

COUNCIL PROCEEDINGS

Council Pre-Meeting

June 3, 2014

6:00 p.m.

A Pre-Meeting of the City Council of the City of Gillette, County of Campbell, State of Wyoming, was held on Tuesday the 3rd day of June 2014, in the third floor conference room of City Hall, pursuant to due notice and call. The Presiding Officer called the meeting to order and upon roll call the following were found to be present:

Council Members present: Forrest Rothleutner, Tim Carsrud, Louise Carter-King, Ted Jerred, Robin Kuntz, Kevin McGrath, and Mayor John Opseth.

Staff present: J. Carter Napier, City Administrator; Charlie Anderson, City Attorney; John Aguirre, Human Resource Director; Pamela L. Boger, Administrative Services Director; Kendall Glover, Utilities Director; Jim Hloucal, Chief of Police; Dustin Hamilton, Director of Community Development; Tom Pitlick, Finance Director; Sawley Wilde, Public Works Director; Levi Jensen, Civil Engineer; Mike Cole, Utilities Project Manager; Joe Lunne, Public Information Officer; Patti Davidsmeier, Community & Gov't Relations Manager; and Karlene Abelseth, City Clerk.

Warm Up Items

City Administrator Napier began with the regional marketing discussion. He stated there is a potential for a relationship with Sheridan and Buffalo as it relates to generating interest with site locators in our combined regional area. This would require an investment from the City of \$4,000 to participate. Councilman McGrath asked what Sheridan's and Buffalo's investment would be. Mr. Napier replied that Sheridan's investment is \$3,000, Buffalo's investment would be \$2,000 and the Business Council is funding \$1,000. After some discussion, Mr. Napier stated that staff can bring this pilot program discussion up at the next NEWY meeting.

City Administrator Napier reported a complaint received from a local business owner in regard to the advertising that the City is sponsoring on behalf of the Gillette Avenue Reconstruction Project. Mr. Napier wanted to be sure that staff is heading in a direction that Council is comfortable with. Some of the complaint is in regard to the City providing unnecessary advertising on behalf of the businesses that are inconvenienced during the construction period. Public Information Officer Lunne presented pictures of the weekly advertising proposed several months ago. Mr. Lunne informed the Council that the advertised businesses and specials are changed each week. Councilman McGrath stated that he believes the biggest complaint is from businesses that did not get the same treatment during the construction of Highway 59. Mr. Lunne reminded Council that Highway 59 was a State project, not a City project. After the discussion, Council was comfortable moving forward as is.

City Administrator Napier brought up a follow-up item that was discussed at the City/County/Town of Wright Luncheon relating to the Air Enhancement request. Staff is requesting direction so that the budget can be altered accordingly. Mayor Opseth stated that he would be in favor of a one year commitment to see if the proposal and expectations are going to be met. Councilman Rothleutner stated he didn't feel as if this would be seen as a one year commitment; he feels that it will be an on-going commitment. Mr. Napier stated that he would want to use 1% Funds from the current year's surplus revenue for the commitment, and went on to say that he feels it would still be appropriate to include this type of use on the 1% Survey.

Senior/Disability Program Discussion

City Administrator Napier introduced Stephanie Boyd who had submitted a letter on behalf of her father who does not qualify for the current Senior/Disability Utility Discount program. Ms. Boyd explained her father's hardship and asked Council to consider changes to the ordinance that would allow more flexibility to those who do not qualify for the current annual program. City Administrator Napier stated that the discussion is threefold in order to give Council ideas of what staff's proposals are in regard to changes to the current Ordinance. Mr. Napier went on to say that what needs to be captured in the proposed changes of the Ordinance is to be more responsive to life changes that occur in the interim between the annual enrollments that the current Ordinance requires. Secondly, he suggests that Council needs to be aware of the entire rate paying base and the fiduciary responsibility that Council has. Mr. Napier feels it appropriate to manage the program, via an Ordinance that identifies thresholds so the program can be managed. Thirdly, deficiencies of the current ordinance were taken into consideration as well. Mr. Napier stated that staff's proposal is a quarterly enrollment program be provided so potential applicants can have multiple opportunities throughout the year to establish and verify life circumstances. We would still require that some level of verification of income be a part of the review program to determine that the applicant still falls below the poverty guideline. Staff is also requesting a change that would give the Ordinance more "teeth" in order to enforce a situation where an applicant has fraudulently reported information that would include a repercussion to verifiable abuse of the program. City Attorney Anderson stated that repercussions would be the removal of the applicant from the program, charged the full rate for utilities instead of the 50% rate with the reduced amount added back onto their utility bill, and they would not be eligible to apply for the program in the future. After further discussion, Council directed staff to expedite the three readings by adding the third and final reading of the Ordinance to the July 8th Work Session Agenda.

Citizen Advisory Board Appointment Recommendations

City Administrator Napier introduced the recommended applicants for Council's formal approval of the various Citizen Advisory Board appointments. Gradyling Brooks for the CC Lodging Tax Joint Powers Board; Mitch Benson for the Mayor's Art Council; and Jerry Likewise and Terri Leslie for the Personnel Review Board.

Review of the June 3rd Agenda

The group discussed the upcoming agenda items. City Administrator Napier opened discussion in regard to a capital project from the Public Works Department. Public Works Director Wilde gave a presentation as it relates to the request, and more specifically, the requested funding for a roof to cover the sander racks. He explained that the weather is causing damages such as rust on the chains, hydraulic hoses becoming weathered, as well as the electrical components. As a result Mr. Wilde is proposing a roof be installed to cover the sanders. Mr. Wilde assured the Council that this project would not be done in-house; a quote of \$25,000 from a local contractor has already been obtained. Councilman McGrath objected to the request. He stated that he does not believe the roof is needed.

City Administrator Napier stated that in the presentation and deliberation phase of the budget process, discussion took place of projects that, in his estimation, were not eligible for funding given the current revenue and current expense balance staff tries to maintain in the proposal of fiscal year 2015. If Council was

interested, the cash balance from this fiscal year could be transferred into next fiscal year, which effectively would be an amendment, in order to fund projects that staff had mentioned. Those projects are the first floor remodel, continuation of the HVAC project at City Hall, and the design rehabilitation for City West. These projects amounted to approximately, \$3,000,000 and Mr. Napier wanted to be sure Council was comfortable with what staff is proposing and comfortable to draft an amendment accordingly. Councilman McGrath asked for a brief explanation of the proposed first floor remodel. Mr. Napier replied that the proposed 2.4 million dollar program would include the reconstruction of the City Clerk's office, Human Resource office, Customer Service area, major re-construction of the Police Department, Police Records, relocation of the Chief's office, Victim Witness offices, and the Council Chambers.

City Administrator Napier then gave closing remarks with regard to approving the budget. When it comes to this level of consideration and approving the budget, he has been questioned by Council Members who ask if there is an item that they are not comfortable with, should they vote nay as it relates to approving the budget. Mr. Napier stated that his response to this question is "please don't" unless you believe that the budget is structurally unsound. He believes, on the other hand, that it is appropriate if there is a line item that a Council person does not agree with they could say they are in favor of passing the entire budget, but they would like the record to reflect that they are not comfortable, for example, with project A, project B, or project C, which will not have an effect of defeating the budget; but it does announce the displeasure of a particular line item. Mr. Napier also reminded the group that when projects are approved, in most cases, it comes before the Council, which gives Council another opportunity to defeat an item.

Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the Council, the meeting adjourned at 6:54 p.m.

John Opseth, Mayor

(S E A L)

ATTEST:

Karlene Abelseth, City Clerk

Publish date: June 11, 2014