

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE
10:00 a.m., Monday, March 2, 2015

The regular meeting of the Personnel Committee was held at 10:00 a.m., Monday, March 2, 2015 in the City Hall Conference Room, 1207 Palm Boulevard, Isle of Palms, South Carolina. Attending the meeting were Councilmembers Ferencz and Bettelli, Chair Harrington, Administrator Tucker, City Attorney Halversen, Assistant Administrator Dziuban and Clerk Copeland; quorum was present to conduct business.

1. Chair Harrington called the meeting to order and acknowledged that the press and public were duly notified of the meeting in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act.

2. **Approval of Previous Meeting's Minutes**

MOTION: Councilmember Bettelli moved to approve the minutes of the regular meeting of February 2, 2015 as submitted; Councilmember Ferencz seconded and the motion PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

3. **Citizens' Comments – None**

4. **Old Business**

Discussion of Additional Employee Holidays

Administrator Tucker recalled that this will be the continuation of a discussion held previously and that was pertinent to the operating budgets of all departments of the City; for certain departments, the addition of holidays would create a financial impact on their budget. At Council, the pros and cons of declaring specific holidays versus letting employees choose days was debated. The Administrator remembered the discussions from the time the floating holiday was added and noted that the department managers had strong reasons to prefer a designated day rather than a day when any employee could declare a holiday for himself. The Administrator explained that she had invited the department managers to attend this meeting to voice their opinions on this topic; in addition, she stated that floating days are more manageable for the Public Works, Building, Recreation and General Government departments than for the Fire and Police Departments where there must be coverage, whether it is a holiday or not. The preference at this time is to add two (2) holidays and to have the days declared, not floating days; the addition of floating holidays would be cumbersome for the payroll department to track, as well. The Administrator recounted that, at the Ways and Means Committee meeting, floating holidays were seen as a cost-saving measure.

Director Page said that, for the Recreation Department, the issue is that, if someone was not at work due to illness and another employee has decided to use a floating holiday, the Department would be left to operate with a skeleton staff. The Director added that she considers a holiday a day when the building can be closed and no one must be there; whereas letting employees select a day as a floating holiday equates to another day of annual leave in her opinion. If another floating holiday was to be treated as the one is now, where everyone votes for a specific day, the day would be a true holiday for the City.

For the Public Works Department, floating holidays are a bit more complex according to Director Pitts. He explained that residents of the island assume that the City takes all government holidays, so they do not put their garbage out for collection on those days, which results in double the volume and double the work on the next pick-up day. The Director noted that personnel will get the garbage from those residents who did not put their carts out until such time as it becomes overwhelming. When the County has a holiday and the City does not, the landfill is closed and garbage must stay in the trucks an extra day. In conclusion, Director Pitts stated that a holiday should be a day when the City is closed for business.

Chief Graham voiced her agreement with what Directors Page and Pitts have already said but added that the Fire Department works 24/7 and must be staffed at a certain level at all times. If an employee was to declare a floating holiday, the Chief must call someone in to take his place and the substitute would be paid overtime, which is double time for the Fire Department. For assigned holidays, the crew normally assigned to that day would work, and, with three (3) crews, someone will work any specific holiday every third year.

Chief Buckhannon concurred with Chief Graham and added that, as a resort community City staff are already limited to when they can take vacation days off between May and September. He noted that most people want to take a day off to extend the weekend, but the weekends are the busiest times on the island. He explained that, when one (1) of the dispatchers are off, he must schedule an officer, on overtime, to answer phones and be available to the public. Like the Fire Department, the scheduled shifts work on holidays.

Administrator Tucker noted that the proposed operating budgets include the cost for the addition of two (2) holidays; the Administrator commented that, for General Government, the Building Department, Public Works and the Recreation Department, two (2) additional holidays have no financial impact.

Summarizing, the Administrator stated that in terms of how the City operates within the community and internally, staff believes that the addition of declared holidays, while retaining the one (1) assigned floating holiday, would be most advantageous to the City's employees and residents.

Councilmember Ferencz expressed her opinion that, if the decision is to add two (2) holidays with an addition of twenty thousand dollars (\$20,000) to the operating budgets, twenty-thousand dollars (\$20,000) must be cut from somewhere else.

The Administrator commented that additional revenue could also be found to support the holidays.

Councilmember Bettelli stated that one thing the City has aspired to is getting and retaining good employees, and, in reviewing the holiday survey of local communities, the City is not keeping up with surrounding communities relative to benefits. If the City was to offer two (2) more holidays, it could be valuable to present and future employees as a statement that the City is looking out for its employees.

Chair Harrington supported the Administrator' view that the City would find the revenue to support them.

Councilmember Ferencz stated that she would like to see the same budget that the City had for FY15 and to add to or subtract from it as necessary.

Councilmember Bettelli commented that the only thing the Committee could do relative to the additional holidays was to acknowledge that the decision would be made as part of the budget process. Administrator Tucker recalled that the two (2) holidays specified at the last meeting were Presidents Day and Christmas Eve; she explained that, if these additions survive the budget process, the City would look to employees to re-vote for the 2015 floating holiday, which is currently designated as Christmas Eve.

MOTION: Chair Harrington moved to add Presidents Day and Christmas Eve as new City holidays to be considered in the FY16 budget process; Councilmember Bettelli seconded and the motion PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

5. New Business

Review of FY16 Proposed Capital and Expense Budgets

A. General Government, to include Merit Pool

Administrator Tucker distributed a schedule that Councilmember Ferencz requested showing the impact to the budget of merit pools of three percent (3%), four percent (4%), five percent (5%) and six percent (6%) for the departments under the Committee's purview.

The six percent (6%) merit pool was established last year; in reviewing the discussions from the meetings, the three percent (3%) merit pool was instituted when the cost of living (COLA) increases were eliminated.

In 2008 or 2009, some members of the policy-making body felt that employees should not receive an automatic increase just because they were on the payroll and came to work every day. Administrator Tucker explained that the purpose of the COLA was to adjust wages to compensate for adjustments in the expense of living, i.e. the uncontrollable costs that everyone experiences. The change to a merit pool was made during a very difficult economic time, and the prevailing thought from Council was that personnel should not receive an automatic increase because, without increases being merit based, employees had no motivation to work harder and do a better job. So, in a very lean economic time, the COLA was totally eliminated and a completely merit-based pool of only three percent (3%) was established; since that time the City has maintained the three-percent (3%) pool. The policy-making body's intention, at that time, was to generate a pool of money from which all of the department managers would decide who, within their department and based on their performance, would get money from that pool. The distribution of the merit pool could vary from department to department; in one (1) department, everyone who performs exemplary, could each get a thousand dollars (\$1,000)

more or a percentage, but there did not have to be a consistent method. The process has continued unchanged since the change was made. Each department manager knows how much money is in the pool for the department, and, after completing evaluations, determines how that pool would be distributed among those employees deserving of an increase.

The problem has been that the pool has not been increased from the original three percent (3%) until last year; therefore, while expenses were increasing for employees, including increases in

dependent health care premiums and retirement contributions, the merit was not keeping pace with living expenses, and also not keeping pace with other local governments.

Therefore, according to the Chair, City Council authorized increases to the Fire Department, then initiated a wage study of local governments to determine whether there were other departments of the City that need to be addressed. The result in the wage study was an increase to the wage ranges for all positions in the City. The changes were made to attract good employees, to be competitive with surrounding municipalities, to retain those employees and to increase stability and continuity within departments.

The Administrator cautioned that reductions in the merit pool would be dramatic; by returning to the three-percent (3%) pool, the City will again fall out of pace on competitive salaries with surrounding local governments in the span of a very few years. According to the Administrator, the options leaving the merit at 6% as shown on the proposed budgets because that number would keep the City competitive in the marketplace, and only top performers would get up to six percent (6%) merit increase. Another option is to return to the cost of living adjustments and the merit pool; the consumer price index (CPI) for 2015 is one point 62 percent (1.62%); the City would distribute the six percent (6%) merit pool between a one point six two percent (1.62%) COLA and a four point three eight percent (4.38%) merit pool. The COLA would be for all employees and the merit pool would be distributed to those employees, who through their work performance, are eligible for an increase.

Responding to Councilmember Ferencz, the Administrator confirmed that there are circumstances where an employee does not get a merit increase.

Chief Graham stated that, when she began working for the City, it had both a COLA and a step program that an employee received on the anniversaries of hire date; at some point the decision was made that not everyone was deserving of a step increase and the merit-based increases were instituted to add to the annual COLA. When the COLA was eliminated, the merit pool was small; therefore, the City quickly fell behind other local departments in pay and retention became a problem.

Treasurer Suggs explained that the wage ranges are adjusted on July 1 of each year by the CPI which means that a firefighter hired in January would likely end up making less than someone hired in July because the new hire has the benefit of the wage range increase.

The single biggest factor with the merit pool or the merit pool accompanied by a COLA is that the pool needs to be sufficient for employees to keep pace with all other local governments in the area. Combining General Government, the Building and Judicial Departments, reducing the merit pool from six percent (6%) to three percent (3%) would save only twelve thousand dollars to the FY16 budget.

Chair Harrington posed the question to the department managers present if they would prefer to go back to a COLA and merit increases or to stay with the current program of just merit increases.

The Chair commented that, with a COLA, no employee would lose ground.

Director Pitts stated that the drawbacks to him are the employees making forty thousand dollars (\$40,000) are the exemplary employees, and, in the Public Works Department, if someone is not keeping up with his co-workers, he is quickly gone. He commented that he has not been able to reward this best employees properly because they have been at the top of the pay range.

When Councilmember Ferencz asked why the Public Works employees stay, the Director responded that they do above and beyond; in his opinion, Rob Graham runs the department and he is simply the manager.

Since the pay ranges were adjusted upward, the situation Director Pitts described has ended, and he can reward his deserving employees. The Administrator interpreted the Director as supporting the re-instatement of the COLA.

Director Pitts noted that the COLA goes to every employee and takes the manager out of the picture.

Chief Graham agreed with going back to the COLA and making up the difference through the merit increases; she stated that she believes a COLA would be a positive factor in hiring.

The Chair said that he likes a COLA since it does not differentiate between employees, yet department managers retain the ability to reward top performers through the merit increase.

Director Page voiced her agreement with having both the COLA and merit.

Chief Buckhannon also agreed with other department heads, assuming the merit pool is large enough. The Chief reported holding back a portion of the Police Department's merit pool to have money to recognize new employees when they have completed the probationary period.

Assistant Dziuban explained that the City requires that an employee complete six (6) months of service before being eligible for a merit increase; therefore, a person hired in the second half of the year would not be eligible for a merit on January 1 and could work for a year and a half before getting any kind of salary increase.

Treasurer Suggs also distributed the wage variations from a three percent (3%) merit pool to a six percent (6%) merit pool. Councilmember Ferencz commented that the difference between the high and the low merit pools becomes a significant number, just over ninety-four thousand dollars (\$94,000), when looking at total wages paid by the City.

Administrator Tucker voiced the opinion that, if this Committee was going to recommend a return to a cost of living adjustment, it should be a global policy that affects all years going forward until changed again.

MOTION: Chair Harrington moved to recommend to the Ways and Means Committee to re-institute annual cost of living adjustments for employees; Councilmember Ferencz seconded and the motion PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Administrator Tucker reiterated that the budget is currently built with a six percent (6%) merit pool, and cuts can be made anywhere in the coming months before final approval of the budget.

Assuming the COLA survives the Ways and Means Committee and Council, the line item would change to note the one point six two percent (1.62%) COLA and up to four point three eight percent (4.38%) merit pool.

MOTION: Councilmember Bettelli moved to recommend a four point three eight percent (4.38%) merit pool that combined with the COLA will equal six percent (6%); Councilmember Ferencz seconded and the motion PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Changes to the Mayor and Council budget start with the increase in retirement for FY16; Assistant Dziuban explained that not all members of Council participate. As in all budgets, the City is projecting an eight percent (8%) increase to group health premiums, and the amount estimated for Workers Compensation includes current rates and the experience modifier assigned to the City. Office Supplies have been increased based on actual expenditures, and Vehicle Fuel and Oil has been reduced for the same reason. The public officials liability and employee bond insurance have increased.

Councilmember Bettelli pointed out that the single highest expense is health insurance. When the City moved to the State Health Plan, their regulations demanded that elected officials be covered in the same manner as any other employee, meaning that the elected official's health insurance premium would be paid by the City, as well as half of the premium for dependents included in the plan. As a result, a portion of Council is getting a total of fifty thousand dollars (\$50,000) in benefits. Under the old plan, an elected official also was allowed to participate, but he would pay the full amount of the premium to the City.

Moving on to General Government, Assistant Dziuban noted that the four (4) lines following wages were all a function of wages have increased accordingly. The two (2) additional holidays are included, but it is noted that they have no financial impact for the General Government budget. The next figure represents debt service, i.e. sixty percent (60%) principal of the Rec Bond, one hundred percent (100%) of the Public Safety Bond principal and forty percent (40%) of the bond principal for Fire Station 2.

Councilmember Ferencz asked why the debt service payments were not on the appropriate departmental budgets; the Administrator said that she would get the answer from Treasurer Suggs. With the debt service showing in General Government rather than the Police or Fire Department budgets, one does not have a true picture of what the true expense is for a particular department.

A large portion of the increase to the line for Membership and Dues is attributed to the City's membership in SC Beach Advocates, which is an advocacy group for the entire South Carolina coast. This group is an outgrowth of the IOP initiated meetings of coastal mayors to discuss their common issues.

Vehicle Fuel and Oil has been reduced based on past two (2) years' cost per gallon; two (2) factors contributed to the increase in Electricity and Gas, and they are the actual spending over the past twelve (12) months and the addition of two percent (2%) to the franchise fee for SCE&G. The City needs more band width; not only do City computers run slowly, but also the phone service has been interrupted. The cost for additional bandwidth has been proportionately divided between all departments of the City.

The increase to Water and Sewer are based on an increase in sewer rates; the increases to Maintenance and Service Contracts are an increase to the elevator maintenance and software maintenance contact and the addition of one thousand dollars (\$1,000) for HVAC repairs.

Another global comment regarding the expense budgets is that insurance costs have increased since last year primarily because the City took advantage of a one-time accounting correction in FY15 that is obviously not available in FY16. In addition, flood insurance rates are projected to go up by fifteen percent (15%) and employee bonds, property and liability are estimated to increase by five percent (5%).

Overall, the General Government budget is projected to increase by three percent (3%) over last year.

B. Building Department

The Building Department also sees no financial impact from the addition of two (2) holidays. As in General Government, Vehicle Fuel and Oil are expected to be less in FY16 based on the estimated fuel costs and usage over the past twelve (12) months. Sharing the building with General Government, the same reasoning was used in projecting costs for Electricity and Gas, Telephone and Cable, and Insurance. Even with the sewer rate increase, Water and Sewer for the Building Department has been reduced for the coming year, and the increase to Maintenance and Service Contracts is due the increase in maintenance for the new generator. Professional

Services has been reduced because one thousand dollars (\$1,000) previously included would be for training the Board of Zoning Appeals and the Planning Commission; it has been reclassified.

The Building Department is projected to have an increase in its operating budget of six percent (6%) over last year.

C. Judicial and Legal

The increases anticipated in this department are based on the same premises used in General Government and the Building Department. Professional Services have been increased to cover attorney fees; Administrator Tucker explained that local governments are being told that they must have a specific attorney appointed that can provide legal services for someone who cannot afford such services themselves. The Administrator said that she has identified an attorney who is willing to do this for the City; he will be paid on a per-case rate, not hourly. Also included in this line is sixteen thousand dollars (\$16,000) to implement online criminal and ticket payments.

This department also has an estimated six percent (6%) increase over FY15.

Capital Projects

For General Government, funds have been budgeted for additional electrical outlets and an internet connection in Council Chambers. The items proposed to come from Capital Outlay are an integrated financial software package, which was deferred in FY15, and a metal detector walk-through security device and wand for Court. The Administrator stated that she views the metal detector as more of a deterrent than anything else, but she affirmed that there are risks associated with court.

Capital expenditures budgeted for the Building Department include the replacement of one laptop computer and a document folder/sealing printer. As well as replacing the deck and ramp at the front of City Hall, building repairs, painting seven (7) doors, etc.

Municipal Accommodation Fee Fund Expenditures

Assigned to be paid from Municipal ATAX funds are forty percent (40%) of the principal and interest on the Recreation GO Bond; the interest payment has decreased due to the re-financing of the bond. Under Maintenance and Service, the City has budgeted for the trim and replacement of the roadside palms as needed and to refurbish and/or add to the street-prints on the island; the street-prints are a re-budgeted amount because the City has been waiting to do this work until after the County re-surfaces a portion of Palm Boulevard. Fifteen thousand dollars (\$15,000) has been set aside for holiday decorations, the lift used to place the lights, and replacement lights and flags; the estimates are based on actual expenses. In Capital Outlay, staff has budgeted thirty thousand dollars (\$30,000) for fifty percent (50%) of the fabrication and installation of Phase III wayfinding signs, including the cost of the encroachment permits; this is also a re-budgeted figure.

Councilmember Ferencz asked why the increase of five thousand dollars (\$5,000) in the line for holiday decorations; Assistant Dziuban responded that each year staff has questioned that everything the budget is large enough to cover what is needed, and each year the budget is stretched as far as it will go. The additional amount is to purchase more displays since they have become very popular.

Administrator Tucker acknowledged that she had asked which items were going up in price, but she could not remember at this moment; she agreed to find out what the increase actually would cover.

Hospitality Tax Fund Expenditures

This fund will pay sixty percent (60%) of the principal and interest for the GO Bond for Fire Station #2, and other small expenditures for the Building Department.

State Accommodations Tax Fund Expenditures

State Accommodations Taxes will cover the following expenses:

- cost for continuing the full page advertisement in a Spoleto publication;
- the fifty thousand dollars (\$50,000) of discretionary funds for the ATAX Committee;
- the July 4th fireworks display and associated expenses;
- the remaining fifty percent (50%) for fabrication and installation of Phase III wayfinding signs and additional holiday light displays;
- the T-shirt give-away and website maintenance that includes offsite backup disaster recovery; and
- the thirty percent (30%) of State ATAX funds payable to the CVB by State Law.

C. Disaster Recovery Reserve Fund

As budgeted, staff has made no changes; the one percent (1%) decrease is attributed to the reduced projection of interest income.

Councilmember Ferencz recalled that any transfers-in that may occur come at the end of the fiscal year.

D. Plant-a-Palm/Aisle of Palms Fund

No changes have been made to this budget as well.

The next two (2) pages are the Ten-Year (10 yr.) Capital Plan for General Government which summarize capital expenditures viewed earlier by fund. Assistant Dziuban noted that this schedule is evaluated each year; items are added that are new; items are removed that have been sold as surplus and are not going to be replaced and items are deferred.

Councilmember Ferencz asked if there was an approval process for adding items to the Capital Plan. Assistant Dziuban responded in the negative stating that staff puts as many items on the Capital Plan as possible to avoid the scenario where staff and Council are surprised by an unscheduled capital expenditure.

Administrator Tucker added that any time that the City buys a new major asset it is added to the Capital Plan with a replacement year and estimated replacement cost, which will be refined as

the item nears the year for replacement. In addition, when Council makes a expresses a desire for the future, like the undergrounding of all power lines on the island, it would be added as the Gateway Enhancement is on the plan for FY17 – these are things would be nice to do in the future when they become affordable.

The next page is the schedule of Capital and Special Projects greater than five thousand dollars (\$5,000) by funding source for General Government.

The final two (2) pages are the Ten-Year (10 yr.) Capital Plan for the Building Department and the source of funds for those purposes.

Councilmember Ferencz asked whether the City knew how many court cases involved tourists and the possibility of funding a portion of the metal detector through tourism funds; Assistant Dziuban indicated that the data was not something that the City could easily obtain.

The balance of information is tools that were originally presented last year to assist in decision-making. The ledger sheets illustrate the budgeted expenditures by the fund from which they will be paid for General Government and the Building Department.

Councilmember Ferencz asked whether the increase in BSO wages was the result of the parking plan; Administrator Tucker said that she needed to be reminded of the reasoning behind the change and would speak with Treasurer Suggs.

Councilmember Ferencz stated that staff knew better than Council what was needed and what could be done without at this time; she, therefore, asked that staff go back through the budgets presented at this meeting to reduce each by two to three percent (2% - 3%). She added that there were to be “no sacred cows” and everything was on the table.

Administrator Tucker stated that, when staff builds the budget, they examine each line, look for reductions and investigate renewal and purchase costs. The Administrator noted that, if a department is increasing by six percent (6%), the driver is most likely the merit pool, so there is nowhere to cut.

Councilmember Ferencz interpreted the Administrator’s statements as meaning that the budget as presented was as low as it could go.

Administrator Tucker responded that all of the considerations Councilmember Ferencz is suggesting were done when the budget was developed.

Chair Bettelli recounted the budgeting process last year when Committees and Council were presented a budget, which they went through line-by-line in detail, but the budget was not approved until June because Councilmembers who wanted to cut more and then some more. If Council does not start out with a budget based on what staff says their needs are, the margin for “wobble room” gets smaller and smaller.

Councilmember Ferencz thought that her suggestion would eliminate getting to the Ways and Means and/or Council level with Council saying cut this and cut that. If staff were to come

forward with a budget where expenses meet income and not looking at a deficit again, the lengthy discussions would be eliminated.

Councilmember Bettelli stated that what Councilmember Ferencz was describing was the budget process.

When Councilmember Ferencz suggested cutting Council salaries by two percent (2%), Councilmember Bettelli informed her that those salaries were set by code.

Director Page stated that she begins the budget process in November or December, and she quickly saw the need for more cleaning supplies because the building is used quite a bit, so she went to an account that she had used less than anticipated and reduced it. She emphasized to Councilmember Ferencz that each department manager goes through the budget the same way, but that it was impossible to predict everything that was going to come up in the next fiscal year.

Councilmember Ferencz drew from the Director's comments that the budget as presented is the budget that should be passed; and, assuming that to be true, the Councilmember asked why Council should go through the budget process since this budget represents the needs of the City.

Administrator Tucker stated that the budgets as presented represent the work product that came out of looking at what expenses have been, what could be anticipated as new expenses, and where expenses could be reduced or eliminated altogether; that work has happened to get to the budgets before the Committee at this meeting.

Councilmember Bettelli noted that Council has the final word on the budget by adopting it and that Council must go through a process to get to that point. He added that Council would be negating its fiscal responsibility if it was to accept the budget without doing its due diligence.

Administrator Tucker stated that she takes a totally different approach to looking at capital items and special projects and the operating budgets; she continued that, on the operating budgets, staff is limited to only a few line items where the reductions Councilmember Ferencz is requesting could be taken. Additionally staff makes as many reductions as possible before the operating budgets are presented to Committees then Council. On the capital budget, decisions can be made to defer the replacement of an item/project for another year or a less expensive alternative can be found, and, in some cases, the replacement/project has been expedited. The Administrator said that the operating budgets were so lean now that it was difficult to find one or two percent (1%-2%) to cut because, to do that, would mean cutting something that would actually skew the budget. To make her point clear, the Administrator directed attention to the detail for General Government Maintenance and Service Contracts; the very last entry is for three thousand dollars (\$3,000) and marked as undesignated, but followed by a long list of things that get charged to that "undesignated" amount of money. The Administrator stated that, every year, small issues come up that do not fall to any category on the approved budget. She stated that staff would be happy to review the budget to see if there is an error or to review the reasoning for some increases; she indicated that staff sees the budget as a partnership with the policy-making body that they are doing their due diligence to tell Council what the needs are and

what they are seeing and anticipating. Working in concert with Council, staff is listening to the feedback and looking at the numbers generated to refine them.

Councilmember Ferencz stated that she was trying to figure out the Committee's responsibility in looking at the budget.

Administrator Tucker voiced the opinion that the Committee should ask questions, assist staff with prioritizing the big projects coming forward, to bring forward ideas from the community that might be things that staff has not heard about, etc. The Administrator noted that the budget was Council's document to adopt and pass to serve as the work-plan for staff for the coming year. She indicated that if Council was to demand that the overall budget be cut by "x" percent; the only way that she envisioned accomplishing that would be by reducing services to residents.

Councilmember Ferencz commented that the one (1) thing she is hearing from residents is they do not want a tax increase.

When asked whether they saw anything in the budget that the Committee should question, both Chair Harrington and Councilmember Bettelli responded that they needed to study the budget more.

Chair Harrington thanked the staff for the work they are doing to give Council the volume of materials on which to base decisions.

6. Miscellaneous Business

Chair Harrington gave recognition to two (2) employees, Sgt. Sharon Baldrick and Patrol Officer James Taylor. Sgt. Baldrick is being recognized for becoming a certified Drug Recognition Evaluator; she is one (1) of only two (2) women to hold this certification in the state. Patrol Officer Taylor assisted a couple who had locked the car key in the vehicle; the couple sent Chief Buckhannon an email stating how pleasant and professional Ptl. Taylor had been and stated that he had done "an excellent job."

Next Meeting Date: 10:00 a.m., Wednesday, April 8, 2015 in the Conference Room

Responding to Councilmember Ferencz' concern about any action required on the budget, the Administrator said that there was not, but she stated that staff welcomes the input and questions that the policy-setting body asks because they alert staff to things that need a second look.

Addressing a tax increase, Administrator Tucker expressed hope that each Councilmember had sent an email or letter to the City's representatives at the state level because the pressure to eliminate the municipal business license is strong. If the bill does pass the legislature, the City must have an alternate source of revenue to fill that gap or cut services.

7. Executive Session – unnecessary

8. Adjourn

MOTION: Councilmember Bettelli moved to adjourn the meeting at 12:22 p.m.; Councilmember Ferencz seconded and the motion PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted:

Marie Copeland
City Clerk