any other questions of Mr. Zolper by anyone. Does anyone else have any comments? City Engineering Director Craig Light asked, why are we restricting what state law already allows us to do? Section 8 starts at \$20,001 and state law allows us to use our annual statement of qualifications up to a \$2,000,000 project. Assuming a 7% engineering fee, that would be a \$140,000 contract that we could use our annual statement of qualifications, short list those, and solicit three proposals rather than just an unlimited number of proposals for the city council committee to review. You would be reviewing three proposals, not fifteen. You

are creating a lot of work for yourselves with this ordinance by setting such a low threshold on the \$5,000-\$20,001. I think you would be better served using the \$5,000-\$100,000 so you are not having to review so many proposals. On the Section 8 portion of it, state law allows you to do letters of interest and not get full-blown proposals. You get letters of interest, you rank those, and then you solicit proposals from the top three. Again, you are only going to be reviewing three proposals rather than anybody who submits a proposal. I would recommend that you consider changing this proposed ordinance to include that type of language or you are about to have a lot of work to do in a 30 minute Public Works Committee meeting. Chairman Street said that is why it would be a special called meeting so we would have the time. You can't do that in 30 minutes. Mr. Light said no, you're not and you are going to end up getting large booklets that are going to be hundreds of pages long from several consultants and then you are going to have to go through and read them and rank them and discuss them. You are looking at quite a bit of work that you are signing up for by passing this ordinance. Chairman Street asked, are you saying once we get them, look at them, and limit them to three? Mr. Light said I would recommend that you do a letter of interest based on the firm size, the capabilities, their experiences. And, then, from the top three, solicit proposals from just the top three and read those proposals. This getting an unlimited number of proposals from anybody who wants to submit, you are going to end up having a stack of work to do. Chairman Street said we can take that under advisement. We will have three readings if it gets to council so there is plenty of room to and time to consider that issue.

Councilmember Moore said, not being an engineer, I think Craig might be, I mean I don't know what the up or down side of that, but I understand Craig's logic on the letters of interest. Instead of having full blown proposals from 20 or 30 engineering companies, a letter of interest and then we narrow those down to three and solicit proposals and then we rank those. I would think sometimes, obviously, it is going to be read on three readings at the full council so I would think we probably ought to consider that. Chairman Street said I agree with that. I don't recall when we did the detention ponds before ever going over three before. So, we would probably get someone out of those three. That does tend to make a little more sense. We can look at that again. It is going to be six weeks in going through the council process. Councilmember Moore asked Mr. Light, on the letters of interest, does the city set what information that they ask for in the letter of interest? How does that work on that? Mr. Light said yes. We can put in there exactly what we want submitted as a letter of interest. We have a standard advertisement. Councilmember Moore said, in other words, the items that are in this ordinance, some of those could be included in the letter of interest as far as firm size or whatever. Mr. Light said yes. Those are included. In the letter of interest, I think there are four specific items that we have ranked on historically. In the proposal, there is a separate list for additional items that we rank them on. So, you are not ranking the same things twice.

Councilmember Dr. Charles Coleman asked, would those letters of interest be from state information or just from city information? Mr. Light said there are specific questions that the state requires you to look at as you rank the proposals and letters of interest. I think the questions or the statements that are in there would cover all of that. We could modify our advertisements to make sure we include what language the council wants to see. That is not a problem. Councilmember Coleman said, but if you modify them, would you be consulting other engineers around the community or would this just be with the state or would the city council be looking at it? Mr. Light said it would be what the city council wants to see in the proposals as long as we cover what the state law requires of us, we can ask for whatever else we want.

Councilmember Moore said, so those four requirements are just basically a minimum. The council could decide to add any number of items. Mr. Light said and weigh them however the council wants to weigh them. City Attorney Carol Duncan said the only thing that I will suggest is if there are things such as that that you want to change or work out that you do that in committee as opposed to doing that in first, second, and third readings at the council. I think we get ahead of ourselves and say, oh, we have still got six more weeks that we can work on this at council and make all of these changes when really, that is what I think the committee process is for. The committee process is to work out all of the things that we want to change and make sure the committee has it the way they want it to pass before it goes to council. Councilman Coleman said that is the question I was asking. Ms. Duncan said, I don't think you wait and do the first reading at council and then say well, let's change this and let's move that. That is when we get really confused and the public gets really confused and people don't know what city council is voting on. So, my recommendation is that if there is work to be done on the ordinance and it sounds like there is or possible changes, you all discuss that in committee, make motions or ask for things to be brought back, and we bring it back in a clean format for the next time and vote on it in a clean format in the way that you want it to pass before it goes to first reading at council. I just think that the whole purpose of having committees is for the committees to work out all of the kinks before the council is voting on the final ordinance. We have gotten away from that, not just on this ordinance. We have gotten away from that on other ordinances too where we say, oh well, we can work that out later or oh well, we have got six more weeks to hear about that. Not just on this one. I am not just picking on this one, but I think as a general rule, we have done that with our committee process. The committee is supposed to work out the kinks and then present a more finalized product to the council. That is my two cents. I know that most people sitting here that read these all of the time know OCP to the SOQ to the OCP to the PSP to the LMNOP, but even to me who knows what most of those mean, it got confusing after awhile. I read them out loud in my office and compared the two things. Chairman Street said it is. Ms. Duncan said, I literally felt like I was reading a property description at times. I think it may make it longer, but, maybe, we just need to spell out some of those words so it is not so confusing. I think the general public gets lost in this.

Chairman Street said, well this is a committee meeting and we are talking about it so we might as well go ahead and address a couple of these things and not drag it out. Ms. Duncan said that is what I suggest. Chairman Street said, so let's narrow this down a little bit. What does the committee think about narrowing it down to the top three firms instead of an unlimited amount? Mike Cameron, Associated Engineering, said, letters of interest will vary depending upon what the client puts out. What it ends up being is that a letter of interest can include everything or can include not as much as an RFP and that is a Request for Proposal. There are only four and they are all defined. Ms. Duncan said I know they are, but it's just when you start running them all together, it gets confusing for people. I saw people in the audience, their eyes glaze over and smiles come on their faces when he was reading that because of all of the initials. I know what they mean. You know what they mean, but not everybody does. Mr. Cameron asked, did all of them get defined though? Ms. Duncan said, I didn't say they weren't defined. I said it gets confusing as you read it. Mr. Cameron said, oh, ok, well I am sorry. The letter of interest is not a well defined method of advertising for services. A letter of interest will end up, in order for it to be effective at all, to respond to the letter of interest, you need to respond with an SOQ or an RFP or even an RFQ, that is a new one, sorry. You need to respond with a statement of qualifications. Ms. Duncan said it is a request for qualifications. Mr. Cameron said, or a request for qualifications. So, you end up with it being ill defined when you say a letter of interest.

*It is not really defined in the way that these other things are. Now, you read through the first parts of any request for qualifications or statement of qualifications, you will see the letter of interest as the first two or three pages. It is not sufficient for you to make any kind of decision on it at all. So, those terms and those documents that have been asked for there are standard to industry. All of those folks that are going to be proposing of interest in it know what those terms are. It is standard.*

*Councilmember Coleman said, well, Mike, that is why I asked that question about once that is brought before, even before the council, that there is a committee that has already screened those and looked at those. The letter of interest needs to have more information as far as I am concerned, it needs to have more information in it. Mr. Cameron said the letter of interest would be a part of any of those things that Ms. Duncan says. A letter of interest is a response via a letter of interest. It's scope can get as big or as large and it is very hard for a person doing proposing to know exactly what you want unless you go with what is in the ordinance. Councilmember Coleman said, I would like to address one issue that the city engineer said. I really think it is our job to read this information regardless of how many proposals come before us. I mean that is just my personal opinion. Instead of reading a short version of something that I wouldn't know a whole lot about and I am sure the public wouldn't know anything about. Mr. Cameron said when anyone in February, when people in the business we are in and those from Chicago that propose or turn in a statement of qualifications, you will have a dozen, and that will tell you everything about the company and it is for no particular project. So, if you take the time in February and sit down and read the statement of qualifications of the firms that are interested in doing work in Jonesboro, you don't have to re-read them every time. Councilmember Coleman said right. Mr. Cameron said, if Company A gives you an SOQ and Company A wants to do a project for you, they will do it as Craig defines the project that he wants a proposal on. Then, you take all of the statements of qualifications and then tell how you are going to do that particular project. You don't have to read everything about the company every time. So, it is not going to be that burdensome. Councilmember Coleman said, I didn't think so either, but that is just my opinion.*

*Craig Light said he had one more statement based on Mike Cameron's comments. A letter of interest, you do receive an updated statement of qualifications from the consultants. That is one of the things that is asked for. So, you will get a different list of potential consultants when you advertise for letters of interest. The package that you get requests a statement of qualifications. So, you are getting a statement of qualifications with the letter of interest. I don't want that confusion created with you. But, when you advertise for letters of interest, you are getting statement of qualifications from the firms. That is what you are getting. You are getting a cover letter saying we are interested in the project. Here is our statement of qualifications. Then, you review those. What I am saying is that for a project with about up to \$140,000 fee, you already have a stack of qualifications that you got on February 1st. You can short list off of that and skip that whole six-week process and go ahead and solicit proposals from the top three firms and then review those proposals. That is the reason you would go from a \$5,000 project up to \$100,000 or \$125,000 project. It is going to save you weeks on getting a project started. Now, with a project over whatever that threshold is of \$100,000 or \$125,000, you will go ahead and advertise, get a new stack of statement of qualifications from everybody and a letter of interest saying I am interested in this project. It is a rail project. I know about rails. Here is my statement of qualifications. It gives the consultants an opportunity to tailor their statement of qualifications to this specific job. So, you will get those in, review those, short list those statement of qualifications, and submit solicitation of three proposals from the top three ranked firms. That is basically the procedures we have been following for*



years. Council would like more involvement in it. That is great. But, don't create more work for administration or for yourselves. I don't think you realize how much effort you are going to have to put into this. We have a lot of projects that we do every year that you will have to go through this process on. You need to keep it as streamlined as possible.

Chairman Street asked, what is the pleasure of the committee or do you have further questions? Councilmember LJ Bryant said I have a question for Craig. I was a little confused with the last statements. Are the folks that submit in February the only people who can submit for projects throughout the year or if we advertise some additional people that didn't submit in February can still submit? Mr. Light said, right now, the ones that submit in January/February now are the ones that we review for projects up to the \$2,000,000 threshold. After \$2,000,000 construction threshold, we advertise for specific projects, statement of qualifications, letters of interest, and then we short rank those and ask for proposals from the top three ranked firms. Administration is the one who has been doing the rankings. If council wants to participate in the rankings process, that is great. But, the procedures we shouldn't change. It is consistent with state law. We are creating a lot more work for ourselves and for the consultants.

Chairman Street said, are there any more questions for Craig or anyone? We have a motion and a second, what is the pleasure of the committee? Councilmember Moore said, so let me clarify the two things that Craig asked to be changed were to change received letters of interest and then rank three and he wanted Section 6 changed from \$5,000 to \$20,000 to \$5,000 to \$100,000. How many jobs fall into that category, in the \$5,000-\$20,000 range that we are talking about or \$5,000-\$20,000 on a yearly basis for engineering services? Mr. Light said from the \$5,000-\$20,000, I would have to go back and see. We did a tally on it. I don't recall the numbers. Fourteen, last year, I think is what we did. That may have been over \$20,000 that we did last year. Councilmember Moore asked, how many would fall in the \$5,000-\$100,000 range? Give me some kind of comparison of what the number difference you are asking. Mr. Light said I don't know those numbers. I can pull last year's records, this year's records. Of course this year's records, we have kind of have been sitting still for the last four months, five months not awarding any professional services. So, the numbers will be down, but we can go back for the last several years and get those numbers for you. Then, you would know exactly what they were. Councilmember Moore said I think we would want those numbers before final votes at the council. So, we would have an idea of how many projects we are talking about in the \$5,000-\$20,000 range and how many we are talking about in the \$5,000-\$100,000 range. Mr. Light said it is going to vary from year to year based on what is budgeted for the following year. Councilmember Moore said ok. With those being the only two bones of contention, do we have a motion and a second? Chairman Street said we do. Councilmember Moore said I would call for the vote and have Craig provide the information in that range of however many we are talking about because I think that will be a pretty simple discussion at the council on are we talking about five jobs or are we talking about 500 jobs? Chairman Street said I concur. Craig, if you provide us with that, we will definitely take that under advisement. Ms. Duncan asked if they could go through and remove initials and spell out the words. Chairman Street said that is fine.

**A motion was made by Councilperson John Street, seconded by Councilperson Charles Coleman, that this matter be Recommended to Council . The motion PASSED with the following vote.**

**Aye:** 5 - Mitch Johnson;Chris Moore;Charles Coleman;LJ Bryant and Ann Williams

**Absent:** 1 - Gene Vance

**6. Other Business**

**7. Public Comments**

**8. Adjournment**

**A motion was made by Councilperson Mitch Johnson, seconded by Councilperson Ann Williams, that this meeting be Adjourned . The motion PASSED with the following vote.**

**Aye:** 5 - Mitch Johnson;Chris Moore;Charles Coleman;LJ Bryant and Ann Williams

**Absent:** 1 - Gene Vance