

**COUNCIL AS A WHOLE COMMITTEE MEETING
MINUTES
TUESDAY
JANUARY 26, 2010**

Council President Mr. Morley opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m. Members of Council in attendance were Mr. D'Ambrosio, Mr. Knuchel, Mr. Hoefle, Ms. Vaughn, Ms. DePledge and Council President Mr. Morley. Mr. Lajeunesse was absent and excused. Also attending was Council Clerk Mrs. Cendroski.

Attending from the Administration were Mayor Andrzejewski, Law Director Mr. Klammer, Finance Director Mr. Condrón, City Engineer Mr. Gwydir, CBO Mr. Stigalt, Service Director Mr. Semik and Fire Chief Whittington.

Also in attendance were members of the public.

LEGISLATION PROPOSED:

01-26-(01): Amendment: City Ordinance Section 351.03 "Prohibited Standing or Parking Places, subsection (q):

01-26-(02): Amendment: City Ordinance Section 113.01 "Locations for Posting:

01-26-(03): Amendment: City Ordinance Chapter 154.01 "Establishment; Member, Terms, Powers":

01-26-(04): Amendment: City Ordinance Chapter 1367 "Flood Damage Prevention":

Mr. Morley: The first four items on the agenda were discussed in the Ordinance Committee Meeting.

Ms. Vaughn: The Ordinance Committee Meeting was held on January 19, 2010 which all four items were discussed. The unanimous decision of the Committee was recommended to move forward on all four items. They will appear on tonight's agenda.

Mr. Morley: Are there any comments or questions?

There were no questions or comments.

Upon review by the Committee, there were no objections to move forward with Legislation No. 01-26-(01), 01-26(02), 01-26-(03) and 01-26-(04) for passage at the evening's regular Council meeting.

LEGISLATION PENDING:

There was nothing in Legislation Pending.

MISCELLANEOUS

Roberts Road PAL Houses

Mr. Morley: I would like to answer a question that the Mayor had sent over to Council regarding the Roberts Road PAL houses reminder. In our last conversation Mr. Stigalt was supposed to look into that – has he done that yet?

Mayor Andrzejewski: Yes.

Mr. Morley: Is it zoning?

Mr. Knuchel: What was the question?

Mr. Morley: The question was can PAL build there? When Mr. Voros was CBO there were some issues that they couldn't build there. I asked the Mayor to check with Mr. Stigalt if there are any issues of zoning or was it just some setbacks? I talked with Ms. Vaughn and Mr. D'Ambrosio who have talked to the Police Chief and PAL and they possibly still want to build there. So instead of us purchasing it if we don't have to - is there something else we can do?

Mayor Andrzejewski: I asked Mr. Stigalt to look at it fresh as if someone is coming to with that option. So Mr. Stigalt can take it from there.

Mr. Stigalt: There are no buildings that can be built there with the two homes that are there. *(Mr. Stigalt's comment was inaudible.)* You need three acres to build there. You don't have the three acres to build a building there. If you wish to raise the homes you can.

Ms. Vaughn: It's my understanding because I sit on the PAL Board and I've been at several of the meetings that it was never intended to leave the houses. The houses were going to be raised and there was going to be a PAL Recreation Center built there. But I understand there was some problem with the setbacks. I think Mr. Klammer was involved because PAL is not considered a part of the City. Even though we do subsidize PAL through salaries it is not considered part of the City or Recreation. There is some reason they couldn't build according to Mr. Burrows and Mr. Klammer. Do you remember Mr. Klammer what the reason was?

Mr. Klammer: They are separate with the City so in that regard they are stuck with whatever the ordinances are as a private business. I don't remember the specifics just that there were setbacks. *(Mr. Klammer's comment was inaudible.)*

Mayor Andrzejewski: We can go on and on and on. The last conversation I had, which was yesterday, with the Police Chief was that they don't want the houses. They don't want them period. That's why they sent me that memo saying please pass this on to Council and see if they will work with you on acquiring those houses because PAL doesn't want them. So you can talk about setbacks, you can talk about rezoning, you can talk about raising the houses - they don't want them anymore.

Mr. Morley: Ms. Vaughn can you find out? Ms. Vaughn is on the PAL Board - if not we can put it on the agenda for the next meeting in Communications.

Mayor Andrzejewski: Now remember it has to be rezoned and you have other qualifications there that would make it very difficult to build and PAL knows that.

Ms. Vaughn: PAL knows that but my concern was whether the City was willing to make any considerations to PAL so they could build there. Because I don't know what the City would want to do with that property.

Mayor Andrzejewski: I will answer that question again emphasizing that PAL doesn't want the houses. But, secondly our plan is as we proposed to you to take one minute and I put that in the memo with the specifications of the home. Mr. Condrón as indicated we have a fund that we have available for land acquisition.

Ms. Vaughn: I know.

Mayor Andrzejewski: What we want to do is purchase the homes at a reasonable price then go to the County and do what's called a lot split. Take off some of that land that is adjacent to City Hall and leave some so it would have a reasonable back yard for the two houses, annex that land to the City property so when it is 10, 15, 20 years from now – if the City has money and they decide they want to build more on City property we will own that land and we won't be subject to a home owner owning that land and asking a ridiculous price for it because they know the City wants it. Then the City would go about reselling those two homes and with the money we get after we resell the homes we would put it back to that same fund.

Ms. Vaughn: Okay that makes sense. I will follow-up with PAL.

Mr. Morley: Mayor, I will get back with you on this.

Mr. Morley: Are there any comments or questions?

Mr. Knuchel: Did you say that you were going to refer this into Committee next time?

Mr. Morley: That's correct – it's not on the agenda tonight. Once we get an answer from Ms. Vaughn then we will put it back in Communications and then we will go from there.

(Fire Chief Whittington joined the meeting.)

Contract A: Paterson-Stevens, Inc. Houston Fisher Pool Rehabilitation: \$372,260:

Contract B: A.J. Goulder Electric Co. Houston Fisher Pool Rehabilitation: \$48,350:

Contract C: Miller Plumbing & Heating Co., Inc: Houston Fisher Pool Rehabilitation: \$84,000:

Mr. Morley: Under Miscellaneous we have three items and they are for the Houston-Fisher Rehabilitation for the pool. There are three different bids - one is for the construction of the pool, one is for the electricity for the pool and one is for the plumbing and heating of the pool. If there are no disagreements from Council I would like Mr. Gwydir to go through the bids. Then if we have any questions for him then we can open that up. Then I would like to go with Mr. Condrón to discuss the funding and then if we have questions then we will go from there. I know that there are some residents in the audience regarding the pool. Depending on our discussion I

will either have comments made during Council-as-a-Whole or we will make them at the Regular Council Meeting where we have the three minutes for everyone to talk.

Mr. Gwydir: There were bids taken for the pool. Contract A for the pool itself – they were A.C. Piping, C. Miller Plumbing and A. Patterson-Stevens, Inc. A. Patterson-Stevens, Inc. was the low bidder at \$372,260. Contract B for the electricity for the pool there was only one bidder which was A.J. Goulder Electric Co. for \$48,350. Contract C for the bath house plumbing and heating of the pool there were two bids one from A.C. Piping and one from C. Miller Plumbing & Heating Co., Inc. C Miller Plumbing & Heating Co., Inc. was the lowest bid for \$84,000. We added the low bids to \$504,610. The initial estimate was \$531,000.

Mr. Morley: So it came \$26,000 under?

Mr. Gwydir: It came \$26,390 low. From the beginning to end we are down approximately \$54,390 from the first bid on the pool.

Mr. Morley: The bid for the electrical – since they were the only bidder do you feel that is a reasonable price?

Mr. Gwydir: Yes, I do.

Mr. Morley: Are there any questions or comments for Mr. Gwydir?

Ms. DePledge: In regard to the bids that were not listed or not accepted were there any substantial differences aside from the price between the two bids that you recall?

Mr. Gwydir: On Contract C for the backup plumbing the second bidder was at \$84,800 – they were \$800 higher and that was A.C. Piping. Contract A for the pool ranged from a higher \$432,000 which was Miller Plumbing, next was A.C. Piping at \$387,000 and Patterson-Stevens, Inc. was at \$372,260. It was \$14,000 between first and second on the pool itself.

Ms. DePledge: And the services were they the same? Was the work that they were promising to do on the pool the same or did the higher bid include additional work?

Mr. Gwydir: No, under each contract each bidder did on the same exact work.

Ms. DePledge: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Morley: Are there any other comments or questions for Mr. Gwydir?

Mr. Morley: There were no further comments or questions for Mr. Gwydir.

Mr. Condrón: I would like to highlight some of the relative points on the memo that I sent out last week on the Houston Fisher Pool funding. Basically, we set up in the General Fund in 2008 for Recreation Capital Contracts. The purpose of the inheritance money and any of the proceeds from the sale of HUD homes is to establish some cash for this project and other improvements. At the end of 2008 we had \$350,000 cash which came from inheritance tax which was transferred in 2008 and 2009. The cash amount for 2008 was \$142,822.35 that was transferred and the cash amount for 2009 was \$213,000 that was transferred. We also applied for the recipient of \$150,000 State Grant and we're accepted in May, 2009. That's basically funding for the pool – the first third is cash, the other two-thirds are private proceeds getting reimbursed. So in 2009 we received a little bit under \$50,000 of this Grant. We still have another \$100,000 available from the State and additional inheritance taxes. The difference that was received in 2008 was \$198,493.90 and out of that \$142,822.35 was transferred to the Recreation Capital Fund. This leaves \$55,671.55 still available for transfer. In addition, in how inheritance tax works is that you get it twice a year. *(Mr. Condrón's comments were inaudible.)* As of January 1, 2010 there was approximately \$44,000 in inheritance tax funds due us. We will receive this in May of this year. *(Mr. Condrón's comments were inaudible.)* With the inheritance tax money we have received and we will receive we will have enough money to cover these contracts.

Mr. Morley: Are there any comments or questions for Mr. Condrón?

Mr. D'Ambrosio: I see the new inheritance tax that is coming from 2010 and what was left over from 2008. If we wanted to transfer the amount from 2008 of \$55,000 and not do anything with the \$44,000 that would actually give us enough money for the pool?

Mr. Condrón: *(Mr. Condrón's comment was inaudible.)*

Mr. D'Ambrosio: That would give us about \$507,000 and the contract is for \$504,000.

Mr. Condrón: You could always transfer it later.

Mr. D'Ambrosio: Exactly. Thank you.

Mr. Knuchel: I have a couple of issues. If we do transfer that \$55,000 out of the General Fund that would come out of our surplus for 2009 – correct?

Mr. Condrón: It would be for 2010.

Mr. Knuchel: That was my next question. We have not seen the 2010 budget yet, therefore, I'm concerned about spending money that we don't have yet. You're saying we have it but the next logical question from there is this where we want to spend our money because there are a lot that are charged off to this #438 Fund that were above and beyond what this pool was. My perception and my recollection was that we were going to use that money for the pool. Had we not used that money for other things we would have had money for the pool without making these expenditures and these transfers out of the General Fund, again, and a \$44,000 inheritance fee

that we haven't received yet. And again, with this inheritance tax - as you well remember - we discussed this in Council when we decided to create this fund. The way it was created and set up was at the end of the year after we went over our numbers we would transfer money then at that point and time to that fund for recreational purposes if we didn't need it for any other purpose. It wasn't a general blanket statement that we were going to drop all this money into the Recreational Fund. So I just want to make sure that we are all on the same page here. The question was – is that your priority for spending for this fund? Because we are going to have to look at this at budget time and say we need a little bit more money in the Recreational Fund and I wanted to make sure that was your number one priority as far as recreation goes this year.

Mayor Andrzejewski: Absolutely, I think the pool is vital for the youth and the residents of our City. I know what you are saying Mr. Knuchel but we all sort of indicated that the inheritance money would be used for the benefit of the people of Eastlake. And one of the areas that we can use it is recreation. I think I feel very confident when Mr. Condrón gets the numbers from the auditor that says you will an additional \$42,000. Also, one of the other things that we have had is interest in the second HUD home – the one that we would sell for about \$20,000. It was bought for \$1 and we will sell it for about \$20,000. If we get that sold then we would use that \$20,000 towards the pool, also. And we could save the inheritance tax for something else.

Mr. Knuchel: We took the \$40,000 from the first HUD home and we were going to use that for operating expenses and the pool. Maybe that's a consideration we might want to make again for that \$20,000 when we get to that point.

Mayor Andrzejewski: And, again, to answer your questions without a doubt I think the pool is vital for the City.

Mr. Knuchel: Thank you.

Mr. Morley: Are there any comments or questions for Mr. Condrón?

Mr. Hoefle: Some of the questions that I sent out today I addressed to Mr. Condrón. I would just like everybody to understand my view on this whole situation with the pool. I'm not against the pool. I just have a lot of questions that I would like answered with me being new. I thought that the process could have been done a little bit better. If you could bear with me I have a long list of questions here.

Mr. Hoefle: Do we currently have a committee with representation from each ward, senior citizens, swim team members, Council and our Administration to review items for the Houston Fisher pool?

Mr. Morley: We do not. We went through the Recreation Committee. That was the procedure that we followed.

Mr. Hoefle: Was an action plan ever created for this project?

Mayor Andrzejewski: Mr. Morley, I've already talked to you before and I saw that list of questions. Many of those I don't even want to comment on and I'm not going to comment on. Mr. Hoefle if you want to ask those questions and put them as part of the record that is fine. I think we have answered everything to do with the pool. We have thoroughly discussed it many times in various committees. I know it was before you were on Council but it was thoroughly discussed and those meetings were open to the public and you attended many of those meetings. Everything was put out in the open. The bottom line is we have the pool specs. We did them correctly, we have the pool bids and we have the money to pay for the pool. We don't do action plans to fix a pool.

Mr. Hoefle: May I continue?

Mr. Morley: Yes.

Mr. Hoefle: Was a specific budget created for the Houston Fisher pool?

Mr. Morley: Could you elaborate on the budget? What are you looking for?

Mr. Hoefle: Was there a separate budget for the whole project? Laying it out seeing what exactly it will cost for operations, construction and everything?

Mr. Morley: When we do the bids and when we do the budget. Regarding your question about expected revenues - if you do go to the other cities the pool is a service we provide above and beyond our normal services of snowplowing, leaf pickup, and garbage pickup. The pool does not make money. The pool is not here to make money it is to provide a service for the residents. Tell me anybody if I'm incorrect. Therefore, we will not look to say that there is a going to be a profit for the pools.

Mr. D'Ambrosio: Correct me if I'm wrong Mr. Condrón but I thought the operating budget was set at \$71,500. That was the number that was used in previous years. We figured it was \$21,000 for pool passes, \$9,000 for fees which totals \$30,000. The other \$41,000 we were going to use the inheritance tax if possible. Mr. Condrón gave me a ten year list for the inheritance tax. The average for ten years was about \$100,000. That's what we averaged in that account. I wouldn't use that number - the lowest in ten years was about \$30,000. So if we added that to make up that \$41,000 and the lowest inheritance tax that has ever been in the last ten years was \$30,000 that would leave us with \$11,000 that we would have to come up with. We have a \$14,000,000 budget. There are the other Directors and everybody else trying to cut costs throughout the Departments. I feel we would be able to do the \$11,000. Are those numbers pretty accurate Mr. Condrón?

Mr. Condrón: Yes.

Mayor Andrzejewski: If I may comment that was a very good analogy that you made Mr. Morley. The pool does not break even. It was not intended to break even. It is very much like

the Building Department here collects building fees for inspections. They are not expected to bring in enough fees to cover the expenses if there is a problem. The Police Department collects fines for parking and for speeding and for other fines. I don't expect the Police Department to get enough fines to cover the entire operation for the Police Department. This is another service that is provided to the residents through their tax dollars – and I don't want to label this as a must be a break even proposition. If we do that then we have to start looking at every area as a break even proposition.

Mr. Hoefle: I grew up on E. 337th St. for over 40 years. Growing up on that street I know that there were several issues and I just want to find out if anybody has gone door to door on a couple of streets over there regarding the re-opening of the pool? And what problems have they encountered over the past several years with the park? And what can we do to address these issues if the pool were to re-open? I would just like to make sure that if we do re-open the pool that we do meet with some of those residents and find out that there were several issues on those two streets.

Ms. Vaughn: Especially since running for Ward Councilman I knocked on every door on Jakse St. and E. 337th St. and I've been in communication with the members of the Block Watch for two years. I think we are all aware of the problems that we're there. I think that the Block Watch has solved many of those problems. I know your mother still lives on E. 337th St. and she probably doesn't like the pool and maybe I wouldn't like kids running down the street going to the pool at my age. But regardless there has been a major turnaround in that park and the crowning touch to that park would be reopening that pool. I think that there are people in the audience that would justify my statement and they live on Jakse St, they live on E. 337th St., they live on Waverly St. and they live all over Ward 2. So was there was some effort from residents of Ward 2 and not just me.

Mr. Morley: Mr. Hoefle if we went door to door for every issue that we vote on or every issue we have to talk about as Council people - we were elected to make Council decisions. I'm okay with talking to people in areas but if we did that for everything - for example, if we were going to get a new fire truck do we go and talk to every resident and say we are going to be spending \$150,000 on a new truck. That's what we are elected to do and that is part of our function on that.

Mayor Andrzejewski: I couldn't have said it any better than what you both said. Mr. Hoefle many times people on the street - or they e-mail me - and say "Mayor, we elected you and we elected Council to make decisions for us. We are too busy and we don't want to get involved in everything that goes on in the City. That's why we elected you." I think both of you said it very well. That's why people elected us.

Mr. Hoefle: Have you given any thought in regards to building spray parks at Jakse and Surfside parks?

Mr. Morley: Yes we have. There is not one person that's on Council that has been on previously that would not love to have a brand new facility like some of these other Cities. When I first got

on Council we looked at a pool and I was working with the Mayor. This was five years ago and a brand new pool just exactly like we have was over a million dollars. To spend over a million now and then put two spray parks in – we would love to have that but let's face it the only way that's going to happen is if a levy would pass. The only City that has voted down the school levy was the City of Eastlake. So the school levy passed but the residents of Eastlake said "no" to the school levy. I don't think it is fair to the other Departments such as the Fire Department and the Service Department that we would go out and put a levy on for a new pool when we are going to need operating money in the next few years - from looking at the forecast - to keep what we have running.

Mr. D'Ambrosio: I think a spray park is a great idea. I have never done a study or anything but I think that most municipalities that have a spray park usually have a pool first. I think a pool gives more versatility – mostly the spray parks attract maybe some younger kids and there is nothing wrong with that but as far as a pool it accommodates everybody – kids, adults our age, seniors that might just want to swim laps. That's why I feel a pool is more accommodating for the first piece of swimming equipment than a spray park.

Mr. Hoefle: My concern was that we are reconfiguring the pool as it stands. There is no zero entry for toddlers or anything like that because the toddler pool is being torn down. So all we have is a 3 ft. depth to 6 ft. then it L-shapes to 12 ft. We have nothing for mothers and their infants unless they are going to hold their kids the whole time.

Mr. Morley: I think we talked about that in Committee and if the parents bring them to the pool it is up to them to take care of their child in the pool.

Mayor Andrzejewski: The reason the wading pool will probably be torn down is not that we want it torn down but because of government regulations. There are some enormous new regulations required for a wading pool. Is that correct?

Mr. Gwydir: The wading pool was nonconforming and it was also hooked directly into the main filter system through the large pool. Clearly with the younger children there are also some sanitary issues that provided that the non-standard wading pool exists.

Mayor Andrzejewski: So it wasn't that the City didn't want to do it. The second thing is if you look at the study that was done by Mr. Whitmer; he gives you the cost per foot for constructing a new pool. I think the last time if my memory serves me right that I figured it out it was three and half million dollars. For three and half million dollars you can buy a new pool. Mr. Hoefle how are you going to pay for three and half million dollar pool? I'm not trying to put you on the spot.

Mr. Hoefle: I am not saying that we need a toddler pool. Can we reconfigure a section of the pool to accommodate for a zero entry? Is there a possibility that we can do it?

Mayor Andrzejewski: I don't know.

Mr. Hoefle: That is the key thing with the residents.

Mayor Andrzejewski: No it isn't. The point is the pool is the way it is and even though we would like to have the wading pool, unfortunately, we found that through these government regulations that it is impossible for us to carry it. Mr. Gwydir is being nice because I think we all kind of know what he means by sanitary things that infants do. Okay? So the answer to your question is - other analogy would be that sometimes you would like to have a brand new car for \$40,000 but as a household you can only afford a three year old car at \$20,000. Well that's where we are at. Everybody would love to have a new pool, a splash park and an aquatic thing and whatever but we are not at that that point. We have to get the used car and then after we get the used car and we get in better shape and save a little bit and we put some money aside then we can look at some of those things. So the best analogy I can give you right now we can afford the good used car. And when we get done that pool it is going to be a very good pool which will be usable for the next 10 to 15 years.

Mr. Hoefle: Some of these questions that I have were answered already. I received a recent memo regarding a police dispatcher. I believe that safety for our residents would be a higher priority. I wanted to know are going to address that? The memo states that they have been asking for a police dispatcher for the last five years. I still firmly believe that the safety of our residents come first before recreation.

Mr. Morley: Mr. D'Ambrosio and I talked about this at the budget meeting last year. We are going to look at that and if we can add on a dispatcher we are going to try to do that through the budget. Some of the memos and e-mails I sent to you - regardless, the money that we have for the pool is in that pool fund. We are not going to be able to take money out of the pool fund even if we have to get a new police dispatcher. When we go over the budget, tell me if I'm wrong Mr. Knuchel, we are going to look at that dispatcher and if there are things that we can do to get a new dispatcher we are going to try to get a dispatcher. That's where we are at and you can't say "yes" to a dispatcher until we go through the budget and look at the other numbers and as Mr. Knuchel said in the other discussion - the priorities will be set. The Mayor will give us the priorities that the Administration wants and we will look at them and then we will make our adjustments to what we have to do. I mean I have been for another dispatcher and Mr. D'Ambrosio has, also. And we will talk about that in the budgets.

Mr. Knuchel: You're correct in most of what you said - there is just a little tweaking. If the inheritance tax is not put in the Fund #438 it will remain in the General Fund, therefore, it could be used for other things. That's what I was trying to explain before about the inheritance money coming in and how we would use it. That's why we set it up the way we did so that at the end of the year we would transfer money because we didn't know what the City's needs were going to be at that time.

Mayor Andrzejewski: Mr. Hoefle, I'm going to give you some cold hard numbers. Over 50% of the budget is spent on police and fire. You figure we have a budget somewhere around fourteen million dollars. We're spending six to six and half million dollars on two departments - police

and fire. I think that is taking care of our residents very well. Compare that to what we spend on recreation – guess how much? Zero. And if we add \$71,000 to operate the pool and divide that by fourteen million you're going to find far less than 1%. Compare 1% to over 50% we are doing a great job with our policemen and firemen. And the residents deserve something else with our tax dollars. A city is not a city without recreation, service, building, tax department and police and fire. Over 50% of the budget goes to police and fire.

Mr. Hoefle: I just want to make sure that we are covering the fact that the memo did say that in the last five years they have been asking for another dispatcher and it has not been taken care of yet. They firmly believe that we need another dispatcher. Why should it take five years?

Mr. Morley: I understand that but there are other things on the budget that have been on for five years that we haven't done. Off the top of my head when they wanted to hire an Economic Developer we said "no", for recreation we've said "no", for a videographer we said "no". So we have said "no" to the majority of what the Mayor has sent to us. Regarding the dispatcher it was not just the Mayor's thought – there were seven of us on this Committee and seven people decided and last time - it was 3 to 4 or something like that - the dispatcher shouldn't be in there. So it's not always the Mayor's choice on some of the things that get passed in the budget. Last year the Mayor wanted \$350,000 more into the budget than we were willing to put in and we did not do that last year. So it's not just the dispatcher.

Ms. Vaughn: A point of consideration only from personal and professional experience. At one point and time the Dispatch Department was run with equal amount of full time and part time at considerable less amount of money. Now I know part time is a bad word for a lot of people but with the dispatchers it did seem to work out very well.

Mayor Andrzejewski: I like the alternative.

Ms. Vaughn: We can look back at history and see how it worked. I'm sure it was cheaper when it was worked that way.

Mayor Andrzejewski: Absolutely.

Mr. Hoefle: Do we have a list of miscellaneous items that will need to be addressed that the bids do not cover? If we do have a list of these items have we identified what our cost will be for each item? I was talking to Mr. Gwydir last week and I did learn a lot from him but I still think that there will be some unforeseen things that are going to be outside the bid spec.

Mr. Knuchel: There are several items that were addressed last year by Mr. Semik regarding

restrooms and other items. So there were problems previously taken care of before the pool bids were tabulated this December. There have been more expenses but they have covered up to this point.

Mr. Morley: To add on to that question. The labor is a set cost because they do not punch in job time cards and each Department won't say "Well I worked on the pool - \$400", just like they don't punch in and say they did this many hours in leaves. I know that was out there and that was a concern by one or two of the Councilman. It is not a job shop - it's a fixed cost for the labor. You cannot say "Well, Mr. Semik had two of his guys working 100 hours that goes against the cost of the pool." It doesn't work that way. Is that correct Mr. Semik?

Mr. Semik: That's correct.

Mayor Andrzejewski: We just did South Lakeshore Blvd. for 1.7 million dollars. That's three times the cost of this pool. There are probably more things that can go wrong when you tear apart a 40-year old road than when you tear apart a pool. And you handle those things when they go wrong if there is anything. I'm not saying that there will be anything. But in any large project – we're just going to do Quinton Road Pump Station – another big project for the City. That pump station is so old we don't know what we are going to run when we dig into it. So to say have you look at blah, blah, blah. We look at it but you have to handle those things as they come along.

Mr. Hoefle: My question was the whole park itself. If we are going to re-open the pool do we have the manpower to clean up the park? I just want to make sure that you have the proper staffing to make sure that the park is maintained. Or do you need to hire more part-time or full time people to help out?

Mr. Semik: We have part-time staff to clean and maintain the parks but sometimes not as quickly due to weather and equipment failure. We have a full complimentary part time staff for the summer months.

Mr. Hoefle: If the economy gets worse and we have to cut 10% across the board what will we cut? When I first ran for Council and when I first started this years ago I was told that specifically safety is the priority and recreation will always come secondly. And I just want to make sure that we are doing our homework and that all our questions are asked and answered and I want to make sure that everything is right for the residents. I don't want to see another stadium issue where all of a sudden everyone is upset because they did not have their say so on this. I just want to make sure that everything is covered. And if we have to cut 10% across the board would it go to recreation or would it go to service or safety?

Mayor Andrzejewski: I don't think that is a fair question to ask when we are talking about pool bids. We're talking about pool bids.

Mr. Hoefle: Questions answered. Thank you.

Mr. Morley: Are there any further comments or questions?

Mr. Knuchel: We spent \$34,727.00 on Fund #438 for renovations of the pool.

Mayor Andrzejewski: Mr. Semik, haven't your guys been taking out the boiler and other stuff that you can physically take out? We are going to be doing the cement work. This is going to be reducing the cost. Mr. Hoefle, we have done a lot with our own labor and as Mr. Morley has pointed out whether they are plowing snow or picking up leaves or it is not an hourly wage. Also, in the summer time we have some youth that need direction. Catholic Charities pays for that and gives us free labor and Mr. Semik has them do some clean up. We do this with cooperation with the Union because they do not have them operating equipment. They clean up the parks. Therefore, we not only have the part time help we hire in the summer time we also have the help free of charge given to us by the Catholic Charities.

Mr. Morley: Are there any further comments or questions?

There we no further comments or questions.

Upon review by the Committee, there were no objections for Mr. Knuchel to make a Motion to add Legislation No. 01-26-(05), Legislation No. 01-26-(06) and Legislation No. 02-26-(07) to the agenda at the evening's Regular Council meeting.

RECOGNITION OF THE PUBLIC:

Morely: I will have the residents speak at the Regular Council Meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

The Council-as-a-Whole Committee meeting was adjourned at approximately 7:42 p.m.

cr