

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE
10:00 a.m., Tuesday, June 3, 2014

The regular meeting of the Personnel Committee was held at 10:00 a.m., Tuesday, June 3, 2014 in the City Hall Conference Room, 1207 Palm Boulevard, Isle of Palms, South Carolina. Attending the meeting were Councilmembers Bettelli and Harrington, Chair Ferencz, Administrator Tucker, Assistant to the Administrator Dziuban and City Clerk Copeland. A quorum was present to conduct business.

1. Chair Ferencz called the meeting to order and acknowledged that the press and public had been 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 May 1, 2014 as submitted; Chair Ferencz seconded and the motion PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

3. **Citizens' Comments – None**

4. **Old Business**

A. Status of City-wide Staffing

Administrator Tucker reported that only one (1) department has vacancies at this time, i.e. the Police Department; the Police Department is looking for one (1) officer position, three (3) BSOs and the Animal Control Officer. The Department expects to hire one (1), possibly two (2), BSOs by the end of the week, and the Department is processing two (2) candidates who have experience for patrol officer positions.

MOTION: Councilmember Bettelli moved to reorder the *Agenda* to cover items C and D of Old Business at this time; Chair Ferencz seconded and the motion PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

C. Discussion of Vacancies on Boards and Commissions

Administrator Tucker explained that the regular process for appointments to Boards and Commissions begins in August when people, who are serving and whose terms expire at the end of the year, are sent a letter asking whether they are interested to serve an additional term. Also at this time, an advertisement for applications from people who want to participate in local government is run in the local paper; the ad also lists the number vacancies to be filled in each board/commission. The Personnel Committee interviews new applicants, usually in October, and the Committee decides on its recommendations to Council in the November meeting.

When vacancies occur out-of-sequence, information on the persons who make up the candidate pool from the prior year's appointments are provided to the Committee for appointee(s) to fill the vacant seats. At the present, the Code Board of Appeals, which is called upon as needed when the construction of a building deviates from the City's building code, has one (1) vacancy, and there is one (1) vacancy on both the Board of Zoning Appeals and the Planning Commission.

Councilmember Bettelli commented that the existence of the Code Board of Appeals is mandated by the State. This group is seldom called upon for a decision; Administrator Tucker recalls only one (1) meeting in her tenure with the City. The ideal candidate will need to be familiar with construction or building codes.

An ideal candidate for the Board of Zoning Appeals (BOZA) would have some kind of legal background or prior experience since it is a quasi-judicial board; qualifications for the Planning Commission are more varied.

The applications and any supporting information on the pool of candidates are included in meeting packets and are the group from which the Committee would make its selection to fill the current vacancies. If the Committee feels that none of the pool of candidates meet the qualifications suitable, staff can reach out and try to get more candidates for these mid-year appointments.

Responding to Chair Ferencz' question, Administrator Tucker stated that staff has not reached out to these candidates. Clerk Copeland noted that each member of this pool was approached in August 2013 about remaining in the pool, and all of these people indicated that they wanted to be in the pool.

The Administrator commented that the terms for these three (3) persons expire on December 31, 2014.

Councilmember Bettelli asked whether Jon Regan Walters had pulled his name from the pool in 2013; Clerk Copeland stated that he was serving on active duty, and she did not know if he had returned.

The Administrator noted that, in her review of the active candidates, she did not see anyone who had any type of legal background or experience; she added that she became concerned that the City may not have a candidate consistent with the requirements for BOZA. Administrator Tucker stated that the Committee is not required to make recommendations today if there are people to whom members might want to appeal to complete an application, or, if the Committee wanted staff to advertise specifically, it could be done. On the other hand, if there is a candidate with whom the Committee is comfortable recommending for a six-month (6 mo.) term on the Planning Commission or the Code Board of Appeals, that could be done as well.

Chair Ferencz commented that, since no candidate in the pool has any kind of legal background, she would like to see staff advertise very specifically for the Board of Zoning Appeals describing what the service requirements are.

MOTION: Councilmember Bettelli moved to go into Executive Session at 10:16 a.m. to discuss appointments to boards and commissions; Chair Ferencz seconded and the motion PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

The Personnel Committee returned to regular session at 10:38 a.m.; Chair Ferencz stated that the Committee had not taken a vote or taken any action while in Executive Session.

MOTION: Councilmember Harrington moved to recommend Bill Mills to fill the unexpired term on the Planning Commission; Councilmember Bettelli seconded and the motion PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

The Committee agreed that, if Mr. Mills is not interested in serving, another candidate can be selected at the June City Council meeting.

D. Consideration of Committee Structure

The Chair stated that she had asked that this item be added to the agenda; she then quoted the City Code as follows:

“All Committees shall consist of three (3) members selected by the Mayor and Council, except for the Ways and Means Committee, which shall consist of the Mayor and the other members of Council.”

The Chair has realized that the Mayor relies heavily on the Committee structure in terms of discussion, research and bringing an issue to Council; Chair Ferencz indicated that she wanted to discuss the possibility of expanding the Committees to five (5) members. With five (5), the Committees would have more brain power and provide more input and more discussion. The Chair recalled that this Committee has some serious issues to consider in the future, and, if one (1) member is absent, only two (2) members of Council are predominantly discussing these “weighty” issues. Chair Ferencz reported that she has spoken with Attorney Halversen and to Mayor Cronin about the process for amending or changing an ordinance; the City Attorney suggested that Chair Ferencz begin the process by talking with the Mayor. Such an action would mean that, in addition to being Mayor, he must be a committee member as well as Chair of the Ways and Means Committee; the remaining that seven (7) councilmembers would serve on three (3) committees, plus Ways and Means Committee, and the remaining two (2) councilmembers would serve on two (2) committees, plus Ways and Means. In the conversation with Mayor Cronin, he advised the Chair to bring the topic before this Committee for discussion.

Councilmember Harrington expressed his opinion that the idea has merit and to do so lands favorably on the idea of holding all committee meetings in one or two (1-2) days, and, in his opinion, less of a burden on councilmembers.

Chair Ferencz paraphrased the Mayor by saying that the City is “a governance by committee;” therefore, there is less need for lengthy discussions at Council meetings. If there were more Councilmember involvement at the Committee level, issues would not require lengthy discussions at Council meetings because more members of Council would have access to information distributed and discussions at committee meetings.

Administrator Tucker stated that the only complication she sees, basically, is that there would be more Council meetings because five (5) members on a committee make up a quorum of Council, and all of the committee meetings would have to be noticed as Council meetings.

Assistant Dziuban said that advertising the meetings as Council meetings opens all of the meetings to the nine (9) members of Council and does not allow the exclusion of four (4) Councilmembers not on a particular committee.

Having reviewed the Committee processes of other local governments, the Chair had seen that Sullivan's Island's committees are composed of the mayor and four (4) members of Council, but, according to the minutes, other Councilmembers attend committee meetings. Administrator Tucker commented that, if more than the members of the body attend the meeting and subsequently participate in the meeting in whatever way – mouthing opinions, hand gestures, etc., the meeting becomes a full Council meeting and must be noticed. This is the primary reason that the Administrator discourages Councilmembers from attending other meetings than the ones to which they are appointed; she also noted that there are times when councilmembers may find it hard to contain themselves from participating and, by doing so, could tip the scale to another committee. When looking at other local governments, one must keep in mind the number of members who make up City Council to know what number makes up a quorum. Regarding Sullivan's Island, the Administrator commented that members may attend other Committee meetings without participating as they wait for another meeting to begin.

Administrator Tucker expressed understanding the burden of keeping everyone informed about what is happening; she recalled communicating with Councilmember Ward about actions taken at another committee, because one (1) agenda item was of particular concern to him.

The Administrator noted that, over the years, discussions have taken place about having nine (9) members of Council for a community the size of the Isle of Palms is highly irregular; typically groups of nine (9) or eleven (11) or twelve (12) make up county-level boards. The Administrator suggested that a Council of seven (7) would be much more manageable for a community of this size; she suggested that it is possible to lower the number from nine (9) to seven (7) and would make it more manageable in terms of communication and keeping people informed. No one has investigated the process needed to reduce the number, but an ordinance change would definitely be included and, possibly, a change to the City's incorporation papers. The ideal time to make such a change would be when some Councilmembers were not going to run for re-election; there would simply be no one filing to fill those seats.

The Administrator agreed that two (2) influencing five (5) others would be less daunting than two (2) members influencing seven (7) Councilmembers.

Chair Ferencz summarized that any committee composed of five (5) Councilmembers would have to be noticed as a Council meeting, and Administrator Tucker added that other members of Council could attend and participate in the committee meeting; they cannot be excluded. The Chair then asked if there were negatives to having five members on a committee; she agreed that technically it would be a meeting of Council, but, in actuality, it would be a portion of Council meeting for a specific purpose.

Councilmember Bettelli added that, since a meeting would be noticed as a Council meeting and would have a quorum of members present, any vote taken by the Committee would be a vote of Council and would not be discussed again.

With that stated, Chair Ferencz conceded that the Isle of Palms must continue to have three (3) member committees.

Councilmember Bettelli concluded that the City needs to find a way to get information to the full body of Council, possibly even sooner, before a Council meeting.

Chair Ferencz stated her issue that a committee researches an issue, discusses it, votes on it and takes it to Council with a recommendation for approval, but Council has not had the information that the committee had from beginning to end. And, even if they get the end information, they do not know the thought process the committee went through to get to the point of making a recommendation to Council.

Assistant Dziuban expressed the opinion that the best source of information for any committee is the minutes of the meetings; she stated that people frequently come to her office asking what happened at a meeting. The Assistant indicated that she does her best to remember everything to give a good account, but she conceded that the recorder does an even better job. In her opinion, the clerk's minutes are the most accurate and complete communication of a committee's actions; she questioned that the real issue was the timing of meetings to get minutes into Council's hands earlier.

The Chair concluded that everyone feels the need for more information to the full Council, and, if it is decided that the minutes are the way to go, she questions the amount of work the Clerk can do.

Councilmember Bettelli stated that several members of Council are very analytical and want to see the data that the Committee has used to make its decision; he suggested providing Council with the supporting information upfront that they may be more receptive of the committee's recommendation.

Councilmember Harrington commented that telling Council that a committee's recommendation is the result of a unanimous vote should help to persuade Council to accept a recommendation. In addition, he suggested providing Council with the rationale behind the vote.

The Administrator voiced the opinion that this is simply the nature of the beast and how the system works; when advocacy is needed, each committee chair must make the case using as many tools as needed to influence the entire body. Administrator Tucker also indicated that, many times when people want to vote in the negative, they will say it is because they did not have enough time to study or enough information on which to base a decision. At times, an issue will be brought forward, and, unfortunately, the balance of Council has not had the time, in their lives, to study the issue, to know that it is coming forward, to note it on the agenda and to call the Administrator to ask for more information; it is not until the moment in the meeting, because their lives are busy and full, that a negative vote is cast. As an example, the Administrator said that, if one were to read the Personnel Committee minutes from January forward, a Councilmember would have been armed with all available information related to the need for a mechanic. Administrator Tucker stressed that the opportunity to get the information is available to all of Council via email, telephone, questions, etc. in advance of a meeting.

Assistant Dziuban added that staff prefers to get inquiries and questions before a meeting when they have all of the City's resources from which to gather the answers. When caught in the moment of a meeting, staff can be taken off point and, often, must delay an answer.

Councilmember Harrington stated that, if a Councilmember is going to vote no, that vote should be based on substantive information; he also stated that, if the City is going to believe in the committee system where everything is thoroughly vetted, Council should trust in that system to work.

The Chair stated that she is taking from this discussion that there are procedural reasons why committees cannot be expanded to five (5) members. By staying at three (3), the committee chair is still challenged to make the balance of Council feel informed enough that they have the information needed to cast an informed vote. Possibly in the reporting system, the "why" be presented along with the recommendation. The Chair indicated that, in her opinion, it is important to inform other committees that this discussion has occurred and the reasons behind the discussion.

Chair Ferencz stated that all Councilmembers need to be more attuned to the minutes of all of the standing committees; she added that, if a councilmember does not understand something coming before Council, he should read the meeting's minutes and the minutes of the previous meeting if necessary. The history of a committee's discussions on issues is in meeting minutes; all necessary information is available to every Councilmember.

Councilmember Harrington commented that part of the discussion needs to include statements emphasizing the values of the committee system and that it is incumbent upon Councilmembers to investigate the minutes.

B. Discussion of FY15 Budget

1. Consideration of Reservation of Funds Policy

Chair Ferencz commented that she had asked Treasurer Suggs to attend the meeting to answer questions from the Committee. The Chair initially asked for an explanation of the schedule entitled "Estimated Reserve Requirements."

Treasurer Suggs recalled that, at the Council meeting, staff was asked to consider options on this schedule, such as pushing out the replacement schedule by a year or two (1-2) on particular items or the possibility of financing some portion of the replacement cost of a particular item. Council was looking for something to make the annual required reserve smaller; staff has discussed various things that could be done on paper to illustrate the different options, but it became too complicated so staff returned to the original document. The schedule makes it somewhat clear what taking one (1) of those options would mean dollar-wise.

In directing attention to FY14, the Treasurer noted that the City has purchased the garbage truck already, but, in FY15, the rescue truck and the Public Works packer are scheduled for replacement. These two (2) purchases are in the FY15 budget, the FY15 General Fund budget

is balanced, and the fund balance at the end of the year is manageable. If FY15 remains unchanged, the City will not be replacing any major vehicles until FY18. Treasurer Suggs stated if, at this time next year, Council were to determine that it could not set aside enough money in FY16 because it is too much of a burden to the Capital Projects and the ATAX reserves, it would finance the next purchase, a Mack garbage truck. Financing that item would mean a reduction to the annual reserve of approximately fifty thousand dollars (\$50,000) a year. If the City were to decide to go back to financing all equipment, this schedule would go away entirely, and the City would be back in the situation of borrowing money to finance "big ticket" vehicles. Treasurer Suggs noted that it is never cheaper to borrow money than to pay cash for large items.

The Treasurer stated that, in a typical municipal lease, the financing entity would not finance only a portion of the cost for a vehicle, but the City could go to a local bank to borrow x amount of money for x term and use the money to acquire the piece of equipment.

The Chair asked whether the City could use its reserves at any time to make extra payments or to pay off the loan off entirely.

According to Administrator Tucker, the way these loans are structured, there are components that explain early payoff penalties; typically the City would have to get to a certain point in the lease to be able to pay it off early without a penalty. The Administrator expressed her opinion that, if the City were to enter into a lease that would allow the City to pay it off at any time without a penalty, the financing entity would likely charge a higher interest rate, because they would lose money if the loan is paid off early.

The Administrator reiterated the fact that money going into the reserve is money that is in the bank; the money budgeted to be expensed is expensed. The Administrator explained that this schedule represents equipment purchases that the City used to finance over six or eight (6-8) years and would cost the City in interest expense. With this schedule, the equipment costs are spread over their recommended useful life allowing the City to save money and to buy these pieces of equipment with cash, saving the interest expense. This schedule does not reflect the purchase of small items such as a patrol vehicle, ATVs, pickup trucks, etc. which are budgeted for and expensed in any budget year. Administrator Tucker stated that it is easy to become confused between fund balance and the reserves; she noted that she frequently reminds Councilmembers that they must look at the fund balance as well as the balance in the reserve/savings account, which together are the true fund balance. If the City were to experience an emergency, there was a need to spend money out of the reserve fund and to delay a purchase in that year, City Council would have the purview, in any budget year, to use those funds for that purpose. The money does not go away until such time as a check is written to purchase a specific piece of equipment.

The Administrator and Treasurer noted that, if the City can get through the startup period, by FY20, the contributions become much smaller and reasonably stable going forward.

Chair Ferencz recalled discussions at Council where it was said that City revenues are not keeping up with City expenses; she stated that the contributions to this reserve fund are part of the reason.

Treasurer Suggs stated that, until the time that the City is unable to make contributions to the reserve, the City should stay on this path as long as it can afford to do so.

Chair Ferencz asked whether the City can afford to do this in FY15; she agreed that it is "great" to save this amount of money, but she questioned making these contributions at the expense of residents paying more millage because this is part of the expense the City is incurring.

Administrator Tucker stated that the City cannot fix the General Fund if it stops saving.

The Chair countered that, if the City stops spending capital, the City does not have to transfer as much from other sources into the Capital Projects fund as it currently does; that, in turn, will help the General Fund.

The Administrator said that to stop saving is not going to reduce General Fund expense, because the only way staff has sourced the Capital Projects Fund has been from the year-end positive net results in the General Fund. The Administrator stated that the only way that she sees not buying these things affects the General Fund is that the City cannot provide services to residents that they expect the City to provide. It would affect the City in that there would not be garbage trucks to pick up garbage or there would not be the proper equipment to fight fires, so not saving would affect the City operationally.

Treasurer Suggs remarked that these pieces of equipment must be purchased, so the money has to be there, and it is always going to be more expensive, in the long run, to lease. Ultimately taxpayers, to the extent, a purchase is not financed from ATAX funds, will pay the bill either way, and leasing costs more money over time.

The Treasurer explained that the money reserved for equipment purchases from both State ATAX and Municipal Accommodations Fees are left in their respective fund balances until the time comes to make the purchase.

Chair Ferencz concluded that the City is dipping into the reserves for the tourism funds and, by doing that, Council will have to have a tax increase because the City will no longer have those reserves; therefore, the Capital Projects Fund does affect operations in that the funds that would normally be looked to for operational costs are no longer there because they have been used for capital reserves.

Administrator Tucker stated that, if the City is using a great deal of the fund balance in Municipal ATAX, State ATAX and Hospitality Taxes towards operations and the City is using those funds to assist with capital expenses, when the time comes that the fund balances are zero, the City will have to find some other way to pay for capital expenses. The Administrator said that staff does believe that the level to which the City is using the tourism funds to help pay for expenses, though completely warranted and justified, on the General Fund side will end in about three (3) years unless there is a significant up-tick in tourism revenue; the City will then have to look to other sources of revenue, of which a tax increase is only one (1).

Councilmember Bettelli commented that the useful life on the schedule is the City's best estimate; there is always the change that one (1) will last longer or the one (1) will have to be replaced sooner.

- B. Consideration of Adjustments to Frozen Wage Ranges
- C. Consideration of Adjustments to Comparative Wage Ranges

Assistant Dziuban stated that staff has listened to the comments made in the budget discussions at Ways and Means and Council and is offering some flexibility in moving forward. Staff feels that addressing the problems outlined is very important, especially in light of the fact that one (1) department had an issue, Council decided that it was meritorious to address, and staff wants to ensure that the problem does not occur in any other department.

The Assistant noted that the initial pages are repeats of the information provided to the Committee at the previous meeting. She recalled that Councilmembers had questioned whether the comparisons with other local governments offered sufficient data; what is presented here is a little more in terms of the number of municipalities to which the Isle of Palms was compared when the Fire Department analysis was prepared. The Assistant noted that it was difficult to find a community that was a match to the Isle of Palms, making an apples-to-apples comparison was hard to do. The City reached out to many local governments; those listed on the schedule are the ones that responded.

Directing attention to page 7, Assistant Dziuban reminded the Committee of staff's recommendations from the May meeting; they are

1. A five to ten percent (5%-10%) increase to the wage ranges for positions that are at the maximum of the pay range;
2. A ten percent (10%) increase to the wage ranges for positions where the IOP minimum and maximum pay ranges are below the local average by ten percent (10%) or more.
3. A five percent (5%) increase to the wage ranges for positions where the IOP minimum range is six percent (6%) of the local average, but the IOP maximum is five percent (5%) or more below the local average.
4. No change to the wage ranges for positions where the IOP wage range is five percent (5%) below the local average.

On page 9, staff has listed several options for implementing the recommendations above and the impact of each on the FY15 budget:

A.	Implement all recommendations effective July 1, 2014	\$61,500
B.	Delay implementation of all recommendations until January 1, 2015	23,750
C.	Delay implementation of recommendation A until January 1, 2015 but implement other recommendations effective July 1, 2014	47,500
D.	Delay implementation of A until January 1, 2015, implement other recommendations July 1, 2014, and reduce salary compression by half	31,000

- E. Replace all recommendations with an increase in the spread between minimum and maximum wage ranges for all positions effective January 1, 2015 -0-
- F. Only implement recommendation A effective January 1, 2015 -0-

In discussing option B above, Treasurer Suggs explained that employees at their maximum wage range do not recapture past merits but become eligible for the next regularly scheduled merit evaluations in January 1, 2015. This option only addresses wage issues at the minimum of the range.

Treasurer Suggs state option E is a good option, but increasing the spread between maximum and minimum provides no relief for positions at the bottom and could make IOP less attractive to potential new hires. Assistant Dziuban added that option B could be taken along with other options presented.

Chair Ferencz commented that the ranges need to be increased going forward to avoid having to do it again in a few years. The Chair voiced support for taking action for the employees that are at the maximum for their position, but questioned where the money would come from. The Chair stated that these are fixed costs that Council agreed were increasing year after year.

The Treasurer reported that she had studied the Fire Department analysis in preparation for this meeting, and she stated that staff and Council must remember and think equitably for all City employees. The Fire Department employs about one-third ($\frac{1}{3}$) of the City's head-count; the total number of City employees is eighty-nine (89) and thirty-four (34) are in the Fire Department. After receiving an analysis very similar to this, City Council voted to put one hundred twenty-five thousand dollars (\$125,000) toward adjusting wages in the Fire Department. Treasurer Suggs indicated that she was making these comments to put these recommendations into perspective.

Chair Ferencz added that the situation in the Fire Department was the reason that the Personnel Committee had requested this study, because Council felt that it was not equitable to do it for one (1) department and not do it for all.

Treasurer Suggs said that she prefers option B because it addresses all of the recommendations, but delays implementation until January 1, 2015 and making it more affordable. She stated that the impact for FY15 is twenty-three thousand seven hundred fifty dollars (\$23,750), but, when considering what was done for one (1) segment of the employee population, it is not a significant amount of money.

Chair Ferencz commented that the one hundred twenty-five thousand dollars (\$125,000) equated to four hundred forty thousand dollars (\$440,000) in the FY15 budget.

The Treasurer reminded the Committee that the one hundred twenty-five thousand dollars (\$125,000) represents only one (1) of three (3) adjustments that were made; the wage ranges were increased by ten percent (10%), so that people at the bottom of the range got an increase, and a ten percent (10%) actual increase to all employees except the Chief and the department

secretary. Staff is not considering anything on that level for the balance of employees, but is trying to address some issues on the minimum end of the pay ranges.

Administrator Tucker stated that the easiest process to implement, to have a fair impact on the issues and a small fiscal impact would be the combination of options B and E, assuming that the Committee believes in the work product and believes in the solution.

MOTION: Councilmember Bettelli moved to add \$23,750 in expense to the FY15 budget by implementing options B and E, making employees at the maximum of their pay range eligible for wage increases effective January 2015 and increasing spread between minimum and maximum pay ranges from 40% to 50%; Councilmember Harrington seconded.

The Chair indicated that her conundrum was whether the Committee should be looking at the sixty-one thousand five hundred dollars (\$61,500) rather than the twenty-three thousand seven hundred fifty dollars (\$23,750); she also asked if the Committee was supporting the lower number to get Council to approve.

The Administrator assured the Committee that the larger number would not have been put forth if staff had not believe it was the amount that was necessary; however, it is important to do something. Administrator Tucker noted that the Police Department is now steadily losing people, not as dramatically as in the Fire Department. With even the smaller dollar amount, there may be a chance of slowing down the departures and to maintain some key level people who are being faced with the problem of not having any ability to increase their salaries as long as they continue to work here.

According to the Treasurer, deciding upon the twenty-three thousand dollar (\$23,000) option is doing everything that the sixty-one thousand dollars five hundred dollars (\$61,500) does but delays it to the first of the year.

The Chair asked if the amount would remain at sixty-one thousand five hundred dollars (\$61,500) in future budgets. Treasurer Suggs responded that, once someone's wage actual rate goes higher, it rolls into the calculation every year at the higher number.

Chair Ferencz stated that the Committee and Council need to be equitable. She acknowledged that Council was in an emergency situation when it acted for the Fire Department, but the pay study was assigned to the Personnel Committee to be equitable by looking at the wages in all departments.

VOTE: The motion PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

5. New Business – None

6. Miscellaneous Business

Councilmember Harrington asked whether the addition of a part-time mechanic could be re-visited in Council. Chair Ferencz said that she had not wanted the motion to go before Council because she could see that it was going to be defeated.

Administrator Tucker responded that Councilmember Harrington could ask for a motion to be re-considered. The Administrator stated that the only dilemma she could foresee was the budget because the mechanic's position was not included in the most current version of the FY15 budget. If that motion is made at the Ways and Means meeting and passes, staff would have to generate a new version before the Council meeting.

Councilmember Harrington's concern was that the objective in recent months is to save money, and, through the research, staff proved the City would save money with a part-time mechanic. In addition the Police, Fire and Public Works Departments agreed to reduce their maintenance budget by seventy-three thousand dollars (\$73,000) to pay for this position.

Chair Ferencz stated that she thinks the Committee would have a better chance at getting this position accepted if they waited until the FY16 budget year; in the meantime, she suggested that the Committee members have individual conversations with other members of Council to garner their support.

Administrator Tucker stated that the problem getting a successful outcome was the price of the vehicle; Councilmember Harrington was quick to note that the motion did not include a vehicle.

Chair Ferencz recalled the timeline for goals the Committee wanted to complete in 2014, but she noted that, in June, the Committee was to determine measurable goals for calendar year 2015 for City Administrator's position and to create a first draft. The Chair suggested that the Committee begin in July by looking at the City Administrator's evaluation tool.

Next Meeting Date: 10:00 a.m., Tuesday, July 1, 2014 in the Conference Room.

When asked about the new employee evaluation tool, Chief Buckhannon replied that he was very close to completing the project, and the supervisor evaluation builds off of it; he indicated that he can have ready for the July meeting.

Administrator Tucker reminded the Committee that their role in evaluation tools is one of approving the document.

Since the new form is very similar to the new one, Councilmember Harrington asked that the Chief send the old forms to members of the Committee for review.

7. Executive Session – not needed

8. Adjourn

MOTION: Councilmember Bettelli moved to adjourn the meeting at 12:18 p.m.; Councilmember Harrington seconded and the motion PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted,

Marie Copeland
City Clerk