CITY OF BURTON
REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
JULY 6, 1999, 7:30 P.M., COUNCIL CHAMBERS

INVOCATION AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE IS LED BY CHARLES CROSS.

THIS REGULAR MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER BY VICE-PRESIDENT PAULA ZELENKO AT 7:30 P.M.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Zelenko, Martinbianco, Cross, Walls, Centilli, Cox, Hammon

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

OTHERS PRESENT: Atty. R. Austin, C. Abbey, Personnel Director, J. Major, DPW Director,
J. Adams, Clerk's Office.

Cross moved and Centilli seconded the following motion:

Approve and authorize the minutes of the following meetings: Special Council Meeting of June 21, 1999 at 6:00 p.m., Special Council Meeting of June 21, 1999 at 6:30 p.m., Special Council Meeting of June 21, 1999 at 7:00 p.m., and the Regular Council Meeting of June 21, 1999 at 7:30 p.m.
Motion carried, 6-0.

Mr. Cox indicated he believes the minutes of the Special Meeting of May 25, 1999, had not been approved. He questioned regarding approving them without first being reviewed.

The Clerk's office will check further to see if the minutes have been approved or not.

PETITION/APPEALS:

Lot Split #99-16, applicant appeal of Planning Commission's decision of May 11, 1999, denial by a 9-0 vote. (Postponed from Regular Council Meeting of June 7, 1999 at 7:30 P.M.)

Mrs. Walls said as a member of the Planning Commission, they did make the decision by a 9-0 vote to deny this because it is not consistent with the neighborhood.

Mr. Austin said he reviewed Mr. Hamilton's correspondence to Mr. Hammon, dated June 7, 1999, regarding the procedure to be used by the Council in this appeal. There should be ground rules set as to the form the appeal itself will take. Mr. Hamilton suggested it be an appeal based upon the record of the Planning Commision or a denova appeal, which means starting essentially from scratch. Mr. Austin stated further, he thinks either one is fine and agrees with Mr. Hamilton's opinion.

Mr. Austin suggested that even if the Council elects to have an appeal just on the record of the Planning Commisison, the applicant should be afforded an opportunity to address the Council.

COUNCIL DISCUSSION:

Mr. Martinbianco asked for clarification from Mr. Austin of the two procedures for the appeal.

Martinbianco moved and Hammon seconded the following motion:

To conduct the hearing as an administrative appeal for Lot Split #99-16.

Mr. Hammon said Mr. Austin stated the applicants can in fact, if they wish to address the Council, be afforded that right, and the applicants should be afforded the right to address the Council if they so choose to.

Mr. Martinbianco said he has no objection to that if it is allowed under the rule.

Mr. Austin said if there is any due process property rights here, it would be those of the applicants. He is not suggesting whether the appeal should be approved or denied, he is only suggesting that he thinks procedural due process would require that they be given a brief opportunity to address the Council, even in the context of an administrative appeal.

Mr. Martinbianco spoke of allowing a time of five minutes and stated further, that there are residents here that are also opposed to it as well. He suggested allowing five minutes for both sides to present the case for and against.

Mr. Austin said it would then be a denova appeal. If it is your desire to conduct an administrative appeal, and that you should conduct an administrative appeal that affords the applicant time not to exceed five minutes to address the Council, then the Council would go into deliberations based on the record made at the Planning Commission.

Mr. Martinbianco said he would opt for that form of administrative appeal.

Mrs. Zelenko asked for clarification of allowing just the applicant to speak and not audience participation.

Mr. Austin said the audience could participate during audience participation portion of this public meeting, but as far as this hearing goes, it is appropriate to conduct it on an administrative basis, and the applicant should be afforded some opportunity to address the Council in addition.

Mr. Cross inquired if the same motion was made and passed at the last Council meeting of June 7, 1999, and why they need to re-do this again.

Mrs. Zelenko said possibly to reaffirm because there is a change in attorneys, and Mr. Hamilton was present at the last meeting.

Mr. Cross asked further if they would need to re-vote, because they voted on it, 6-0 at the last Council meeting to do an administrative appeal.

Mr. Austin said he was not at the last Council meeting and did not realize that. If it was already handled at this aspect and it was decided what form the appeal would take, he has no problem with that.

Mrs. Walls asked to see the Council minutes of June 7, 1999.

Mr. Austin reviewed the motion in the minutes concerning the case and indicated that it seems to presume an administrative appeal.

Mr. Centilli read aloud the motion in the minutes of the June 7, 1999, Council meeting concerning the case.

Mrs. Zelenko asked for a roll call vote of Councilman Martinbianco's motion to conduct the hearing as an administrative appeal for Lot Split #99-16.

Motion carried, 7-0.

Scott Amy, 2229 Judd Rd., Burton, MI, spoke regarding his Lot Split case #99-16. He stated he has enough property to put a house on it, and he is within the ordinance. His mother-in-law has owned the property for 30 years, and he feels this is wrong to be stopped for no reason. There is nothing in her deed that says the land cannot be split. Mr. Amy stated further, the neighbors do not want it there and he can understand that, but it should not stop him. The house he wants to put there is an $80,000 home and after it is all done, it will be worth $150,000. Mr. Amy said if it is denied, he would like to have something written as to why.

COUNCIL ACTION:

Centilli moved and Walls seconded the following motion:

To deny Lot Split #99-16, upholding the Planning Commission's decision of May 11, 1999.
Motion carried, 7-0.

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT:

Mr. Abbey stated that for Item #8, they ask the Council to approve a new MERS rate for AFSCME. They will see the different rates and supporting document from MERS, and the calculations where AFSCME's contribution rate has dropped. He is asking to adopt this resolution so they can forward that to MERS with a copy of that agreement.

Mr. Abbey stated further, a union member of the AFSCME bargaining committee questioned the percentage of drop by some .06 %. They have a call in to verify the numbers, but they do believe the numbers are correct.

Mr. Martinbianco inquired regarding Item #8, and asked if the only one they are dealing with is strictly Division 11, which is just the AFSCME unit.

Mr. Abbey indicated they will also get the one for Division 02, which is Patrol and Detectives in COAM. When they negotiated the agreement last year and capped them, they will have a contribution rate as well. They are going to try and work out the details and it is their belief, that it should only pertain to senior patrol officers and detectives and not the junior patrol. The junior patrol falls into a different category and their contribution rate is much less.

COMMITTEE REPORTS: None.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

Laurie Tinnin, 2340 Harmony, Burton, MI, inquired regarding the 5% that both the COAM and POAM would pay.

Mr. Abbey said in the COAM contract, they have a cap at that present level which is the same level as the POAM.

Mrs. Tinnin inquired regarding when the contract expires, the amended actuarial for the SEIU, and the cost of living benefits.

Mr. Abbey responded that in December of 1997, they modified their contract and chose to back that date up to when they entered that portion of the pension plan. The employees opted, and did not see anyone retiring in the near future out of that bargaining unit, so therefore, there was no sense in paying for that benefit for a couple of additional years.

Robert Sak, 3172 Eastgate, Burton, MI, said he appeared at the Zoning Board two times regarding building a garage in his back yard, and both times were turned down. He spoke further of the City ordinances, maintaining his back yard, and the need for storage. Mr. Sak presented pictures of a structure on another residents property and addressed the size of the structure in comparison to his property.

Pauline Dargel, 6119 Hugh St., Burton, MI, inquired regarding approving the minutes of May 25, 1999.

Mrs. Zelenko indicated the Clerk's office will look into if it has or not been approved, and if not approved, they will bring it to the next meeting.

Mrs. Dargel spoke regarding Attorney Grandholm's comments in an article pertaining to her speech to the press in Ludington. She said Attorney Grandholm stated open government is good government, and everyone in government should realize this. The right of the citizen to know is absolutely critical to the government. Mrs. Dargel inquired regarding when the minutes are approved, and is it at that point the Clerk's office does the resolution that will be the formality for all time. She commented on having the minutes approved before a resolution would be in affect.

Mr. Austin asked for clarification of Mrs. Dargel's question of should there be an official resolution prepared when Council makes a motion and passes it in a Council Meeting.

Mrs. Dargel commented on resolutions that are assigned a number or a code, and inquired further as to the resolutions being formulated after the minutes have been approved.

Mr. Austin said the resolutions with the master agenda that Council has presented, are the resolutions that are adopted by this Council. Once in a while they will adopt a separate resolution that frequently is prepared by their office. As to when those numbers are assigned, he does not know.

Mr. Cox said he believes Mrs. Dargel's question is, when in fact does the resolution become a legal document if we are talking about a resolution that goes to the Liquor Control Commission. Is it prior to minutes, and that resolution being approved by Council. Mr. Cox said you can always change and adopt or add to those minutes in the previous meeting. Once you accept the minutes of the meeting, he assumes you would consider that is the action taken without change. Mr. Cox inquired as to what point in time, before or after, that the resolution would become effect.

Mr. Austin said it is his opinion that a resolution takes effect, if the majority of this body votes on it and it is adopted. At the time minutes are approved, to correct something that was done in error, the resolution might at some point be changed. The public has a right to rely immediately upon any resolution adopted by this Council. Mr. Austin re-iterated that once and awhile, they are asked to prepare a separate resolution on a specific issue, but generally, they are prepared in advance of Council action.

Mrs. Dargel spoke further regarding the resolution, Freedom of Information Act, and the budget for the part-time Parks & Recreation Director. She indicated at the last Council meeting they chose to add $15,000 more to the $10,000 for the sum of $25,000 for a part time director. She feels there should have been public comment at that point because that was a change to a change, and she believes the $10,000 was an amendment. Mrs. Dargel asked if it was a budget amendment.

Mrs. Zelenko said there was Council action taken to increase the allocation for a total of $25,000 for the purpose of a Parks & Recreation Director, and to handle the cost associated with the office that is involved. That action passed.

Mrs. Dargel asked where the dollars come from to provide that action.

Mrs. Zelenko responded from the General Fund.

Mr. Hammon asked Mrs. Dargel if she is suggesting every time Council moves into Council Action and an amendment is made to any line item on the agenda, that the Chairperson stops and goes immediately back to audience participation.

Mrs. Dargel responded that the change had already been provided.

Mr. Hammon said that during budget discussion, the Council had decided to put $10,000 into Parks & Recreation. No motion was made, then Mrs. Zelenko decided to increase that and made a motion to increase it by $15,000. He does not remember it as an amendment and asked if the minutes reflected that.

Mrs. Zelenko indicated they did not reflect that.

Mr. Martinbianco said this was done during Council discussion which the past policy of the City Council has been to open those issues for discussion by the audience at that point, because they were not in Council action. Also, if you go back to the minutes which was approved, you asked Mr. Becker for clarification on the issue and Mr. Becker agreed that any changes to the proposed budget should be in the form of an amendment, which he thought was amendment #3. He feels audience participation at that point in time should have been entertained if they are going to follow past practice.

COUNCIL DISCUSSION:

Mr. Cox said at the previous meeting he was out of town, and was a little surprised and disappointed as to the amendments that were made to the budget. It is his belief that those changes created a deficit budget and he does not believe that as a Council, they should be passing a deficit budget. He indicated that they need to consider the impact of this and he hopes Mr. Becker's comments as he heard about in the previous meeting of financing of certain equipment, would have been given to more consideration then it had. Mr. Cox stated further, if you refer to the Charter, it speaks to not spending more then the proposed income. He asked Mr. Abbey if with the changes made in the budget at the previous meeting, are we now proposing a deficit budget and is the expense going to exceed the revenues as proposed.

Mr. Abbey said he did not at present have his budget book with him.

Mr. Cox said he believes it was not a deficit budget when presented to Council, and there were things added that moved it to a deficit budget. He thinks they need to look at it as a Council.

Mr. Abbey said he does not disagreed that they should look at it and make sure they are not in a deficit mode. It is not unusual and at the end of the year, there has always been transfers to make up either for deficits in certain individual budgets, and if there are surpluses in other budgets, they move money around depending on where it is at. Mr. Abbey stated further, that you can follow history and see that has happened.

Mr. Cox said there has been surplus budgets.

Mr. Abbey said they always balance at the end of the year out of one account from the others.

Mr. Cox said he is saying that as a Council, not administration, they may need to make changes to comply with the Charter.

Mr. Abbey said they will look into it first thing in the morning and have a response.

Mr. Austin said the Charter, Section 7.2, provides such budget proposals shall be presented to the Council as the first regular meeting in April. The proposed expenditures set forth in such budget, shall not exceed the expected revenues in the City for the next fiscal year by an amount greater then the expected unencumbered funds not transferred in any special account under the authority of 7.7. Mr. Austin stated further, we get to include on the plus side unencumbered funds, and we don't have to just account for anticipated revenues.

Mr. Cox inquired if all the funds beyond that also.

Mr. Austin responded yes.

Mr. Cox said another concern he has is the Davison Road Water Project. It is a project engineering estimated at $100,000, Division A. The bids came back at $238,000, which is 100% high. Through conversations, he understands there is a couple of different types of bid processes, one being an invitational bid and a public bid.

Mr. Major said they are both public bids.

Mr. Cox asked how they bid this particular project.

Mr. Major said there is two selection processes that they are allowed to use. One is by invitation and one by advertisement in the Michigan Contractor & Builders Magazine. This particular one was by invitation. The last bidders they had, that is where they were selected from, the previous low bidders on one of the past Michigan contractor type builder advertisement.

Mr. Cox inquired as to contacting three bidders.

Mr. Major said they contacted three contractors.

Mr. Cox said the bids were twice what the estimate was.

Mr. Major indicated mistakes were made.

Mr. Cox said his concern is the Council made their decision based on the engineering estimate that we do not expect to see go more then 10 to 15%.

Mr. Major said you do not expect the bids at the end of the project, the final construction cost of the project, to exceed the allocated amount by the City Council at the time bids are taken by 10%.

Mr. Cox said he expects when an engineering estimate comes in, that it at least be realistic. It was twice the engineering estimate.

Mr. Major said they were not very accurate on their estimate.

Mr. Cox said his other concern is when the City is limiting itself to three contractors, and he believes that an engineering firm that we hire, should go out and look throughout the County or beyond. Mr. Cox asked what the other option is and how that is advertised.

Mr. Major said through the Michigan Contractor Builders.

Mr. Cox asked if it is state-wide.

Mr. Major responded yes.

Mr. Cox inquired further of the three contractors, and the reason one was eliminated.

Mr. Major said failure to comply with our requirements, lack of a bid bond.

Mr. Cox said they are now down to two people they invited to put on a project, to award a project to, and we are talking about one of the reasons the cost is so high is because they are busy.

Mr. Major said their bid is reflective of the period of time, and reflective of todays contract prices.

Mr. Cox stated when they get a bid that looks like that, we should say that is too high. Mr. Cox asked Mr. Major if he thought it was excessive for Davison Road.

Mr. Major indicated he did not, and stated further, they are serving Eastmoreland Subdivision for a second fee.

Mr. Martinbianco commented on construction in Meadowcroft where there was some excavating done, and the developer was directed to take steps to fill it in.

Mr. LaDuke said they are currently using that site to dump the dirt that they are getting from the ditches. They are filling that as a viable place to dump their excess dirt, which they do not have a lot of places to dump.

Mr. Martinbianco inquired regarding busted concrete in Maple Pointe.

Mr. LaDuke said the developer was given 10 days to remove the concrete or they will.

Mr. Martinbianco said a communication they received from Mr. McDougall that he sent a letter to Police Chief Benthall in reference to a problem with release of information from our Police Department, could have implications of liability on our part. As a matter of record, this might be referred to the Police Chief for his response to the Council or Mr. McDougall.

Mr. Martinbianco inquired in regards to Item #6.

Mr. Major said the State Highway Department decided since the last filing they did last year, that they want copies of all existing plats, even though Potter Road is a County road, and the State has a copy of the plat. This is a new policy, ACT 51 section of the Highway Department, and they will not go over to another department to obtain a copy, so starting this year, we have to provide them with copies.

Mrs. Walls stated Mr. Kefgen was expecting a resolution on the agenda tonight and she does not see it there.

Mrs. Zelenko responded that the Parks & Recreation Commission would like Mr. Kefgen to come to the Parks & Recreation meeting and make a presentation. She spoke to Mr. Kefgen and he will be at the next P & R meeting of July 21st, at 4:00 p.m.

Mr. Centilli inquired to Mr. Major as to how long the DPW has been opening bids for water lines, and even though CHMP made an error on the estimate, if it sounded unrealistic to him.

Mr. Major responded they have been opening bids for 26 years, and the estimate did not seem unrealistic.

Mr. Centilli commented further that they did take three bids in.

Mr. Major said they followed the procedure set up by the City Controller's Office, by his direction.

Mr. Centilli inquired regarding Item #7 on the agenda, and if their intent was to serve liquor during the brunch hours of 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

Mr. Major said his understanding is they cannot, but they need special approval to stay open and serve food because of the liquor being in the building.

Mr. Hammon spoke in regards to Mr. Sak's comments. He said the City Council is totally responsible for appointing the ZBA members, and not long ago they had appointed Mr. Sak's daughter, although she served a short term and went on to bigger and better things. Legally, the City Council has no authority over that body. They are the only acting body in the City of Burton that the City Council cannot overrule. Mr. Hammon indicated to Mr. Sak that he would have to take his case to a District Court and appeal before a District Judge.

Mr. Cross said he covered at the last Council meeting the resale of used cars on street corners. He told Mr. LaDuke that they did a fine job and by Wednesday, they were all removed. Mr. Cross inquired regarding a repair on the corner of Kettering and Briggs St.

Mr. Major indicated he will look into it.

Mr. Cox spoke regarding information received from Mr. Abby on the MERS plan, and stated it shows the top total at 33.72%. In 1992 when it was implemented, they were told it would never exceed 21%. Mr. Cox stated that hopefully they can make some changes in the MERS program to benefit the City and the employees because as it is now, it continually rises, with an exception of AFSCME, which has gone down.

Mr. Cox said they spoke a couple of months ago regarding retroactive pay for non-union charter members and administrators, including the City Attorney. At that time the Council asked that a request be sent to the Attorney General and it went through Senator John Cherry's Office, as a matter of procedure. Mr. Cox said he believes at that time the letter came back to Mr. Abbey and he passed it on to City Council, that Senator Cherry's recommendation was that it go to the City Attorney for his ruling. Mr. Cox inquired as to the results of the Attorney making a ruling as to whether retroactive pay should have and could be paid.

Mr. Cox spoke further of the Charter's wording being, any prior work should not be compensated.

Mr. Abbey said Senator Cherry sent a letter back saying this issue is better dealt with in-house by the City Attorney. Clearly it was the Council that directed us to send it to Senator Cherry or the Attorney General Office through the Senator's Office. We got that response back and it was forwarded to Council for further direction. This Council directed this administration to ask the City Attorney for his opinion on that.

Mr. Cox said he would ask Council for the support at least for the Attorney to make recommendation based on the Charter words accepted. Originally, we wanted the Attorney General's ruling, it was voted by the total Council to do that. He assumed that upon direction by Senator Cherry to turn that over to the City Attorney, that would have happened.

Mr. Abbey said Mr. Hamilton did give an opinion of what he thought about that issue, and it was the Council that felt he was not the appropriate one because he was also involved in that. At that point, we sent it to the Attorney General's Office through Senator's Cherry's Office. He sent it back saying it was a local matter and better handled by the City Attorney.

Mr. Cox said he would like to see it sent to the Attorney General for review.

Mr. Martinbianco inquired regarding agenda Item #2. He stated that reserving the right to object, does this imply that this is a contractual agreement for which the Council may not have any recourse if they decide to change attorneys mid-term first part of next year, and would that preclude them from doing that.

Mrs. Zelenko said it is her understanding that the attorneys serve at the pleasure of the Council and it can be changed at any time.

Mr. Martinbianco said he would withdraw his reservation

Mr. Cox said previously, the City attorneys have been referred to as City Attorney and Deputy City Attorney. He asked Mr. Austin if this was correct.

Mr. Austin responded that in the beginning when the City was created, Mr. Hamilton was designated the City Attorney and he was designated the Deputy City Attorney. He has assumed the chief prosecutorial functions and submit to you as is reflected in Item #1 on the agenda tonight, a separate billing from his prosecutorial activities. He thinks he is still technically the Deputy City Attorney, but just so they are aware, he is doing most of the prosecutorial work.

Mr. Cross inquired in reference to Item #3, if they need to accept the resignation of Larry Brawner before they appoint someone.

Mr. Austin asked if Mr. Brawner's resignation is what creates this appointment.

Mrs. Zelenko acknowledged it did, and Mr. Brawner did resign.

Mr. Austin said he thinks it would be appropriate to accept the resignation in the context of a resolution, and officially create that vacancy. If the maker of the motion would like, it could include both items, and the same motion could serve that dual purpose.

Mrs. Zelenko asked if the maker and supporter of the motion for Item #3, be willing to accept the resignation of Larry Brawner.

Mr. Hammon said to simply remove the word "due to" and insert accept the resignation of Larry Brawner.

Mr. Cross inquired in reference to agenda Item #6, and asked if we previously did these, and all we are doing is reaffirming with the State.

Mr. Major said they approved all the streets that are in those subdivisions, by namely, submitting the yearly application/form. They came back and said they also want the actual subdivision's name.

Mr. Martinbianco inquired regarding Item #6, the last sentence in reference to the right-of-ways will be used for public street purposes. He asked if that does not exclusively mean we will use the right-of-way for public street purposes.

Mr. Major responded that is correct.

Mr. Cox inquired regarding agenda Item #7. He asked if one address is for the establishment and the other for vacant property.

Mr. Major indicated he did not know, unless the outside area has been given an address outside of the building itself.

Mr. Abbey said they would have to check for sure, but he thinks 1076 is through 1086 and that is the additional property they are going to develop in the future.

COUNCIL DISCUSSION ACTION:

Martinbianco moved and Hammon seconded the following motion:

To conduct the hearing as an administrative appeal for Lot Split #99-16.
Motion carried, 7-0.

Centilli moved and Walls seconded the following motion:

To deny Lot Split #99-16, upholding the Planning Commission's decision of May 11, 1999.
Motion carried, 7-0.

COUNCIL ACTION:

Cross moved and Walls seconded the following motion:

1. Approve and authorize the Attorney Billing (Richard Austin) from June 16, 1999 through June 30, 1999 in the amount of $1,856.00.

Motion carried, 7-0.

Hammon moved and Centilli seconded the following motion:

2. Approve and authorize the reappointment of Attorney Richard Hamilton and Attorney Richard Austin as City Attorneys for the period of July 1, 1999 through June 30, 2000.

Motion carried, 7-0.

Hammon moved and Martinbianco seconded the following motion:

3. Approve and authorize the Mayor's appointment of Robert Bement, 5198 Washtenaw, Burton, MI 48509 to the Election Commission for a four (4) year term, expiring July 2003, and accept the resignation of Larry Brawner.

Motion carried, 7-0.

Walls moved and Centilli seconded the following motion:

4. Approve and authorize the continuation of the contract with Patrick McDougall of the Criminal Diversion Program through June 30, 2000.

Motion carried, 7-0.

Martinbianco moved and Centilli seconded the following motion:

5. Approve and authorize the Cooperative Agreement with Genesee County Planning Commission for Community Development funding for the years 2000-2002.

Motion carried, 7-0.

Hammon moved and Centilli seconded the following motion:

6. Approve and authorize the streets and roads in the subdivision plats of Lanning Acres, Weston Subdivision, Maplewood Meadows #2 and #3, Brookwood Pointe #4, Maple Pointe #7, and the single family site condominiums of Hidden Trails #2, Ridgemoor Condominium #2, Maple Leaf Estates, and Hawkshire Meadows to be accepted into the City of Burton Act 51 local street system, and acknowledging that all streets and roads are located within rights-of –way under municipal control and the rights-of -way will be used for public street purposes.

Motion carried, 7-0.

Hammon moved and Centilli seconded the following motion:

7. Approve and authorize the Liquor Control permit for difference in hours of operation of Belsay Enterprises, Inc., 1076-1086 Belsay, Burton, MI 48509 to include Sunday hours from 10:00 A.M. to 12:00 P.M. for the purpose of Sunday Brunch.

Motion carried, 7-0.

Hammon moved and Martinbianco seconded the following motion:

8. Approve and authorize MERS employee contribution rate for AFSCME (Division 11) of 7.6% effective July 1, 1999.

Motion carried, 7-0.

COUNCIL DISCUSSION:

Mr. Cox inquired regarding demolition properties and a 90 day update.

Mr. Abbey spoke regarding the earlier comments of a deficit budget. He indicated it is the Mayor's position, we have the largest General Fund balance in the history of the City. Mr. Abbey said they have two options, they can either take the taxpayers money and see what they can save over the years, or they can give some of that money back to them, which is such a small amount if you spread it out. Or, they can spend it on projects that can benefit those residents, which they propose in this budget, and that is why there is the additional costs and expenditure. The Parks & Recreation's feelings are to put something back in the community to help the youth in this community.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 8:54 P.M.

jra