

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE
5:30 p.m., Thursday, March 12, 2015

The regular meeting of the Public Works Committee was held at 5:30 p.m., Thursday, March 12, 2015 in the City Hall Conference Room, 1207 Palm Boulevard, Isle of Palms, South Carolina. Attending the meeting were Councilmembers Ferencz and Loftus, Chair Ward, Administrator Tucker, Public Works Director Pitts and City Clerk Copeland; a quorum was present to conduct business.

1. Chair Ward 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 Ferencz moved to approve the minutes of the regular meeting of February 11, 2015 as submitted; Councilmember Loftus seconded and the motion **PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**.

3. **Citizens' Comments** – None

4. **Department Reports for February 2015** – Director Pitts

A. Maintenance and Trash Collection Tracking Reports

The Director commented that personnel had pumped water from 46th, 50th, and 51st Avenues on February 26th and 27th from the heavy rains. February was the month when the City received the invoice for repairs to the CAT; the Director reported that the problems had been the coolant and the rebuild of the hydraulics system. Despite the big hit in February, the Director was confident that vehicle maintenance would end the year at budget unless something unexpected was to happen.

Debris was up slightly in February, primarily because the CAT was back in service for the entire month; garbage was also up slightly.

B. Update on Cleaning Drainage Ditch on Forest Trail

Director Pitts reported that the work on Forest Trail was completed in February.

5. Old Business

A. Follow-up Discussion Related to new Front Beach Lights

Chair Ward stated that he heard nothing but good things about the new Front Beach lights at Island Gras held on Saturday, March 7th. The Chair indicated that he had put this on the *Agenda* to make certain that the lights were truly turtle-friendly.

Administrator Tucker reported that she had reached out to SCE&G regarding this question and received the following information:

- It would be possible to dim the lights, but the City would have to change to a different control mode that might have some costs involved;

- Alternate lights or groups of lights could be turned off and on at different times by computer software with little or no additional cost;
- The LED lights are much directed down more and have less light trespass or ambient light that is the problem for the turtles;
- Shields are currently not available because the lights are new to them, but SCE&G has inquired of the manufacturer about the cost to fabricate them; there would be the cost of the shields and the cost to install them.

Administrator Tucker got the impression that, since the new lights are LED, SCE&G did not think the City would have a problem. They also stated that they would continue to research and get back to the City with any new information.

The Chair remarked that the primary reason the City had these lights installed was for the safety of the residents and visitors and that should not be diminished, but, at the same time, the City must be aware.

B. Update on Drainage

• Ditch at 29th and Palm

Administrator Tucker reminded the Committee that drivers have been backing into the ditch; when discussed at the Public Safety Committee, one (1) solution from Chief Buckhannon was to place one (1) of the NO PARKING WITHIN 4 FEET OF ROAD strategically so that a driver would have to hit the sign to go into the ditch.

• Handicap Space at 21st Avenue

The City has reached out to the County asking that they evaluate the situation to see if there are any potential solutions.

Councilmember Loftus commented that he had studied the area since the last meeting and that the space has a “true design flaw;” the parking space is definitely the lowest in the area. He expressed confidence that, if the County was to make the handicap space even with the road, the problem would be solved.

The Administrator said that she would stay in contact with County and keep the Committee informed.

6. New Business

A. Consideration of Removal of 18 Old Light Poles on Front Beach

The old lights at Front Beach are still in place and, in some cases, are right next to a new light. The old ones have not functioned for a while and were not repaired in anticipation of the new lights. Staff learned that they could all be removed and hauled off for eight hundred ninety dollars (\$890) less any salvage value there might be.

Administrator Tucker said that she had not wanted to do anything without the Committee's approval.

Chair Ward asked where the money would come from in the budget, and the Administrator noted that the lighting project had come in under budget and funds were also available in miscellaneous items on Front Beach.

Councilmember Loftus stated that it was a minor issue and that he did not have a problem with the Administrator moving forward. He admitted that he had not noticed the old lights, and that this was an aesthetics issue.

Also having not noticed, Councilmember Ferencz said that she had no opinion on the matter.

The Administrator said that they looked bad and probably detracted from the new ones. She commented that she did not know if there was any time sensitivity with the bid; basically the City was taking advantage of having a contractor on-site.

Councilmember Loftus asked if the old lights could be used elsewhere on the island.

Before that could be done, they would have to be repaired; Director Pitts indicated that he did not know whether some were still functioning.

The Chair referred to the next item on the *Agenda* and asked if these old lights could be used on Forest Trail.

Commenting that the old poles belong to the City and not SCE&G, she explained that SCE&G would not take poles that were not the type they have in their inventory. The poles were installed as part of the Front Beach Enhancement Project, and SCE&G has not been maintaining them like they will the new lights.

Councilmember Loftus thought that the old lights could, possibly, be placed at the Doggie Park and asked that, before they were removed and hauled away, the City should be certain that they could not be used somewhere on the island.

When Councilmember Ferencz asked about proceeding with their removal from Front Beach, Director Pitts expressed the opinion that only removing the lights would drive the cost up since the cost to remove also included any salvage value.

The consensus of the Committee was to look around the island for locations needing light and to discuss the matter again next month.

B. Discussion of Street Lights – Forest Trail

Chair Ward reported that, since the lights went up on Front Beach, his friends have been calling asking for lights where they live, some of whom live on Forest Trail. He recalled that, in the past, SCE&G would put in streetlights when lobbied by a group of resident, and asked whether that was true today.

Administrator Tucker noted that SCE&G would have to get permission from the City to install new streetlights even when lobbied by residents. She commented that, at times, a situation referred to as “conflicting neighbors” occurs when some want more light while others do not; the Administrator referenced 43rd Avenue as an example of there being no streetlights based on all neighbors indicating that they did not want them. In another situation, one (1) streetlight had to be permanently turned off due to arguing neighbors.

The Chair suggested that the Forest Trail community needed to hold a neighborhood meeting to decide what they want and elect a representative to come back to the City if they do want streetlights.

Director Pitts reminded the Committee that the City incurs ongoing expenses when streetlights are added on the island.

Councilmember Ferencz asked whether SCE&G had a plan for the island and where streetlights should be installed.

The Administrator responded that they do have a plan and a streetlight map that shows the location of all lights on the island, but lights were still added occasionally or taken away.

If the streetlights are anything other than the traditional SCE&G streetlight, the expense can be greater than normal because they are considered non-traditional and more expensive to operate.

The Administrator noted that she had received a call from Representative Sottile after he saw this item on the *Agenda*. He stated that the area does not need more lights and that, as originally developed, Forest Trail was intentionally supposed to be like going through a trail in the woods.

C. Discussion of Drainage at 123 Sparrow Drive

Director Pitts reported that last year a resident at the corner of Duck and Sparrow complained about the water in the area; Charleston County’s engineer studied the spot and had it vacuumed out. With residents present on site, the decision was made to use the vacuum truck in the culvert underneath the apron to get to get the water flowing. The neighbor indicated that he would cut a “V” in the ditch from the road to the entrance to the culvert, which he did; by doing this, the level of standing rain water was lowered. The Director added that the neighbors decided they did not want to disturb the corners of Duck Lane or Sparrow Drive.

The resident at 123 Sparrow does not have standing water, but he has a low lying area adjacent to the asphalt and the apron of his driveway which was constantly muddy. He wanted to get the water to move; according to the Director, the water was the result of sheet runoff and no stormwater on that side of the street.

When asked for his recommendation, the Director indicated that there was little that the City could do. He recommended filling in the area between the road and the apron of the driveway

at the resident's expense to raise the level and to drive the water across the road toward the culvert.

Councilmember Loftus suggested asking the property owner to try the Director's plan and to see if that solved the problem.

Chair Ward agreed to talk with the resident.

For the City to go forward would mean designing an infrastructure system for that area. The Administrator commented that the request could be added to the priority list for CTC and/or TST funding, but as the City's top priority focus was on the project from 43rd to 52nd Avenue. She opined that a project at Duck and Sparrow would be a six (6) figure project.

D. Discussion of Hazardous Materials and Shred Day, 9 am to noon, Saturday, April 25

Administrator Tucker stated that this was the only day staff could make this event happen and involve Charleston County, Shred 360 and Public Works personnel; the issue was the County's commitments for Earth Day, April 18th. The Administrator noted that this would be the same day as the Annual Yard Sale at the Recreation Center.

Councilmember Loftus applauded Director Pitts for scheduling Shred Day after tax season.

The Director stated that the County will bring over a truck and personnel handling e-waste collection, as well.

E. Analysis of Relocating Public Works

The Administrator explained that this has been on the horizon since the discussions last year related to the need to come into compliance with NPDES regulations at the Public Works site by re-configuring the site. She stated that staff was asked to look at the option for moving Public Works off-island, and she referred the Committee to the analysis that was included in the meeting packet. (A copy of the analysis is attached to the historical record of the meeting.)

According to the Administrator, the lateness of the report was due primarily to the decision making certain assumptions because the staff could not locate an appropriate odd-island site for the Public Works Department. For the purposes of calculating numbers, a site was located in Mount Pleasant, but it is not something the City would envision, i.e. a site close to the island on Rifle Range or in that vicinity would be ideal.

A look at the marketability of the existing site was one (1) of the assumptions staff made; they did not consider the area now used for overflow parking because it has a big SCE&G easement nor did they consider the two (2) residentially zoned lots behind Public Works. The analysis was based only on the Public Works site. In considering what kind of return the City might get from the current site, staff considered the presence of the under-ground storage tanks that

would have to be abandoned; associated with the abandonment would be monitoring requirements to make sure there has never been a leak to contaminate the soil. If the property was to be transferred, the responsibility for monitoring it would stay with the City; it was difficult to get accurate costs, but the City was told between one hundred and four hundred thousand dollars (\$100,000-400,000) for the possible cleanup of the site, so staff decided to use a figure in the middle for this analysis.

The analysis assumes that the City would need to have fuel pumps, tanks and a canopy at a new site for vehicles and emergency purposes and that other City departments would buy fuel from retail establishments. With a location off-island, there would be travel time to and from the site that would preclude the service delivery residents have today. In addition, the Caterpillar would require a lowboy to carry it or it would be driven to the island at a time of very low traffic volume on the Connector at a speed of eight to eleven (8-11) miles per hour; there was also the option of finding a location on the island on which to construct a shed to house this piece of equipment during the week.

Based on the assumptions noted above, two (2) budgets were developed, i.e. remaining in the existing location or moving off-island. The total budget for staying on the island totaled two hundred eighty-four thousand dollars (\$284,000), and the budget for moving off-island was estimated at one million one hundred sixteen thousand dollars (\$1,116,000).

The next page of the analysis was a listing of the pros and cons expressed by staff.

When asked why the two (2) lots behind Public Works were not included in sale considerations, the Administrator replied that they were both zoned as residential, but the sale would be an option if Council chose to do so. She noted that staff had assumed that the existing Public Works site would be sold for a commercial use.

Administrator Tucker recalled that the two (2) residential lots were purchased originally because land was finite on the island and the City could not predict what its future needs might be.

Councilmember Ferencz asked whether the City fleet could be fueled at the marina if Public Works moved off-island; the Administrator responded that it would be the same as purchasing at any other retail outlet.

The Administrator stated that the analysis was meant to be a working document to give the Committee information on how staff had approached the assignment; she noted that there could be other alternatives that staff has not thought about.

When the Chair asked how long staff had looked for the property, Administrator Tucker recalled Director Kerr telling her numerous times that he was unable to find a location that met the City's need across the Connector; she indicated that the question could be better answered by Director Kerr. Director Pitts reported that Director Kerr had reached out to Lisa Safford, a member of the Planning Commission who works in commercial real estate, to assist him with the search, and they finally found the piece included, which is not large enough. The Director noted that a new site should be an acre, and the one (1) in the analysis was one half ($\frac{1}{2}$) acre.

Chair Ward described looking one (1) day per week for eighteen (18) months to find a location for the Crabpot Players, but he did succeed in finding a property that meets their needs. He commented that Mount Pleasant does not have a lot of new construction, but there were quite a few areas on Long Point Road that have empty buildings with surrounding land.

A lengthy discussion ensued with Chair Ward focusing on the effect of the aesthetics of having the Public Works facility at the entrance of the island, while Councilmember Loftus countered that this was not a concern for people on the island and would be a waste of taxpayer money.

The Chair asked that the City keep the concept of moving Public Works off-island under consideration.

F. Review of FY16 Proposed Operating and Capital Public Works Budgets

General Fund Operating Expenses

Administrator Tucker reported that, for salaries and wages and the items that follow that are affected by that, a merit pool of six percent (6%) has been applied to all departmental budgets, which was equivalent to the change Council made at the end of the fiscal year last year. She added that the Personnel Committee discussed the possibility of re-instating the cost of living adjustment (COLA), with difference between the COLA amount (based on the CPI index) and the six percent (6%) merit pool would be the pool for merit increases. Salaries and wages throughout the City were computed with the addition of two (2) holidays; for the Public Works Department, the additional holidays would have no fiscal impact.

Councilmember Loftus asked whether the City was continuing with the holidays that would impact the budget by approximately twenty thousand dollars (\$20,000); the Administrator related that is what the Personnel Committee was recommending. The Councilmember went on the record saying that he does not support this and would not be able to support it in the budget process.

Chair Ward expressed his complete agreement.

From the Personnel Committee, Councilmember Ferencz reported that they had looked at floating holidays, but every department head had stated that it would be impossible to do that in their departments.

Administrator Tucker stated that, in her opinion, hearing from each department head before making a decision would be very important, and she asked that the department managers be given the opportunity to express their concerns at the Ways and Means Committee meeting.

The Administrator recalled the discussion when the employees were originally given the one (1) floating holiday and floating holidays were discussed in depth at that time. At that time, two (2) floating holidays were granted, one (1) of which was not voted on; the holiday left to the employee's choice later became the established holiday of the day after Thanksgiving. The one (1) floating holiday remaining was and, is, voted on each year by employees, becoming,

therefore, an assigned holiday in the year; typically employees select the day before or after Christmas.

Councilmember Loftus repeated that the reason behind floating holidays was to eliminate overtime.

The Administrator indicated that she understood what the Councilmember was trying to accomplish, but she repeated that Councilmembers need to hear from the department heads. One (1) argument they made was that department managers who have shift employees also were required to have a certain number of employees on duty at any given time; they also do not think floating holidays would reduce overtime.

Director Pitts reasoned that, for instance, when Charleston County, banks and the post office were closed for "x" holiday, residents assumed that the City was also on holiday. For Public Works, that means residents did not put their garbage out for pickup, and the landfill was closed to offload garbage, so Public Works personnel could not pick-up garbage or yard debris on that day.

Councilmember Loftus also stated that, when the City was closed for holidays, residents are denied City services because City offices were closed.

The Director said that when one (1) of his employees was absent, he would pull someone else off their normal assignment to fill in.

In his opinion, a floating holiday was equivalent to another day of vacation.

Chair Ward asked for the Director's thought on the two (2) concerns of the Committee, cutting services and increasing payroll. Director Pitts answered that he would not be cutting any Public Works services; the Fire and Police Departments also would not cut services

Councilmember Loftus stated that he wanted to take care of employees, but he also wanted to maintain the integrity of City services; he noted that the impact to the budget over ten (10) years would be two hundred thousand dollars (\$200,000) and that figure did not take into account the annual pay increases or inflation. Despite his desire to take care of employees, he could not support something that would be detrimental to residents of the City. He voiced confidence that the goal of two (2) additional holidays for employees could be achieved in a fiscally responsible manner.

MOTION: Councilmember Loftus moved that the FY16 budget has a 3% merit pool that can be increased if additional money is available; Chair Ward seconded.

Councilmember Loftus opined that a six percent (6%) merit pool had skewed the remainder of the budget.

Councilmember Ferencz recalled a schedule the Committee reviewed that showed the differences between a three, four, five and six percent (3, 4, 5, 6%) merit pool; at six percent (6%), the merit pool would add ninety-four thousand dollars (\$94,000) to the budget. The

discussion at the Personnel Committee had gone back to the COLA; she stated that, if there was a possibility that an employee would get nothing, and he would be go backwards due to the increase in the cost of living. The Committee did not understand why the COLA was eliminated; they thought it was fairer to have the COLA in the budget every year with a cap on the annual merit pool, which the Personnel Committee thought should be six percent (6%).

Councilmember Loftus explained that Council had eliminated the COLA and gone with a merit-based system because they wanted to provide an incentive for employees to do their jobs better and to send a message to those employees who were sub-standard that they should improve their performance or go somewhere else.

Administrator Tucker explained that the reasons behind the six percent (6%) pool were because the City had reached the point where it was no longer competing with salaries in other local municipalities, and the City was losing personnel after having made the investment to train them.

It was then that Council agreed to a merit pool of six percent (6%) and that Council should keep in mind that, if the City stops keeping pace with other local governments, the City would find itself in three or four (3-4) years back in the same situation. Other municipalities want IOP employees because of their training, and, when employees learn that they could do the same job or just a part of their IOP job for more money, they leave.

Councilmember Ferencz stated that she would prefer that Council make a decision on the merit pool after hearing from department managers rather than set a percentage at this meeting; she noted that the motion at the Personnel Committee stated that the merit pool could not negatively impact the budget.

The Administrator reminded the Committee that the review and study of wages City-wide was assigned at a Council meeting to the Personnel Committee for recommendation(s).

VOTE: The motion PASSED on a vote of 2 to 1 with Councilmember Ferencz casting the dissenting vote.

Continuing with other changes in the Operating Budget, the Administrator pointed out that the State has increased retirement expense for the coming year for both employers and employees. The increase to Workers Compensation represents an increase in the premium due to a change in the experience modifier and not having the one-time insurance accounting correction taken in FY15. The increase to Electricity and Gas was based on twelve (12) months' actual usage and the two percent (2%) increase to SCE&G franchise fees. Councilmember Loftus referred to the line for Vehicle Fuel and Oil and opined that the "per gallon" estimate for FY16 was too high.

Chair Ward noted that the estimate was typically budgeted high because the market for oil was so volatile.

Councilmember Loftus stated that he thought three dollars (\$3) per gallon was a more reasonable figure on which to base the budget.

Globally, the expense for Telephone and Cable will increase based on the City's need for additional bandwidth, which was actually needed now. Water and Sewer expenses have been reduced based on actual in spite of a two percent (2%) increase in sewer fees for FY16. Maintenance for the new Fuelmaster system has been added to the expense line for Maintenance and Service Contracts. Small increases were made to Cleaning and Sanitary Supplies and to Medical and Lab Supplies based on actual. As with Workers Compensation, the City does not have the reduction created by the one-time accounting correction taken in FY15, and premiums are expected to increase for the City's property, liability and flood insurance. The City has been informed of a rate increase for temporary labor that was reflected in the budget. Although expenses for contracted services have been non-existent at 4B year-to-date, to be on the safe side, a small amount has been budgeted for FY16. And, finally, the cost of rollout carts has increased slightly.

Overall, the Public Works Department's FY16 operating budget was projected to increase by five percent (5%) over FY15.

Capital Projects Fund

Under Construction in Progress, the funds have been re-budgeted from FY15 for the balance of funding to complete the engineering and design cost for the Phase II Drainage project, as well as twenty-five percent (25%) of the estimated construction cost of Phase II. The City was working to get all of the easements in place before starting the project; in addition, the City continued to seek funding from CTC and TST funds of Charleston County.

Capital Outlay has decreased significantly from FY15; two-thirds ($\frac{2}{3}$) of the estimated cost to bring the Public Works site into NPDES compliance has been included.

Other items included are a small increase to Drainage Contingency for small drainage projects on the island and the first year of a new five-year (5 yr.) cycle with Eadie's for maintaining the open drainage ditches on the island. Director Pitts explained that the contract was based on the number of linear feet to be cleaned in one (1) year; therefore, the budgeted amount changed from year to year.

Municipal ATAX

A variety of expenses are included in the Maintenance and Service line, such as the City's portion of the solid waste disposal fees on the compactor, right-of-way maintenance and beach path maintenance.

The money budgeted for street signs was increased by one thousand dollars (\$1,000) for new signs in tourism-related areas.

Councilmember Loftus asked for a cost analysis for the City to assume the responsibility for trash and recycling removal from the beach rather than contract with Schupp Enterprises; the Councilmember acknowledged that the Public Works Department would need additional staffing and equipment. His second suggestion was to consider renegotiating the contracts with Schupp for savings to the City.

Chair Ward asked that the staff do whatever was necessary to get the sign fabricated and installed at the Mayor Carmen R. Bunch Park.

Administrator Tucker directed the Committee back to the Municipal Tax Fund budget and to the last line listing the replacement of a 2008 Ford F250 at twenty-eight thousand dollars (\$28,000); the Administrator noted that this replacement had been deferred last year.

Director Pitts stated that he thought the truck could be deferred for another year; it currently has something over fifty-five thousand (55,000) miles on it. He commented that the 2009 Ford truck with the short hopper on it was in worse condition than the 2008 model, but, if it was to be replaced, the hopper would have to be replaced as well. He reminded the Committee that the hopper has been transferred from three (3) previous trucks and was about eighteen (18) years old. If the 2008 truck was deferred this year, the Director would have gotten three (3) more years' service from that truck by the time it rolls forward for replacement in FY18.

If the Director was to swap the 2009 Ford F-150 for replacement in FY16 with the 2008 Ford truck, to defer the 2008 truck and buy a new hopper, the cost should run about forty-two thousand dollars (\$42,000).

MOTION: Councilmember Loftus moved to defer the replacement of the 2008 Ford F250 to FY17 and to replace the 2009 Ford truck and purchase a new hopper in FY16; Chair Ward seconded and the motion PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

State ATAX Fund

City-wide landscaping has been increased for FY16 to include Mayor Carmen R. Bunch Park in the contract, and the contract for street sweeping contract remains the same. The money allotted for Miscellaneous and Contingency was used primarily for tourism-purposes, such as pooper- scooper scoops, pooper-scooper stations and beach trash barrels. Director Pitts was of the opinion that the City should have a skid steer apparatus for beach maintenance; presently he rented this equipment for a week in the fall and a week in the spring to clear the beach access paths. Having the equipment on the island would mean that beach access paths would be cleaned when needed, not twice a year. Director Pitts stated that the weekly rental was twenty-four hundred dollars (\$2,400) per week; having looked at used equipment, he voiced confidence that a skid steer apparatus could be purchased for twenty to twenty-two thousand dollars (\$20,000-22,000). The life span should be fourteen to fifteen years (14-15 yrs.), but, with the salt environment on the island, he was not sure what he could expect the life span to be. He commented that the equipment would be housed in the bay to be kept dry; the skid steer apparatus would also have multiple attachments allowing it to do a variety of jobs. Also in this line was thirty thousand dollars (\$30,000) for MobiMat for beach accesses where needed.

Following up on discussions about the 28th Avenue beach access from the Real Property Committee, Councilmember Ferencz asked whether the MobiMat can be purchased in narrower widths.

Director Pitts replied that MobiMat was only manufactured in the six foot (6 ft.) width.

>\$5,000 – Spread by Fund

This schedule shows the capital expenditures just reviewed spread by funding source. Also included were the assignments of fund balances for future capital expenditures.

10-Year Capital Plan

Expenses for FY16 were listed in the first column, and the balance of the spreadsheet depicted future capital expenditures for the Public Works Department by the year they were scheduled for replacement. Special Projects and the assignment of fund balances were shown on the last page.

Councilmember Ferencz asked for clarification on the sustainable fund for road maintenance included in the Special Projects section of the Capital Plan. The Administrator explained that this was the answer to the question of how much it would cost the City, in annual maintenance, if it took over control of the roads.

The balance of the financial packet was composed of the tools which were provided last year.

The schedule of FY14 Audited Revenues by Source shows that accommodations rentals and every revenue line item associated with rentals was represented and were approximately fifty percent (50%) of the City's total revenue.

A second schedule looked at the percentage of total employees of each department that was necessary to support tourism on the island; it did not take into account increasing the number of BSOs or other staffing increases. This document was used to justify the use of tourism funds to pay for operating expenses; the criteria for the percentages was as follows:

- Police – the analysis was based on monthly call volumes, and conservatively, estimates that twenty-two percent (22%) of the call are tourism-related;
- Fire – the analysis was based on monthly call statistics that indicate approximately fifty-six percent (56%) of the calls are for non-residents; the schedule uses fifty percent (50%); and
- Public Works – Information from the Building Department indicates that approximately thirty-three percent (33%) of IOP residences are involved in short-term rental activity.

The final tool illustrated what portion of the General Fund budget of operating expenses were controllable; the percentage was only eight percent (8%). Changes to personnel or other operating costs that the City has no control over would result in a reduction in services to the residents.

When Chair Ward commented on the increase in legal services FY11, Administrator Tucker explained that legal expenses included in the FY16 budget included fees associated with the 52nd Avenue litigation and the potential expense should the City be challenged on the beach access parking plan. Neither of these items were covered by the City's insurance.

The largest of schedules looked at all expenses for the Public Works Department and spreads them across the funds associated with each expense. At the bottom of the page was a comparison between the FY15 budget and the proposed FY16 budgets.

7. Miscellaneous Business

Next Meeting Date: 5:30 p.m., Thursday, April 9, 2015 in the Conference Room.

8. Adjourn

MOTION: Councilmember Loftus moved to adjourn the meeting at 7:50 p.m.; Councilmember Ferencz seconded and the motion **PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Respectfully submitted:

Marie Copeland
City Clerk