

City Council Chambers \Diamond 524 West Stephenson Street \Diamond Freeport, IL 61032

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE REPORT SPECIAL MEETING Monday, June 15, 2015

1. CALL TO ORDER

The special meeting of the Freeport, Illinois, Committee of the Whole was called to order by Mayor James Gitz with a quorum being present at 5:00 p.m. on Monday, June 15, 2015, in council chambers.

2. ROLL CALL

Present on roll call: Mayor James Gitz and council members Tom Klemm, Peter McClanathan, Art Ross, Jodi Miller, Patrick Busker, Sally Brashaw, Mike Koester, and Andrew Chesney (8).

City Staff Present: Corporation Counsel Sarah Griffin, City Clerk Meg Zuravel, Finance Director Cynthia Haggard, City Engineer Shaun Gallagher, Public Works Director Tom Dole, Fire Chief Scott Miller, Chief of Police Todd Barkalow and Water & Sewer Executive Director Tom Glendenning.

Note for the record; this special meeting of the Committee of the Whole was televised live on Comcast Cable for public viewing.

3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Alderperson Busker, chairperson of meeting.

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS – AGENDA ITEMS

Signed on the sheet for public comments on agenda items was the following:

Jon Staben, 1070 Canyon Drive, Freeport, Illinois, spoke in regard to budget items. He stated he is a member of the Airport Commission and he provided a progress report on the replacement the Albertus Airport maintenance hangar and the allocation of funds needed to complete this project. He encouraged council members to attend the Airport Commission meetings.

Steve Carroll was signed on the sheet and stated his public comments were on non-agenda items so he will speak at the end of the meeting.

5. NORTHWEST ILLINOIS DEVELOPMENT ALLIANCE (NIDA) AGREEMENT AS PRESENTED BY MAYOR GITZ

Mayor Gitz presented the draft agreement with Northwest Illinois Development Alliance (NIDA) and explained this agreement has been approved in concept by the NIDA board after much thought and consideration on both parties. He explained there has been a great deal of dialogue on the goals of NIDA and bringing them together with the City's goals. They will be paid \$100,000 per year (which is the previous commitment) and this will primarily paid out of the tax increment financing funds from various TIF districts. He stated that if this is properly structured between those different TIF districts

that it would include development of the intersection of Rt. 26 and 20 because NIDA receives other funds that they can basically put back into the hopper for the retail consultant. He stated the City has been asked to not only approve the one year contract but pursuant to the agreement as written a two year contract with an option to renew. Mayor Gitz stated he recently received questions from a couple of council members and he chose to answer them for the benefit for everyone on the floor of the Committee of the Whole. He explained why the City choses to fund NIDA and his issues with NIDA in the last couple of years. He stated NIDA has drawn closer to the agenda for the City. The NIDA Board did a survey late last year to their members and the survey results came back almost verbatim as to what the City felt were important priorities. Those included business retention, attention to existing businesses both City and NIDA members, development of retail, and a multi-faceted approach to manpower development. He stated he thinks the issues that have separated us in the past have been resolved. The second issue goes to the investment of the members and he explained that other public bodies have been asked to become members of NIDA. As a public-private partnership there is more than the City that should be giving financial support. He spoke about the importance of economic development and job retention. He explained the contract in that it involves NIDA with the City in retail development and including support of a retail consultant. Mayor Gitz stated this document does not list the 20 pages of goals but instead lists them simply and general. The conciseness is an asset, not detraction. He stated NIDA was instrumental with the behind the scenes work on the cannabis production plant at Mill Race Crossing and they did so without any financial support from the County. They are involved with the City in soliciting a call center. They are involved in the redevelopment of the Farm and Fleet property and another senior center apartment complex on the West end of town.

Mayor Gitz stated this draft agreement is on the Committee of the Whole so we can have an informal discussion about it and it is also placed on the council agenda for later this evening only if there is consensus to move forward with the contract at this time.

Alderperson Klemm provided his comments as the council representative on the NIDA board. He stated he has seen a lot in his tenure as a board member for the last nine years and the relationship is the best it has been, that NIDA is organized, knows where it is going, and is set up with committees within three to four different areas of expertise. They are working to find shovel ready land for development. He spoke about improvements that have been made to the NIDA website to market the local communities and property that is available. He spoke about the agreement and felt that this is a document that works for both entities which is not as time consuming on the part of NIDA to account for time reporting. He explained how he thought billing through the TIF's and use of a retail consultant would be an advantage to both parties.

Mayor Gitz explained that the cost for the retail consultant has been budgeted in the spending plans for the TIF's unless we make an expenditure on our own for 26 and 20. The goal is to try this on a one time basis and see how it goes for this term.

Mayor Gitz introduced Mr. Fritz Kuhlmeier as the Chairperson of NIDA. He stated he would like to address the question on the ongoing contributions to the retail consultant. He stated the mayor and NIDA really did not discuss that so he can't speak for our commitment level for the NIDA board. He stated however if that is a successful on going thing we would be available to discuss that.

Alderperson Koester spoke about his concerns of Stephenson County opting out of financing for NIDA and asked if the agreement has been focused to work for the City since the County is not funding them. Mr. Kuhlmeier stated at this time, we do not have a contribution commitment from Stephenson County. We have an ongoing effort with the county board members to get NIDA back into funding for them. He stated your mayor has done a good job of communicating to the NIDA board that this is public – private partnership and the mayor expects to have a lot of the effort of NIDA focused on the City. He stated we do have our private members that we are accountable for about \$150,000 of funding so we also have to be concerned about the focus of those partners. He explained that need for shovel ready property. He explained plans for public partnership is moving forward with contributions from the public school district and hopefully soon the Village of Lena. He stated it is not to say that there won't be a charge for service to the County if they are not a contributing member.

Chairperson Busker opened the floor for comments and questions from the council.

Alderperson Brashaw noted a typographical error on page three of the contract, under Section 3, Payment item b. NIDA participation in the reference to the retail consultant as being 1c and not 1b as stated. Corporation Counsel Griffin noted this correction.

Alderperson Klemm explained the membership and participation of Freeport School District #145, Highland Community College and the work being done on the workforce development and skill trades.

Alderperson Miller spoke about her concerns about having this agreement for two years and recommended it be presented as a one year contract with NIDA, especially since we do not know about funding from the County. Mr. Kuhlemeier explained NIDA's participation in projects that affect the City of Freeport to its benefit including work on the call center, Farm and Fleet property development, senior housing project of Swift Hospitality, cannabis project including infrastructure of the property and power, Snak King project working with them to acquiring State of Illinois incentives, Pearl Valley Egg expansion project, three retail projects in Freeport and a commercial prospect to fill a building.

Discussion was held as the projects behind the scenes that cannot be made public. Discussion was held on the visibility of projects with the council, the retail consultant for Route 26 and 20 and whether there is even any land available for projects.

Alderperson Chesney spoke about his concerns about going after property that is not even for sale. Mayor Gitz referred to three different parcels with land available in the vicinity. Mayor Gitz explained that a retail consultant would not be hired without the council listening to proposals and signing off on hiring based on their conditions and terms. This sets the financial participation of NIDA for a later event to be determined and approved by the council. He explained that a retail consultant would also be used to fill in West Street and South Street and having NIDA's participation in this is helpful and the NIDA board agreed after much discussion and consideration. Discussion was held if and when a retail consultant was hired it would be for the entire community and areas that it was needed.

Alderperson Miller asked for the council to become more involved with NIDA and their committees. Alderperson Klemm there is a considerable amount of confidentiality of projects and land purchases. Mayor Gitz referred to page 4, paragraph 5 which requires NIDA to submit monthly reports on its projects, activities and services as well as generic information on serious business leads with whom

NIDA is working to the Mayor and City Council and it also provides that a council member can be placed on committees. He asked for four council members to be added to the committees.

Alderperson Chesney requested reinstituting the monthly reporting by NIDA to council members.

Alderperson Chesney made a motion to amend the term of the agreement to one year and strike the extension to another year. This motion was seconded by Alderperson Miller. Discussion was held as the feasibility of striking the working for the second year rollover because we are already into the first six months of the first year and they would need to start renegotiation of the contract in a couple of months. Mr. Kuhlemeier recommended the two year contract and reasoning due to time commitment of two-person office dedicating time to negotiating contracts in addition to projects. He recommended council members to be placed on the committees. Alderperson Chesney and Alderperson Miller stated they would amend their motion to a term of January 1, 2015 through December 31, 2015 with a one year extension which will automatically take effect absent written notice by either party hereto 120 days prior to the expiration. Corporation Counsel Griffin clarified that you are amending your amendment to have it read:

<u>TERM</u>. The Term of this Agreement shall be retroactive to January 1, 2015 and run through December 31, <u>20156</u>, with a one year extension option which will automatically take effect, absent written notice by either party hereto 120 days prior to the expiration.

She stated this means that if notice is not given to NIDA by this September 1st (which is 120 days backwards from the end), then it will be a one and one half year contract.

Alderperson Chesney made a motion to amend the wording under Section 1. Scope of Services, item g; to add the wording in the contract "or city council" after the word mayor. This item as it currently was written is as follows: "Inform and consult with Mayor upon all opportunities within the City of immediate area which might require City utilities, infrastructure, incentives, zoning, or special assistance." This motion was not seconded.

Alderperson Klemm reviewed the privacy issue of projects and management by nine individuals.

Alderperson McClanathan spoke about monthly reports already provided for in the contract and explained how he interprets section 1. g). Alderperson Chesney stated he feels he is getting filtered information and he prefers not only having monthly updates but feels he should be able to go to the executive director and have questions answered through the contract.

Corporation Counsel Griffin stated she can certainly make up an h) to section 1 that states something along the line of, "None of the above provision shall prohibit NIDA and the City Council from having direct communication regarding projects, etc." Mayor Gitz explained that 1.g. creates an affirmative obligation on the part of the executive director of NIDA and its leadership that if they are addressing opportunities that implicates City infrastructure then we become aware of it and it has been a 150 year tradition that the mayor of this city is the chief executive officer so the contact starts there. So if someone is offering a business incentive and we are going to be on hook for it for financial commitments we all want to know about it. He stated what mayor in their right mind would undertake

this information and make the commitment without consultation with the council. Discussion was held on the role of NIDA to communicate with the City.

Chairperson Busker stated sounds like there is enough interest to recommend the contract to council.

Corporation Counsel Griffin stated there is a motion and a second on the floor to amend the term of the agreement for recommendation to council. She stated: The Term of this Agreement shall be retroactive to January 1, 2015 and run through December 31, 2015, with a one year extension option which will automatically take effect, absent written notice by either party hereto 120 days prior to the expiration. Motion prevailed by roll call vote of:

Yeas: Klemm, Ross, Miller, Busker, Brashaw, Koester, Chesney (7)

Nays: McClanathan (1)

The amended term passed by majority vote.

Corporation Counsel Griffin stated there was not a second on the motion to add the concept of h. and there was not a second to add additional wording to item g. She confirmed this with City Clerk Zuravel who concurred. Chairperson Busker asked again if there were any seconds on the motions to add wording to g or to add the h as provided by Corporation Counsel Griffin.

Alderperson Klemm made a motion to move the contract to the council floor at the next council meeting which is scheduled for this evening. This motion was seconded by Alderperson Koester. Motioned prevailed by a roll call vote of:

Yeas: Klemm, McClanathan, Ross, Miller, Busker, Brashaw, Koester, (7)

Nays: Chesney (1)

Alderperson Koester noted even though this is on the council agenda for this evening, it can still be referred to the Committee of the Whole or the next council meeting.

Chairperson Busker noted this meeting has gone past the time to begin the regular meeting of the City Council.

Corporation Counsel Griffin stated we have the administration's draft of the budget provided to members and absent any changes from council, that is what will be going for first reading of the Appropriation Ordinance and that is what is going to be published in the newspaper for the public hearing. With the transparency which this council is espousing, she suggested for public purposes, that you continue your Committee of the Whole meeting and finish your budget because individual council members calling up the Finance Director between now and then does not change what get posted on the website as published in the newspaper. You have what you have unless you amend it tonight.

6. <u>CONTINUATION OF DISCUSSION OF PRELIMINARY BUDGET DOCUMENTS FOR</u> THE GENERAL FUND FISCAL YEAR 2015-2016

(view doc 1 titled "What changed from FY 2015")

(view doc 2 titled "FY 2016 all funds draft 06/08/2015")

(view doc 3 provided as handout 06/08/2015 "corrected treasurer & pension funds")

(View Fiscal Year 2016 Budget for Council dated 06/15/2015)

The following were provided as notes for discussion:

- All other funds
- Scheduled inspections and maintenance on City Buildings added to budget?
- Fire Improvement Fund Transfer
- Cost of living, disparity, and PEHP cost information
- Council member requested additions/reductions/funding sources

Finance Director Haggard presented the above stated documents. Director Haggard reiterated the request from Corporation Counsel Griffin and stated if you have recommendations for change, she would like to go through those this evening. This document is a manual document that she keeps and she created so that if you make a line item change, it may not be as simple as just that. We need to analyze that number as it may impact other funds and other departments. For example if you add a position, it would impact the interdepartmental as well as the department budget, FICA match, etc. She asked to hear comments, suggestions and questions of the council.

Alderperson Brashaw asked how property taxes show an increase of \$36,000. Director Haggard stated property taxes may have increased based on the rounding out of 5-6 digits and also it may look like an increased but prior year we may not have collected all the taxes that we should have because although we assess taxes, not everyone pays timely so we could be seeing that result coming in this year. That is a comparison of budget to actual.

Each council member was provided an opportunity to ask department heads questions regarding the Police and Fire Departments. Discussion was held on department staff count, health care benefits, promotions, cost of living rates, PEHP, and contractual raises. There were no final actions of the Committee of the Whole or recommendations to the Freeport City Council.

Finance Director Haggard explained that her intent is to continue to have discussion on the budget documents through the end of June and to have the finalized appropriation ordinance prepared for first meeting in July, which is July 6, 2015. She reminded council that this is a draft and it is subject to change as she still has finalized revenue and expenditure numbers coming in.

Alderperson Chesney asked about an amount of \$9,100.00 for ordinance codification. Corporation Counsel Griffin stated her legal administrative assistant handled ordinance codification and due to her retirement there was a period of time were the quarterly codifications were not done and the cost differential is due to this process not being completed in last fiscal year due to time constraints of that person being on disability and then retiring. Based on prior year's actuals, Director Haggard stated she is comfortable with that amount as budgeted.

Alderpersons Chesney asked about the legal administrative assistant who has been placed in the budget as a full time position and asked if that person will be shared 50-50 as the deputy City Clerk. Corporation Counsel Griffin stated the intent on that is again the person that was on FMLA and for the last fifteen years that person was full time. During this past fiscal year in an effort to cut the budget, there was a hiring freeze. That person has only been working on a part time. That person had not always been deputy city clerk but much of the 15 years prior that position was the deputy city clerk and able to assist that department. She explained the intent is to fill that full time and have that person the deputy city clerk and take some of the work off the City Clerk. Alderperson Chesney asked if that is split 50-50 shouldn't that part go to the City Clerk's budget. Corporation Counsel Griffin stated she

does not have an objection but she does not know that it is a 50-50 split and she asked Alderperson Chesney if he was seeing something in writing stating that. Alderperson Chesney stated no but when he had a conversation with Director Haggard she thought some of the roles would be taken as deputy city clerk and we should probably allocate whatever percent that he or she will be used as deputy city clerk. Corporation Counsel Griffin stated we discussed that this morning how we would make that split. Mayor Gitz stated the use of the legal assistant for deputy city clerk is not like they are doing regular work all the time, they are filling in by doing it as assigned as needed. The intent of going full time is to do the things that were normally done by the legal assistant that ended up being outsourced to the prosecutor and therefore it is paid for that way. Our belief is that it is less expensive to retain clerical functions in house to have the load for the required actions for the prosecutor outsourced. We can split that be what that implies is the person is doing half time as deputy city clerk and they are not. They are filling in when the load is such if we need it filled in and we need someone at the meeting. Most of the work they are doing is legal related and is not going to be fifty percent of the time it is going to be a higher percentage. He stated historically the person has been carried in legal and it is understood that they will do deputy city clerk duties as required when there is an absence or a need when someone is on vacation or sick. Corporation Counsel Griffin explained the process of putting council packets together first comes from the Legal Department and then goes to the clerk and with a part time person doing 15 hours a week there are things that are not getting done. When we have had a full time person there, as long as there is someone who is able to attend council meetings, it has worked very well and it works on an ad hoc basis such as during liquor license review that person could fill in for that week and do almost all of her other duties. We are comfortable about it being allocated in administrative finances between my department and her department and we can figure out the hours. Alderperson Chesney explained the intent is to give the public more time to review documents as it pertains to city business. He spoke about his concerns in changing an ordinance which allows the public as well as the council more time to review and we need to make sure the funding is in place to achieve this goal and in its present sense the funding is not in place. Corporation Counsel Griffin stated if you want to take money out of my budget and not make my position full time and add it to the City Clerk then that is what you need to do. She explained she needs a full time person and we have worked out in the past where that works. The council needs to be clear on what you are doing, either not fully funding a position for the Legal Department, which is not an addition to the budget it has been there for fifteen years and it was only since this year when the position was place on a part time basis so the work is not getting done or you need to add something to her budget.

Alderperson Koester spoke about the need to have more help for the City Clerk and he suggested looking at for a couple of months and see how much it is used and see if another full time or part time person is needed. He suggested leaving it the way it is and keep a record of how much the person does in Legal and City Clerk and review again in six to eight months when we start to talk next budget.

Mayor Gitz explained that there is understaffing in the executive office and everyone is trying to help everyone else. We chose not to fill the position full time because we were not sure where we were be in this budget and we felt we could get through this fiscal year and revisit where we were. We cost shifted by outsourcing activities that he thought would be less expensive than done in house. What the Corporation Counsel and Clerk are telling you is they work closely together so let them work closely together. You don't need to specify 85-15 or whatever because everyone back there works together. The issue is not a division or a split the issue is a full time person that is needed and all of the incumbent costs to make it more functional. He asked council to specify what it is you want done and

please don't tell us how to get it done. Alderperson Chesney asked City Clerk Zuravel if the time frame could council packets be changed by January 1st. City Clerk Zuravel explained there will be extensive training that needs to be completed and, at this time, they have been told they cannot begin the job search until after the budget is approved so at this time period she cannot answer that question. Alderperson McClanathan clarified that the person is working fifteen hours a week is assisting both the Legal Department and the City Clerk. Corporation Counsel Griffin stated it is only the Legal Department. He asked if by hiring a full time person whether that would relieve the pressure for both staff members and each felt it would.

Discussion was held on the expense on page 14 under line item 01-42-541 for the building maintenance. Director Haggard explained the budget is for \$55,000 and they are looking into the Honeywell contract for the maintenance on the buildings. Director Dole explained estimated the costs have gone down on the maintenance, HVAC, and security system of the buildings. This includes the old City Hall, the Police Department and the Fire Department buildings. He explained there is a reduced level of need at the old City Hall. Director Haggard explained another question has been whether there is money set aside for maintenance of the buildings and she noted on page 78 there has been fund set aside in fund 36. She stated there is a revenue source of \$163,000 and they are budgeting \$120,000 so there is money set aside in contingency in an amount of \$43,000. If the level of funding comes in, we will set aside \$43,000 for building maintenance. She explained if the money comes in we will set it aside in a building maintenance account. Discussion was held on which buildings would be covered.

Alderperson Chesney stated he would like to see the expense for landlord training to be struck from the budget along with office supplies and printing. He stated he would like to see reductions in line item 01-49-612 (books, periodicals, memberships) reduced by \$1,000 to an amount equal to \$125.00; for line item 01-49-613 reduced by \$2,250.00 to an amount equal to \$1,800.00; and for line item 01-49-575 reduced by \$11,900 to an amount \$500.00. This request was not stated in a motion and there was no further action other than discussion.

Alderperson Klemm explained the fees for the Rental Property Registration were set based on a budget that included those expenses for training and the this program was funded 100% with no impact on the General Fund. Mayor Gitz and Police Chief Barkalow explained the benefits of the program and the intent for this year is to further provide education and training of the landlords.

Discussion was held as the budgeted amount for demolitions. It was estimated this amount to be \$100,000 now that the City has been awarded grant funding so this amount was reduced from the \$120,000 amount budgeted this year.

Alderperson Chesney spoke about landlord training and stated it was not the role of government to educate. He stated the government the way it is run is business unfriendly. Alderperson Koester spoke about the need for training landlords and this need is not being filled by the area landlord association. He suggested leaving it in the budget to fill in the gap. Mayor Gitz explained how the fee structure was set and if the council wants to change the ordinance with the next registration period but the budget was set with the training aspect in this budget.

Discussion was held on the Legal Department outside legal costs. Corporation Counsel Griffin explained coming down the pipeline could be an EEOC complaint, AFSCME and Fire union negotiations costs and other outlying issues. She looked at a ten year analysis to estimate the budgeted amount. She explained that the Appropriation Ordinance contains the full \$100,000 and recommended that what can be done would to put \$75,000 in spending plan and \$25,000 in contingency. Director Haggard stated she can make that change.

Alderperson Chesney made a motion to place in line item 01-33-508 an amount of \$75,000 in the spending plan and \$25,000 in contingency. This motion was seconded by Alderperson Miller. Chairperson Busker asked for a roll call vote on the motion. Motion prevailed by a roll call vote of:

Yeas: McClanathan, Ross, Miller, Busker, Brashaw, and Chesney (6)

Nay: Klemm and Koester (2)

Discussion was held on the number of police officers. Director Haggard explained that she funded two officer positions and another one is being applied for in a grant. She explained that if awarded the grant she would move those two line items numbers through a Supplemental Appropriation Ordinance at a later date. She placed in the contingency an amount of \$48,000 for officer positions in the line item for police department sworn officers. Mayor Gitz explained the benefit of community policing and how this will fit into the budget.

Alderperson McClanathan clarified that if he is reading the budget correctly that the administration has budgeted for two additional non-bargaining positions, one additional applied through a grant and one bargaining sworn office. So we are talking potentially four officers in the next year and right now three would be, for lack of a better work guaranteed in the budget with the potential for one on a grant. He asked if that was correct and Mayor Gitz stated yes. Alderperson McClanathan asked if the police officer through the community policing grant can perform other duties besides community policing. Mayor Gitz stated that is correct.

Chief of Police Todd Barkalow explained the community policing and stated it is not just community policing that is what the grant is called. Community Policing is a philosophy that we adhere to. It is community outreach, problem solving, it is getting out of the car and it could mean getting on a bicycle and getting back to the old style of policing with foot patrols and hitting the beat. The way he understands looking at this budget, is we do get our two non-bargaining officers. The way Chief Barkalow understands looking at 4/15 is that he gets one additional officer. He explained they are applying for an officer through the Department of Justice Grant on June 19th. He stated hopefully they will get funding for 5% of manpower so that would be two positions dedicated to community policing. That is no different from what we are doing right now. He explained if we get that, those two positions, there is \$48,000 in contingency to help offset those costs of the two officers because the formula is 75% - 25% the first year and a 50% the next year. He stated worst case scenario we are talking about three officers and the best case scenario could be five officers. If we don't get that grant (and it is a competitive grant) we still have that \$48,000 in contingency and the council will decide what the contingency is on. Corporation Counsel Griffin stated that she is not involved in the police department budget and we talked early on. There is a word used in grants and it is called supplant. What it means is that you can't supplant something that you are already funding. This is one of those grants, if it already in our budget, you can't supplant another officer. So she explained it has to be in contingency

until you get it and that is why it is budget that way. Alderperson Chesney asked Chief Barkalow if the way the budget is structure if he was comfortable with it today. Chief Barkalow stated yes. Alderperson Chesney stated the way he sees it is that you have added one officer and he wants to make sure the department is armed correctly to meet the goals that are set out by the administration but also by the council and does this budget accomplish that. Chief Barkalow stated this budget as it is set up today, yes he feels comfortable and added is he going to be able to change perception or do anything like that, he feels they are making steps towards that. He stated they are going to have to have a hiring schedule set up and we are going to make some progress with the budget and hopefully we will make some more progress next year so we are taking a little smaller bite of this.

Corporation Counsel Griffin confirmed with the council members. She confirmed that the Appropriation Ordinance is 100% as it came in tonight in the documents presented by Finance Director Haggard. The only change noted was in the Spending Plan where a line item was slightly amended in the Legal Department so that we can publish notice in the newspaper that this is the Appropriation Ordinance. She verified this with the council. There were no additions or changes. Alderperson McClanathan stated there were a variety of changes leading up to tonight but that is correct.

Alderperson Miller requested to have on the July Committee of the Whole some discussion on the landlord training with the Chief giving his input and maybe the Freeport Area Landlord Association giving their input so that we can make a better decision on the training issues. Alderperson McClanathan stated he will ask for that as well.

Alderperson Koester asked for analysis on disparity issue and the PEHP plan. Director Haggard provided a handout earlier in the evening and explained the highlighted section. Alderperson Koester explained that there is a difference on the amount to sell back sick time. He stated there are a number of things to look at and he does not know if they can all be looked at in this budget but this is a start. He recommended by the next budget to begin narrowing the gap. He asked to show the costs to bring the non-bargaining up to par with the bargaining unit. She stated yes that is a manual process but it is possible.

Director Haggard asked for input on the council for a vehicle purchase for the building inspector as to whether it should use the capital equipment fund or the general fund for its purchase. Alderperson McClanathan shared his concerns with taking money from an already over-stressed fund balance and by doing so it would leave the ending cash balance a small amount. It may hamper the ability to address situations down the road as they arise.

Alderperson Chesney agreed with Alderperson McClanathan and stated he would not want to deplete that fund or leave it lean. Some of the requests were not agreed upon by the mayor and the wish list may need to be deferred. He asked for further look at the Capital Equipment Fund wish list and offered that by placing the \$25,000 expense into the capital equipment fund that would offer relief to the General Fund.

Corporation Counsel Griffin asked if she could state that for the record the motion. She stated to make that in form of a motion it would take from line item 1-53-741 and amount \$25,000 and move it to Fund 31-3-742 or Director Haggard stated in the 700 series. This motion was so moved by Alderperson Chesney, seconded by Alderperson Klemm. Alderperson Klemm clarified what you are doing is taking \$25,000 from the Community Development Fund and moving it over to the Capital

Equipment fund. Alderperson Chesney stated the reason being is that it would offer relief to the general fund and then read from the footnote of the Capital Equipment Fund, page 72 that this is a recommendation for department heads and the mayor is not in agreement. He suggested at a later time we can re-hash the actual equipment purchases such as the mini excavator, the end loader and the pick-up truck. Chairperson Busker asked for a roll call vote on the motion. Motion prevailed by a roll call vote of:

Yeas: Klemm, McClanathan, Ross, Miller, Busker, Brashaw, Koester, and Chesney (8)

Nay: none

7. PUBLIC COMMENTS – AGENDA OR NON-AGENDA ITEMS

Steve Carroll, 811 Oak, Freeport Illinois spoke about Shawn Homer, Nuisance Inspector. He stated this pick-up truck picks up nothing. He used to call the Nuisance Inspector and now when he has issues in his neighborhood he takes to Mayor Gitz with a photo in order to have issues resolved. He stated there not only needs to be attention to the corridors but to all the streets. He stated there is a lack of leadership in Community Development and this is been going on for a long time.

Chairperson Busker noted we will take a five minute break before beginning the City Council meeting.

8. ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the meeting was adjourned at 7:35 p.m.

S/ Meg Zuravel

Meg Zuravel, City Clerk