



**ZIONSVILLE TOWN COUNCIL
MEETING MINUTES
FOR
MONDAY, AUGUST 2, 2021
AT 7:00 P.M.
ONSITE AND ELECTRONIC MEETING
1100 West Oak Street**

This meeting was conducted onsite and electronically via Zoom. All Councilors participated in person. The public attended via Zoom and in person.

Council Members Present: Josh Garrett, President; Jason Plunkett, Vice-President; Alex Choi, Craig Melton and Bryan Traylor
Council Members Absent: Brad Burk and Joe Culp
Also Present: Heather Willey, Town Council Attorney; Amy Lacy, Municipal Relations Coordinator, and Town Department Staff.

1. OPENING

- A. Call meeting to order
President Garrett called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.
- B. Pledge of Allegiance

2. APPROVAL OF THE MEMORANDUM OF THE JULY 6, 2021 REGULAR MEETING

(copy posted)

COUNCIL ACTION: President Garrett moved to approve the Memoranda of the JULY 6, 2021 Regular Town Council Meeting.

Councilor Melton seconded the motion.

The Memoranda of the July 6, 2021 Regular Town Council Meeting was approved by a vote of five in favor, zero opposed. (5/0)

3. REQUEST TO SPEAK ON AGENDA ITEM

Craig Triscari: I can't hear the board. Did you ask for me to be on? I'm sorry, I can't hear. Can you hear me now?

[pause]

Craig Triscari: Can you hear me?

[pause]

Craig Triscari: Can you nod if you can hear me? Okay. So, I can't hear you, but I'm simply going to just read the statement, is that okay? Okay. My name is Craig Triscari, 3270 Paddock Road.

Today, I'm addressing the limit of public speech in public forum. After the hearing in April of 2020 where this board became a little angry after my public statement that highlighted these board's failures, the president of this board sought to limit public speech in these board meetings. At first, the board leadership, with the attorney tried to let me know that I would be targeted to not speak at your council meetings, which I took to send to the state attorney's public access lawyers and put in an informal complaint. These lawyers initially reached out to the town to make sure they were aware that they are unable to arbitrarily target a private citizen in their initial procedures.

Craig Triscari: If this board wanted to limit speech in their meetings, they will have to do it to all citizens in Zionsville. The public access lawyer stated that taking that approach is not considered the best practice. In their experience, it increases mistrust for that institution with the general public. Your current plan as written required people to simply address what is on your agenda and placed the burden of speech on the private citizen to have to reach out to members of this board to make comments outside of their orchestrated agenda, if they are blessed to have it approved. Of course, all can put written comments in the agenda. I have found that that has been an issue at times, due to technology problems. I would recommend this board talk to the mayor on what she is doing to address community issues in an open and meaningful, transparent way.

Craig Triscari: Her approach to constituent relationship issues is a model which this board can learn from. She may also be able to help this board in the leadership conflict resolution as of April 21, council members displayed. There is a petition that has several dozen people to date that have signed their disapproval for this restrictive community speech behavior and will be left open and presented for the next at least year. I have no expectation this current board under this current leadership will change the policy, but I do predict that when the board changes over, there will be discussions on why the board decided to limit issues to be presented without the unwanted and unnecessary control of this board. I have no expectations that the board will change this practice. I leave you just one thing. When this Board no longer is an extension of the people's will, they are no longer credible and useful to the people that they are supposed to represent. Get with the Mayor and fix your problems. Don't hide from them. And let them be open. Thank you.

Town Attorney Heather Willey: (Due to the Technology problems with the sound the beginning of Town Attorney Heather Willey's comments were not recorded and will be summarized.) Ms. Willey explained that the right to speak was a courtesy granted by the board and was not an absolute right or a first amendment issue. She went on to say that Mr. Triscari had not been told he could not speak and had done so on several occasions. She said that often these opportunities were misused and that is why the Town Council put in place policies to allow the public to speak on issues relevant to what was on the agenda. She explained that information given by Mr. Triscari regarding the comments of the Public Access Counselor were inaccurate, comments which indicated that the public Access Counselor had shared that the Council had done something wrong. Ms. Willey said she was troubled by this incorrect information from Mr. Triscari.

Heather Willey: And I think we should continue to evaluate whether Mr. Triscari is actually adding value to the public at large or to these proceedings, so... Just because we have worked on this, I think it's pretty frustrating that again, we're faced with this kind of response, and we do encourage all of our citizens to provide lots of good comment and information, but unfortunately that's again not been the case. So, I just wanted to share those comments. I don't usually make that kind of comment, but I'm frustrated as you might imagine, by the way it's being portrayed so...

President Garrett: Thanks Heather. Appreciate that.

Vice-President Plunkett: We all are, Heather.

President Garrett: Amy are there any other requests to speak?

Amy Lacy: No, I have not received any other requests to speak.

President Garrett: Okay.

Councilor Traylor: Mr. President before we proceed can the public hear us at this point, because... Okay. Alright, just wanted to make sure.

President Garrett: Are we good?

Councilor Traylor: I guess.

President Garrett: Do you think? Alright, we'll keep an eye on Facebook, if they can't hear us.

Councilor Traylor: Well, I pulled it up when we were having the technology issues, and I just saw somebody else say that also we cannot hear the council at all, so I don't know if that's still the case or not, but...

President Garrett: So, you think we're good? Alright, he's pointing we're good, so I think we are good...

Councilor Traylor: Alright.

President Garrett: I'd say, "If you can't hear us, tell us, but they probably can't hear that either, so..."

4. MAYOR/ADMINISTRATION UPDATE

There was no update from the Mayor or Administration.

5. OLD BUSINESS

There was no old business to discuss.

6. NEW BUSINESS

A. Consideration of an Electronic Meetings Policy Resolution

Resolution 2021-13

President Garrett: Alright, we have no old business. Our first new business item is, consideration of electronic meeting policy resolution. So, a good segue. This is resolution 2021-13. Heather, do you mind leading us through a little bit of...

Heather Willey: Sure. Absolutely, so...

President Garrett: What we're trying to do here, and maybe that last minute change that was made too and what that was for Councils.

Heather Willey: And that's actually to the procedures and not to the resolutions.

Heather Willey: So, we're first considering a resolution to enact an electronic meetings policy for members of the public during the last legislative session, the legislature enacted House Enrolled Act

1437, and this legislation codified some of the electronic meetings procedures that were previously afforded to other boards like Boards of Trustees for universities, Charter school boards, and other government agency boards. There also had been some flexibility given to local public bodies like Town Councils, County Commissioners, and other entities that were meeting during the pandemic to allow those operations to continue when people were unable to meet in person. So, the legislation really codified some of those procedures that were adopted during COVID-19. The new statute actually gives flexibility, and it gives a lot of touch points to the council to make policy decisions about how they want to use electronic meetings going forward. In working with council leadership, the resolution that you all have before you gives some flexibility, but it is the interest of council leadership to have in-person meetings when possible and to have individuals of the council actually be physically present.

Heather: I think the thought there is there's more public transparency, there's more public accountability if we're sitting across from constituents being able to engage and have conversation. However, because we recognize there may be times when a circumstance might present where an individual can't be present. We didn't want to adopt or present a resolution that gives the president of the council at his or her sole discretion, the ability to allow a member of the council to participate electronically. There are a lot of procedures in statutes, so even by doing this, we have to make sure that we're meeting all of those statutory procedures.

Heather: For example, if someone's participating electronically, we'll need to go back and do roll call votes like we did during COVID when we were meeting electronically. We have to have so many members present in the room. Four members would need to be present. We would limit the number of meetings that someone could participate electronically through the year, and we have to make sure that all the members of the public can hear and participate, so if they had a question or we're presenting that they had the opportunity to be heard by that person who's participating electronically, plus they could see and hear that person as well.

Heather: So, the policy you have before you gives that discretion to the Town Council president to allow for electronic meeting use, but I think it retains sort of the traditional view of the Town Council, which is to meet in person and to participate in person whenever possible. So, I think that's a summary of it, and if there's any questions, I'm happy to answer them.

President Garrett: Thanks Heather. That's a good summary. Council, any questions on this or what Heather went over? That's a really good summary if there's no questions.

President Garrett: I will make a motion then to approve Resolution 2021-13.

Councilor Traylor: Second.

President Garrett: Second from Councilor Traylor. All in favor?

Councilor Melton: Aye.

Councilor Choi: Aye.

Councilor Traylor: Aye

Vice-President Plunkett: Aye

President Garrett: Aye. All opposed? Resolution 2021-13 passes with a vote of five in favor. Zero opposed. Next, we've got a Consideration of amended Town Council procedures, I know this is

something we've been working on for quite some time, Heather. Since you gave such a great update last time, could you...

B. Consideration of Amended Town Council Procedures

Heather Willey: Yeah. No problem. So, as the public may recall, as of July 1st, the Town Council put in place formal procedures, which will be posted on our website, really to help the public understand sort of what is the role of the Town Council, how do you request to be placed on the agenda. And we in having those procedures public, want to make sure that we're giving people adequate time. Oftentimes, someone will have a substantive issue, and we're only giving you three minutes of public comment, so this allows you to reach out to your council member who represents you or a member at large and asked to be put on the agenda, and to reach out to Amy Lacy, and she can also make that request to council leadership. Because of the electronic meetings procedures, we are now referencing that in these new council procedures, and basically just cross-referencing the resolution that you all just put in place.

Heather Willey: We also made three... What I would call non-substantive revisions first on the title page, we just added as amended, August second since the effective date of the town council procedures were July 1st. On page nine at the great suggestion of Joe Rust, who I'm proud to know read all the council procedures and made this recommendation to us, instead of having Amy Lacy's name listed as the individual who you would contact, we simply added the Municipal Relations Coordinator in a more generic mailbox so that God forbid Amy would leave, we wouldn't have to update anything. And Amy you're not allowed to leave, but...

Heather Willey: So that's the change there, and then we also then changed the email address to correspond to a more generic email address for the public, and then added the electronic procedures on page 13, so just cross-references, a quick summary of those procedures.

President Garrett: Very good. Another good summary, two for two. Councilors any questions on those procedures? Joe, thanks for reading them as well. Well, I'll make a motion then to approve the amended town council procedures.

Councilor Melton: Second.

President Garrett: Second from Councilor Melton. All in favor.

Councilor Choi: Aye.

Councilor Traylor: Aye

Vice-President Plunkett: Aye

Councilor Melton: Aye

President Garrett: Aye. All opposed? Town Council meeting procedures are approved by a vote of five in favor, zero opposed. Next, we've got the Cedar Street stop sign request. This is by Steven Gorgievski, if you want to approach the podium, please, and if you can give your name and address for the record, and we'd like to hear from you.

C. Cedar Street Stop Sign Request – Stephen Gorgievski

Steven Gorgievski: Steven Gorgievski on 365 Cedar Street.

President Garrett: And your request is around... Maybe you can give us a little background on the request.

Steven Gorgievski: Well, just when I moved in three years ago, I noticed a lot of traffic, high speed, so asked for stop signs a while ago, and so I'm just trying to get stop signs, Second, Third and Fourth Street.

President Garrett: Second, Third and Fourth Street.

Steven Gorgievski: Yeah, just stop signs that's all.

President Garrett: And was there an incident that I'm aware of maybe that helped sort of...

Steven Gorgievski: No, before the incident happened, I was asking for stop signs, yeah.

President Garrett: Got it. Mr. Lantz, I know that you're always helpful in these conversations, would you mind perhaps giving some background on that as well.

Department of Public Works Director Lance Lantz: Yeah. Perhaps some of this may sound familiar. Hopefully, it sounds familiar for those who've been in some discussions on stop signs and speeding in the past, but the governing documents and guidance documents that allow us to rule ourselves under State Statute, under the Home Rule also set in place certain limitations, certain rules, certain guidelines we should follow. So stop signs in every standard that we use, including the manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices and the Indiana manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices, which are our Bibles when it comes to traffic control, expressly state that stop signs are not to be used for speed control or traffic calming measures, and I don't think it's much of a leap, if you can take a moment and step back and start to think that should traffic stop signs, yield signs are also called out or traffic signals begin to be used for any other purpose in intersection manage in the performance and the level of function of an intersection, it would result in a wide proliferation. Certainly, if something is allowed in one location, you have to then consider that in any location where it makes a similar request.

Lance Lantz: So, every study out there shows that the proliferation of stop conditions results in basically sign fatigue, people don't understand the stop signs when they're unwarranted, they begin to blow them off and ignore them. So, we basically have two discussions, if the discussion is speeding, that's one type of discussion. If the discussion is a review of the stop conditions in the village, that's different. So happy to answer any questions or participate in this discussion, but I think first we need to decide what discussion we're having, because if it's speeding, we really shouldn't be talking about stop signs as a tool.

President Garrett: So, my understanding was it was the concern about speeding. If stop signs are not the tool, and it's interesting because I've gotten a lot of emails on this. Half have said absolutely want them and half said absolutely don't want them. If speeding is the concern and a stop sign is not the answer, what is the answer if it... To determine if it really is a problem.

Lance Lantz: Well, I think the first thing you have to do is just that, decide, is there a problem? And quantify that problem. Now, recently, we went through this similar... A similar exercise on speeding on Sycamore Street a more heavily traveled street with higher speed limits, but the

principals stay the same, that study ended up costing over, I believe \$10,000, and I'm never going to put a price tag or a value on the safety or the efficiency of our transportation system.

Lance Lantz: But we have to be cognizant of expenditures and take appropriate steps. So, what I, as I noodle on this, if we're talking about speeding, the best approach then is to utilize the resources that we have, our police department has remote data collection capabilities in their radar feedback trailer, their signs. So, I think like with any problem, first we need to quantify it. So, I would propose that we go to our police department, work into their schedule, collect some data over a period of several weeks, and then look at that data and again, from an engineering and a traffic engineering perspective, we're not talking about changing speed limits, we're talking about enforcement. So, we have to really enlist our enforcement partners, the police department in these conversations.

Lance Lantz: So, I think that taking this data, presenting it to them and saying, is this concerning in your experience? Do you have... Do we have a problem or do we have the occasional outlier that you're going to experience in every situation, or do you think that this warrants some special attention, some increased patrols, some periodic increased patrols, frequent... Do you need to make this a hot spot? So first, we need to quantify it, and the most practical way to do that is to let our police department collect some data and we can look at it internally.

Councilor Choi: The other thing... So I went out because I couldn't remember where this was exactly, so I went out there and parked myself out there for about 20 minutes, and also drove around the area and not noticing that much speeding, but it was a low traffic area on a Sunday afternoon, but if we put stop signs out there, the other part is, there are other streets that cross over in a similar fashion, it was beside Cedar, Poplar, and Walnut and other streets that are similarly situated where they can speed down. Why don't we put stop signs along those streets as well, why Cedar, and not those streets then? Those questions popped up in my head as well.

Lance Lantz: And that is exactly on point. And is consistent with what I was saying, when you put an arbitrary nature to these decisions, you do just that, you kick the problem, you just move it one street, typically a stop request is at a more remote location that's not really got influencing locations or influencing intersections in close proximity. You think of our rural areas and you might have half a mile to the next stop sign, so you really have to think about the implications of a stop condition there.

Lance Lantz: In the village you do, and you almost have to take a thematic look, at least to the northern block of the village north of Oak, south of Ash, because anything you do at one intersection when your blocks are 200-300 feet long is absolutely going to have an effect on the performance of an adjacent intersection, and if you look at the general approach and it's been this way for years, there's nothing... In my tenure, really nothing has changed in the village. When you look at that Northern kind of approach, generally it's those North-South streets, the ordinal streets on second, third, fourth, those generally have the stops, whereas the east west or the tree streets, they don't. And I think that that probably stems historically from that actually being a traffic flow pattern, you've got people coming in from the Mulberry, from the high school area working their way through the village down to Oaktree and vice versa.

Lance Lantz: So, I think that if there was logic and I'm going, I'm thinking of our ancestors here, and what thought may have been put into the original approach to stop signs in there, but that's kind of what I think drove that. So if you start looking at stop conditions and perhaps flipping them around, I will say if we look at stops and we take a formal look at it, if there were any changes that were recommended or resulted, it would be due to the wrong street having the stop condition, the two-way stop, you want that primary street, higher volume street to have preference because you

want to have, you want to move people in a safe and efficient manner. So, you might see some two ways that would recommend being flipped and probably some of the four ways that exist there. The findings would be that those should be set back to a two-way and eliminate a couple of stop conditions, that's just what I guess based on my experience. But to your point, yes, you're in the village where you're in close proximity, anything you do on one street is going to have a direct effect on the adjacent street.

Vice-President Plunkett: Lance, one of the other questions we got was speed bumps. Obviously, that creates its own problems in the wintertime with plowing and such. I think the email made the comment about, we see them in neighborhoods, why can't we do that in the street? Is that the only reason why we would not be able to consider that?

Lance Lantz: I will fall on my sword against speed bumps, because much like an arbitrary approach to stop sign placement, once you open up a speed bump option on a public street, there will be no argument not to put them everywhere, and when you start to understand the widespread implications of those daily accesses to our homes, be it school buses, we won't even cover public safety, school buses, mail services, trash services, our services that we provide, speed bumps really significantly impede the efficient operation of a transportation system. I will fall on my sword against speed bumps on public streets.

President Garrett: So, and if it pleases this Council, I think what I'd like to do then is to reach out to Chief Spears.
Just make sure you speak in the microphone so the virtual folks can hear you.

Steven Gorgievski: So basically, Cedar Street is like a main shoot-off, just like Pine is from Main Street, so you have people that want to go around first or Main and Sycamore, they take Main Street up and they hit Cedar and they take Cedar up. During the weekends and evenings, traffic's heavier, families going to the restaurants, eating, people drinking, you really don't need to put a lot of money in to doing a study, just come sit on my front porch and watch. So, I've been in public safety 25 years, people speed up and down the street, there are 20 kids on my street, I think, from third... No, from fourth to second, 20. So it's really not that difficult. I sit on my porch, and I watch it all day.

President Garrett: So maybe a more scientific approach, I appreciate the advice for the porch.

Steven Gorgievski: And anybody is welcome to come sit and watch. I'm just trying to save someone from really getting hurt.

President Garrett: Well, I think what we're trying to avoid is a situation where we arbitrarily as a council start putting in stop signs or speed limits or speed bumps, because then we'll have 50 other neighborhoods coming saying, we need that, and so I think the proposal is... What I want to do is I'm going to email our chief who is very responsive, and do basically what Mr. Lance suggested, which is let's do a speed study and determine... And the speed study is not an expense, right. A speed study is them putting out the equipment we already own to gather the data to say, yes, this is a problem. Or no, it's not a problem, or it's sort of a problem. If it's sort of a problem or is a problem, then it's a determination of, Alright, well what do we do to solve that? Right, is it... Is it stop signs? If it's not a speed enforcement, is it increased enforcement or patrols, whatever that may be? That's at least what would propose doing.

Steven Gorgievski: I suggest that if you're going to put whatever, I think it's that movable box that you can... On the tires or on the wheels that show speed, is that how you track that or just with one of those cables?

President Garrett: I don't know, I'd have to ask...

Steven Gorgievski: If it's a standing-up speed thing, people are going to see it and they're going to slow down, but I think there was someone who... I don't know who put it there but there was one there earlier, maybe a month ago, a month and a half ago, but it was facing going westbound, right at 2nd Street, so cars don't have momentum to pick up and see... If you're going to do it, it needs to be coming eastbound, those guards to shoot down and...

President Garrett: Down the hill, right?

Steven Gorgievski: Correct.

Steven Gorgievski: Yeah. Like I said, I wouldn't be here if it wasn't going on, people are speeding... If I could pull my radar gun out and video it, maybe that's what needs to be done, but... So...

President Garrett: We'll copy you on the note to the chief to make sure that we're doing it the right way and gathering the right data, and I appreciate you bringing it to our attention. Anything else, councilors, on that? Is that okay for a next step?

Steven Gorgievski: Mm-hmm.

President Garrett: Okay. Thank you. I appreciate it. Thanks, Lance. Don't go too far, Lance, you're up in a second. Before that I've got an agenda item here, this is the financial update on litigation expenses. I am not a lawyer nor an accountant, but I'm going to play one here for a minute. So, I asked Tammy Havard to join us. She is on vacation, and I'm glad that she takes a vacation, good for her, but no one else from the administration has chosen to show up to discuss this matter.

D. Financial Update on Litigation Expenses

President Garrett: If I can answer a question, I will, but what I can do is provide some data that was given to all of us, just so that we're aware, and I talked to Tammy about this to get a sense of how this breaks down. For this year, the budget for legal was \$599,000, \$180,000 of that was for town retainer, which is effectively the administration's retainer; \$186,000 is for the council retainer, and then \$233,000 is for everything else, any other legal matter that comes up. Whether it's an individual that's suing the town, whether it is the mayor that's suing the town council or whatever that may be, falls in that non-retainer matters. So, if you look at what we've spent currently, we're at roughly \$472,000, and this was through, let's call it middle of July. Town retainer and council retainer are right on budget, and that would make sense, right? It's retainer, it's pretty easy to budget for. The non-retainer matters, if we budgeted \$233,000, are currently at \$228,000.

President Garrett: So, for those of you playing at home, that's a total of \$472,000 that we have spent of the \$599,000. Now, note that we still have another \$120,000 of retainer to pay for services through the end of the year, so that effectively puts it at our budget. So, any other legal matters spent from effectively this point going forward will put us over budget. Now, Tammy didn't know how much over budget because it's hard to predict what that may be. And I'm also not... I'm not entirely sure, I'm going to have to ask where that money comes from if it goes...

President Garrett: It has to come from somewhere, so it's going over budget where that comes

from. But I expect that if we're on pace for non-retainer matters, if we're 7/12ths of the way through at \$228,000, we would probably spend another \$200,000 which would put us at \$800,000 for legal for this year, which is by far and away a record year, and it's not a good record to have. So, as it relates to... I know there's been a lot of questions about specific litigation, and the numbers that I have so far has been \$68,768 spent by the administration... No, I'm sorry, \$69,853 spent by the administration, and \$61,253 spent by the council, so it's at \$131,100 for that specific lawsuit. I think we're aware the mayor has appealed that so that number will also go up.

Councilor Traylor: And one thing to note too, is there was another firm... I'm sorry if you were getting ready to get to this, but there was another firm represented by the town's insurance company, and we have no idea how that'll impact premiums or anything.

President Garrett: Correct. We won't get a bill for that, but... Correct.

Councilor Traylor: We won't get a bill for... Directly.

President Garrett: Directly. Correct. So that's the update I have on finance, I know a lot of folks have reached out to us on that. Any questions on that? Anything I missed on that, Heather?

Heather Willey: Yeah, I was going to say, that's just a snapshot in time, so I think the numbers you have maybe are from the end of June.

President Garrett: Correct.

Heather Willey: And so, we have July time, so just pulling our time, we have a lot of constituents who've asked and really you have to... From a public records perspective, you have to ask each time, that the town's not going to automatically update you for the procedures under Open Door Law, but that number is changing all the time since there has been an appeal filed. What we've given out publicly is that snapshot, but as people are interested in further updates they should reach back out with the public records request, if that's something they're interested in, to get that more precise information.

President Garrett: Correct. Thank you. Any other questions, Councilors, that I may or may not be able to answer? Alright. Well, we'll move on then to the sewer expansion discussion. Lance, I told you not to go that far away. Okay. And there's not a vote on this, this is just a presentation, correct?

D. Sewer Expansion Discussion

President Garrett: Alright, very good. We presented an update of the Oak Street sewer... Sorry. We presented an update to the Oak Street sewer progress back in June, and that conversation extended into the many other unsewered areas that we have around town. And at that time, we were in the early stages of consideration and development of future projects that are now possible, as a result of the Oak Street sewer construction and being put into service. We also briefly discussed the two basic types of sanitary sewer collection systems, gravity and low-pressure force main.

Lance Lantz: Since that time, we have continued the quantification of unsewered areas of higher concentrations of homes, basically the problem areas or where we are hearing most from our constituents. So tonight, we are continuing this discussion and bringing to you a recommended approach to achieve rapid, simple, and the least intrusive deployment of sanitary sewers to many

areas by the end of 2023. As you noted, President Garrett, there is no formal vote that we're asking for tonight, but we would like your concurrence on our recommendations in order to advance these efforts in a timely manner. And so, each sewer has its story, and here to tell those stories is our Town Engineer, George Lewis.

Town Engineer George Lewis: Need a taller microphone.

[laughter]

George Lewis: Good evening, councilors. George Lewis, Town Engineer. As Lance said I'm just going to walk through a presentation we put together here that talks about some of the things we looked at in arriving at the recommendation that he's talking about as far as proceeding with pressure sewers in these areas. The first slide we have here was just to give you guys an idea of the general magnitude of unsewered areas within the town sewer service area. All the areas that are shaded in yellow, they are ones that have been identified on a map where there is a house or some sort of residence there, but it does not currently have sewer service. There are quite a few areas to the north, west, and south where there are houses with no sewers that are on separate systems. This next map zeros in on the areas that we're currently targeting for doing projects in the near future, and we've got them, shaded in two different colors, one is red, one is purple, and those are what we're anticipating at this point as phases. The red would be a first phase, the purple would be a second phase.

George Lewis: And there's a footnote in there, you guys probably can't read it unless you have the printed copy, but it talks about that this is envisioning the pressure sewer alternative that we're talking about. So, just to talk to everybody about specifically what we mean when we say this; a gravity sewer system, if we did a project for that, we would be putting in the green pipes that we're showing here, we would be putting sewer main down the street, down the right-of-way, and extending sewer laterals to people's property line on either side. So, we would put in the green pipes, and then the homeowners would be responsible for putting in the yellow pipes running from their house out to the street and abandoning their septic tank. But the note at the top says that the town's policy is once all those pipes are in place, the homeowners are responsible from the house out to the main and the street.

Councilor Melton: George, can you just go back one... I'm sorry to interrupt.

George Lewis: Oh sure, no problem.

Councilor Melton: Can you just read the rest of that little star down there? It says... Let me read it, "Phases as envisioned for pressure sewer concept, and the gravity sewers would require more phasing as discussed in a later presentation." I just want that to be on the record as...

George Lewis: Right. Basically, yeah, if we... And I'll get to this, but the gravity sewers, if we go that direction, it costs more. We would have to spread it out into more phases to get sewers into all the areas that we're currently talking about.

Councilor Melton: Thank you.

George Lewis: So, the pressure sewer concept from the part that the town will be putting in is just the green pipe, we would just be putting in a pressure sewer main within the right-of-way down the street. And then, in the future, when people wanted to hook up, they would have to put in a grinder pump in their yard, however it's situated in their yard, and run a pressure sewer lateral out to connect to the main out in the right-of-way. Budgetary costs, it always comes down to, how much is

all this really going to cost? For the gravity sewer option, and we have a little star, a little one up there with another footnote, if people want to actually read the whole presentation. But, really with the gravity sewers, the way everything is laid out with the topography and the current system, there would still be people... Even if we try to do a pressure sewer system, there would still be about 25% of the people who would likely end up being on a pressure sewer anyway. Just because it's down a hill, we'd have to put in a lift station or something that actually served those areas by gravity.

George Lewis: But the overall cost, the putting in all those sewers in the right-of-way and the laterals to the right-of-way line, it's about \$6.25 million is what we're estimating for construction and engineering. And then the property owner cost, once the... And I guess I say here also that, based on the current budgeting and the amount of money that we've been taking in on the utility for connection fees and those types of things, we're estimating that we could allocate about \$800,000 a year to this work. So, if we had to spend that much money, \$6.25 million, it's probably going to take about eight phases, eight years to get sewers to all these areas. I guess we could do four phases and do one every two years or something like that, but it would be that sort of timeframe. But as far as the property owner costs, they would have... We've spoken with some local contractors to try to get an idea of what their cost would be on their lot.

George Lewis: So, you would have to run from the house out to the main and do that connection, estimate is about \$7500 to \$10,000 for that work, and that's assuming you can get a gravity lateral. And if your house is down lower, there's lots of little nuances and every lot is different. But given the up-front costs that would be involved then, we're also saying that likely we would need to have a reimbursement cost from the property owners to the town for the construction of the sewers. So, I think similarly, I think in the mid '90s the town extended sewers to neighborhoods on either side of Willow Street, and during that time there was a 10-year payback of additional... In addition to your regular sewer bill, you had to pay a construction cost, to offset the construction costs that were outlaid at the beginning to put those sewers in, to begin with.

President Garrett: Is that covering the 6.25 million, is that what you're talking about, in that...

George Lewis: Yeah, a portion of the 6.25.

President Garrett: So, we're floating the money and then pay back over time, is that the way?

George Lewis: Right.

President Garrett: Got it.

George Lewis: And then they would have to also pay the regular connection fee, which is a little more than \$4000. So, if you add all that up, the homeowner's portion of the cost would be in the \$20,000 to \$24,000 range. For the pressure sewer scenario, we're saying that we can serve all those areas and get those mains installed for about 1.65 million. With \$800,000, that's about two years or two phases to get sewer service established in all these neighborhoods. The property owner costs that we're estimating, again this is from talking to local contractors, is to install a grinder pump lateral and abandon the septic, it's \$15,000 to \$20,000.

George Lewis: With the lower upfront costs, we're conceptualizing that we could do the projects without asking for that additional cost on their sewer bill, the reimbursement cost. But they would still have to pay the \$4000 connection fee, so that puts the range of that homeowner's portion of the cost to get sewer service at \$19,000 to \$24,000, is what we came up with. So as a timeline to do the two phases that we've been talking about, basically if we started doing design and permitting around now, towards the... We can finish design toward the beginning of next year, bid out the project,

begin construction early summer of next year and have sewer service established by next fall, for the first phase.

George Lewis: And then the second phase, we would try to follow a similar timeline. But beginning in design in the middle of 2022, bidding it in early 2023 and doing the construction in 2023. But as we said, for gravity sewers we would need to do more phases, potentially up to six more. We would just do whatever we could each year, and I'll talk about them. So, discussion points, these are just some of the different items that we thought about as we've been putting together this concept. And the gravity sewer system, it's much more costly, it would take much longer to get service to all the areas that we're currently talking about, it's a lot more disruptive to the neighborhoods, its deep excavations, digging all the laterals across the roads, putting in road cuts. I think one of the neighborhoods we're talking about that, Boone County just paved all the roads so we wouldn't want to come in and cutting... Open cutting all the roads. There are potential delays due to utility conflicts, that's what we've run into on the Oak Street sewer where there's a gas line in the way we've got to get moved, there's just a lot more potential for that kind of stuff.

George Lewis: A gravity sewer you have to lay it on grade in a straight line, with a pressure sewer you can bend it and move it around and miss things. As we said, the council would need to just consider establishing rates for recovery of construction costs for the gravity sewers, and it could be spread out over a period of time up to 20 years, if we really wanted to leave it out there that long. Pressure sewers are going to be needed in some of the areas regardless, we estimate about 25% of the customers that we'd be serving. But in all of these discussions, we're trying to set this up in such a way that the residents would still be able to choose whether they wanted to connect or not. There's other things, you can do a project where you make people connect, which I don't think anybody has a strong appetite to do that, but with the amount of money that's been put out there, it's tying up a lot of resources for the sewer utility and would make it harder to do the other things that we need to pay for with the wastewater plan, etcetera.

President Garrett: Hey, George?

George Lewis: Yeah.

President Garrett: Yeah, what's the catch? Why would you ever put in a gravity sewer system if the pressure systems are a quarter of the cost and all the benefit? Am I missing something?

George Lewis: Well, it's...

President Garrett: What's the benefit of a gravity system?

George Lewis: I mean, it's a conventional system, it's what people are used to. You don't have the pump on your property. You don't have the pump that you have to take care of and keep operating. I actually have a pressure sewer on my house that... At Oak Ridge, we live in Oak Ridge. There's one street and the 10 of us are on this common pressure sewer line. Roger's hooked up to it too.

George Lewis: So, but you have that pump that you have to watch, and the alarm can go off and you have to call somebody and come out and have them fix it.

President Garrett: There's no capacity constraints on pressure versus gravity or anything like that, the grinder pump doesn't have a limit if you got guests over?

George Lewis: No, I mean you... The pumps are sized adequately to serve whatever flow you're going to have in a house. Now, the other things that get brought up are that if you run out of power, if the power goes out, you're not going to have sewer service all the time. But for the most part, power only goes out for an hour, a couple of hours, and you just have to limit water use at that time, I mean not wash clothes and that kind of stuff. I think you could still... There's still some reserve capacity in the system to allow people to use it, but you would have to, if you really wanted to pump the thing out, you'd have to have a generator. And that would all be on the individual property owners as far as how robust and redundant they wanted their system to be.

President Garrett: Got it.

George Lewis: So, the pressure system, I guess, just talking through some of the last points here, it's got lower upfront cost and we could serve more areas in less time. It will require each person to purchase a grinder pump, however, from the cost that we've been able to identify, it would be at least less than or equal to what a lot of these residents would be looking at if they had to replace their septic system on their lot and put in a mound-type system. I think a couple of estimates I had were \$25,000 to \$30,000 to put in a mound. It's less disruptive to the neighborhood because a lot of the pipes can be directionally drilled in, so you only have to dig at certain locations. And we could offer the construction without trying to do this cost recovery, this extra amount on their bill.

George Lewis: And we're still trying to set this up all so that residents can choose... That we would provide a service and have it available, but they could choose at what point they actually wanted to hook up. I do think if we put the sewers in that it would not be an option to upgrade your septic system. If you were going to do a project, if your septic system went bad, I don't think you could... The county wouldn't, I don't think they would let you put a new septic system in if the sewer was available in the street. To this last slide and it says a lot of the same things as we've already said. Recommendation is to go with the procedure, the pressure sewer concept in these areas. It's the lowest cost, least disruption, less risk for construction to the town and being able to get this sewer service established and get this moving because I know a lot of people have been waiting a long time to have this available. So, anybody has any questions for me?

President Garrett: Councilors questions?

Lance Lantz: Sure. Yeah. Thanks, George. And have I mentioned how glad we are to have him join our team? For those of you who don't know or may not recall, George as a civil engineer has quite a bit of extensive experience designing sewer systems for various utilities around central Indiana. But we appreciate the opportunity to hold these discussions in your public forum where they belong so that you as the decision makers are aware of the efforts and needs as well as is the public. As we stated in the opening, we're not looking for a formal action. You can take whatever action you like, send us back, want more information, not go that route. We'd like to get your general concurrence so we can march on. And I should note that we have had survey completed on three areas already, Eagle View Drive, White Oak Court, and Sycamore Court, using the engineering funds that we already had budgeted.

Lance Lantz: But of course, we needed to determine what type of sewer we're going to provide before we can continue with design. There is the possibility, and it may in fact be likely that we may be back before you this year with an additional appropriation request to bring the balance of the areas that were shown as phase one up to speed with the three areas I just mentioned, so that we can march all of phase one along at the same timeline. However, all future construction and all the other expenses beyond 2021 will be presented to you through the normal budget approval process so that you may review revenues and we can demonstrate sustainability. And we will propose using the sewer availability fee. And that's an important point to get across here, which is captured from

new homes connecting to our sanitary sewer system. So, this is not the operating fund. This means that current customers and the rates they pay are not funding this expansion. What is funding this expansion are those tap fees we get from new connections. So, thank you for the time. We look forward to answering any questions you may have and hopefully we can leave tonight with a clear path.

President Garrett: Lance, if we add all these homes, do we have the sewage treatment capacity to take them on?

Lance Lantz: Absolutely. And these customers, in my opinion, are a priority customer and come before new home. These people have no options. We are their option instead of a septic system. So, we have our wastewater study capacity study going on right now. We have factored in these homes. We have quantified them. And yes, we have the capacity and I intend to reserve this capacity for these homes, whether or not we move forward with service to them.

President Garrett: So how many homes is it? We're dealing with the population of the homes in phase one and phase two, just out of curiosity.

Lance Lantz: Total, 325.

President Garrett: For both phases?

Councilor Traylor: How far out is that wastewater study as far as the capacity? I know it's a little off topic, but I'm eager to see where we actually stand.

Lance Lantz: Yeah, I believe we are scheduled currently to be in front of you with a presentation of their findings in November.

Councilor Traylor: Okay.

President Garrett: Any other questions, councilors? Or statements? I think they're looking for some.

Councilor Traylor: I don't know why we would go with the gravity...

Lance Lantz: Well, I will say I also have experience with a commercial property that has a grinder system as well as municipal water. So really, the management is not difficult. When the power goes off at your home, you put other precautions in place. You don't open the refrigerator excessively, etcetera. But can say, the well capacity these little pumps have... You've got several flushes at least before you have any problems.

Councilor Traylor: That's better than out at my house. [chuckle]

President Garrett: Is there any other term than grinder pump we can use?

Lance Lantz: Whatever you want to call it is fine. Widget 3.

Councilor Traylor: Yeah, I just hate that term.

Lance Lantz: An E1 or equivalent.

[background conversation]

Councilor Traylor: Just the grinder pump doesn't do anything for me.

Councilor Melton: Is there any way we could go ahead and do the grinder pumps for phase two as well? Just to his point, he said why use gravity? Why not just kick over into the grinder situation, make everything pressurized?

Lance Lantz: That's what we're proposing, phase one and phase two.

Councilor Melton: Okay.

Lance Lantz: And that would... This is an important conversation to have because as George mentioned, we've not, as a community entertained sewer service extensions for many, many years. And then it's only been one time. So, we are basically setting precedent here, you are setting a precedent in that, what approach do we want to take to serve these areas? And so that's why I wanted to have this discussion publicly, let you ask any questions, get any understandings you needed, because moving forward, as we continue to look at... The big map had many, many areas, so there are going to be more areas that come online that are going to want supporters that are outside the immediate scope of one and two. So, we want to kind of set the expectations for the community, when sewers are coming, this is what it looks like.

Councilor Traylor: Well, if this were presented by anybody else to this council, the first thing I would do is call you two guys, so if you tell us [chuckle] that this is a route to go...

Lance Lantz: I wasn't sure where you were going with that, but I like where you ended. [chuckle]

Councilor Traylor: Yeah.

Alex Choi: For any residents that want to hook up, but they're not financially able to afford it, is there any public assistance available to them at all?

Lance Lantz: We can research that further. There are some grants, and if we go down this road, and I don't want to... I don't know who has the over under on the meeting time. And I don't want to extend this unnecessarily, but there are options that we can look at, such as group purchasing. If we work on these projects and have enough people sign up and commit, we could see about bulk purchase of these grinder... Sorry, grinder pumps. So, we are looking at that opportunity. We have also applied for some grants, so we are looking at any way we can to take this burden off the utility revenues, but we are certainly happy to explore grants for an individual on an individual basis, so that we can at least provide information for people. But remember, keep in mind that they're going to need to do something if they're facing this decision and they might be having significant capital expenses for a septic system too, so we really want to help customers in any way we can.

Vice-President Plunkett: Yeah, I think when you start looking at this, you've got... I know a lot of these folks are in my district and even in Craig's, but I get emails from people in Colony Court, Lakewood, Eaglewood, talking about their septic systems. They're going to have to replace them. They need access to sewer. I like the idea of being able to bring this from an eight-year project to the timeframe we talked about earlier. The idea that we're not disturbing the land as much, we're able to bore directionally, I think there's a tremendous amount of value to this, and I think it's also important to note that we're giving people the choice. They don't have to hook up. Again, ideally it would be good to get as many people on board as quickly as possible to potentially get bulk pricing for the labor, for the grinder pumps, for everything, but it's not something that they're required to do, they have a choice to do it. It's my understanding, correct?

Lance Lantz: That's right, and that's one of the other reasons to consider the low-cost alternative, because you're gambling. You can poll people until you're blue in the face, and you think 50 people are going to connect in the first two years, and then the reality hits or the decision hits and you're, "You know what, I'm going to limp along." So, we don't know, we don't want to predicate any financing on forecasting a number of future rate payers when it's so un-calculable. Calculable. Forecastable. Any other trick syllables there?

Councilor Melton: You mentioned grants, is the Ready grant, something that we've kind of... Can we put that into this...?

Lance Lantz: The Ready grant window has closed, and that was not really an applicable grant. The Swift grant, if you're familiar with that, that is where we have applied for both wastewater and stormwater projects.

President Garrett: Lance, I just want to let you know I'm supportive, as long as it's just not required. I don't want to force someone to have to pay \$20,000 day one. If their septic fails, I understand they then need to join, but I think that's just where I stand on the...

Lance Lantz: Nor do we. We want to keep this as open and fluid, as possible for... [chuckle] Sorry. Many options available for property owners. I did not mean to say that. [chuckle]

President Garrett: Council, is there any other thoughts, or any other direction you want to give to Mr. Lance or George?

Councilor Choi: I'm supportive.

Vice-President Plunkett: I like it.

President Garrett: I don't know that we need to take a vote Lance, but it feels like...

Lance Lantz: I am not seeing or hearing anyone say no, so I think that that's our marching orders clearly enough. And for the edification of the public, now that we have a direction, we really want to try and build a more robust public information. We've got some project information on the website, and I hope that in the near future, we'll be able to get this down to a neighborhood level so that you can see where my neighborhood is in this schedule, what's coming next, and when can I expect things. So, we want to try and provide as much information as we can and as specific to each location as we can.

Vice-President Plunkett: And Lance, is it fair to say you want as many people in these areas to notify you as to whether or not they would want to hook up now or not, is that something you want?

Lance Lantz: Since we're not looking at a reimbursable situation or looking at a rate adjustment to mitigate any of these expenses, we may poll them, but I don't know that is important at this point. We are going to go ahead and get these sewers in the ground, and if three people hook up, fine, if 300 do, fantastic.

President Garrett: Okay, will any of this be in the 2022 budget that we're just starting to...

Lance Lantz: Yes, sir.

President Garrett: Okay, very good. Councilors, anything else on this? Alright, we budget for a

taller microphone for George too. Thanks guys, I appreciate it.

Lance Lantz: Thank you.

President Garrett: Lance don't go anywhere.

Lance Lantz: Okay.

F. Consideration of a Resolution Dedicating Right-of-Way from Boone County to the Town of Zionsville (Holiday Road)
Resolution 2021-14

President Garrett: We've got a consideration... A resolution dedicating right-of-way from Boone County to the town of Zionsville's Holiday Road. This is a resolution 2021-14 and Lance, you're here. Council, Roger Burris is here as well. If we have questions for him on this matter too.

Lance Lantz: Thank you and welcome to your last regularly scheduled agenda item. You have before you a resolution, essentially giving the town a bridge and road right-of-way currently owned and controlled by Boone County. This is locally referred to or known as Holiday Road bridge and Holiday Road from that bridge, west on over to County Route 975. Is everyone familiar with this area? I could pull something up, but I think this is that cut-through that used to exist from Michigan Road to 975 on a gravel lane. Well, with the development of Holiday Farms, this no longer serves a vehicular transportation purpose. However, this has been part of a corridor that has long been identified as an important link in our multi-modal pathway network.

Lance Lantz: This essentially, when in the future, when fully constructed and supplemented by private development would connect Tricky Foot Park area over to County Route 975 and a future park site up on that road, as well as over to Michigan Road when the system is fully built. This action tonight allows the town to be the master of its own pathway plan and improve or modify this corridor in the future to enhance our pathway experiences. Within the resolution itself, the first two pages are the meat and potatoes of the transfer, that's followed by several pages of gobbledygook, which is the legal description of the roadways and the property on which the bridge sits, but I want to direct your attention to the lengthy Exhibit B.

Lance Lantz: I have reviewed this, and this is essentially saying and re-stating in several different ways that this is a historic structure, and it will not be destroyed or materially modified without permission. If we ever fail to have use for the bridge, and we're putting ourselves on the hook to either rehab it, refurbish it, give it away, relocate it. This is a historic structure that's intended to be perpetuated in some form or fashion. There is nothing I read in that agreement that is specific to this bridge, that is a state policy on historic structures.

Lance Lantz: I will say it is also likely that we would have to seek approval for any modifications to this bridge that we make or keep in mind that this was started out as a vehicular bridge, and if we transition its primary function to pedestrian, we may need to make some ADA accessibility changes to it. This bridge was recently reconstructed, for anyone not following the news, so we are getting this in like-new, lightly used condition, and there is no near-term or even medium-term maintenance anticipated for the structure. We have alerted our town insurance company to add this to our insured assets and the county commissioners have already executed a mirror resolution authorizing the donation of this to the town, so the last action is for you, should you choose to accept this dedication so that we can continue to build out our pathway network. So happy to have answer any questions that you may have.

Councilor Traylor: I just find it funny that it's a new bridge, but it's a historic bridge. [laughter]

Lance Lantz: I said it's "like-new", it's not new.

Councilor Traylor: Oh, it's new.

Lance Lantz: It's like new, it's bionic.

Councilor Traylor: Yeah, yeah. Maybe they reused one bolt from the old one, but it's a new bridge. [chuckle]

President Garrett: I guess the only question to me is, do you want it? Your department's effectively...

Lance Lantz: This is titled in the name of the town, so this board has the choice to do with it as you so choose and assign it to whatever jurisdiction, authority, division, department, you want.

President Garrett: I'm assuming it would go to Parks and Roger, I don't know if there's anything you want to add this or not. Don't come up if you don't want to but... The first pathway would be...

Lance Lantz: There have been ongoing negotiations with area property owners on alternate path alignments, and the first and best step was to get this asset in the name of the town to allow town and its agents or assigns to negotiate the changes.

President Garrett: Got it.

Lance Lantz: So, let's get this in our hands and then we'll have some conversations.

President Garrett: Let me rephrase the question then. Is there any reason why we don't want it?

Lance Lantz: I highly recommend that you take this action tonight.

President Garrett: Very good.

Councilor Traylor: I wish we had gotten the opportunity before the road was vacated, but [chuckle] I'll take a free bridge.

President Garrett: A brand new historical bridge.

Councilor Traylor: A brand new historical bridge.

Councilor Choi: Still have no idea where this is.

Councilor Traylor: Holiday Road? Beautiful red bridge?

Councilor Choi: Oh, that kind of iron-ish?

President Garrett: Yes. The red one.

Councilor Melton: So, Lance, do we still own the road on the west side of the bridge? Does the town of Zionsville own the bridge on the west side?

Lance Lantz: This is dedicating transferring to you, Turkey... Holiday Road on the west side of the bridge. So, it's from the bridge to the west.

Councilor Melton: Perfect, thank you.

Lance Lantz: And I would expect that I will soon be back, or someone will soon be back with a similar action as we look to take over the old Turkey Foot Road right away from the county as well.

President Garrett: Well, I appreciate the county's co-operation. They're great folks. Councilors, any other questions?

Councilor Traylor: I make a motion to approve.

President Garrett: A first from Councilor Traylor.

Councilor Melton: Second.

President Garrett: Second from Councilor Melton. Alex, you know where it's at?

Councilor Choi: Yeah, I've heard of it.

President Garrett: All in favor? Aye.

Council Traylor: Aye.

Councilor Melton: Aye

Councilor Choi: Aye

Vice-President Plunkett: Aye

President Garrett: All opposed? Resolution 2021-14 passes with a vote of five in favor, zero opposed. Thank you, Mr. Lance.

Lance Lantz: Thank you.

7. OTHER MATTERS

President Garrett: Councilors, any other matters?

Councilor Traylor: I did have just one thing I wanted to clarify for, I know there's a lot of people watching online. But I've gotten, and maybe you guys have to, but I've gotten a lot of emails and calls about if there is anything the town could do, any ordinance the town could put in place to essentially reverse the school's mask mandate for 12 and under. And I just wanted... It's easier to address everybody at once rather than take all those emails and phone calls, but there essentially is nothing. The governor put that duty on the school boards to make that decision. The school board's made the decision. So, the governor's mandate, that's their authority, supersedes anything we could do, so there is nothing we can do on that. Just so that maybe the phone will quit ringing.

President Garrett: There you go. Thank you. On that note, schools do start tomorrow in Zionsville, so be aware as you're driving around the community that there'll be a lot of kids running around getting to the school bus in the morning, so drive cautiously. Any other matters? Otherwise, we'll go to Approval of Claims. Any questions on the claims that were submitted?

8. APPROVAL OF CLAIMS

Vice-President Plunkett: Yeah, I have a question, but I know that...

President Garrett: Well Tammy's not here.

Vice-President Plunkett: Yeah, Tammy's not here. I just...

President Garrett: If there's a claim you're uncomfortable with, we can exclude it until we can get answers.

Vice-President Plunkett: Well, I just noticed there's another law firm, Faegre Drinker Biddle & Reath for \$16,708 for professional services... And I...

President Garrett: Is there anybody...

Vice-President Plunkett: I would like to know what "professional services" means.

Councilor Traylor: Anybody from the town that knows what that is?

President Garrett: We can approve claims less that claim until we get that answered, if you like Vice-President Plunkett.

Vice-President Plunkett: I'm fine doing that.

President Garrett: Probably worthwhile to make sure we know what we're approving.

Vice-President Plunkett: Yeah, I'd make a motion to approve claims minus that particular line item to Faegre Drinker Biddle & Reath.

President Garrett: Very good. Is there a second on that?

Councilor Traylor: Second.

President Garrett: A second from Councilor Traylor. All in favor?

President Garrett: Aye.

Vice-President Plunkett: Aye

Councilor Choi: Aye

Councilor Melton: Aye

Councilor Traylor: Aye

President Garrett: All opposed? Claims less the Faegre Drinker Biddle & Reath \$16,708.66 claim, are approved by a vote of five in favor, zero opposed.

9. ADJOURN

President Garrett: I'll make motion to adjourn.

Councilor Choi: Second.

President Garrett: Second from Councilor Choi, heard him first. All in favor?

President Garrett: Aye.

Vice-President Plunkett: Aye

Councilor Choi: Aye

Councilor Melton: Aye

Councilor Traylor: Aye

President Garrett: All opposed? Motion to adjourn approved by a vote of five in favor, zero opposed. The next regular Town Council meeting is scheduled for Monday, August 16th, 2021, at 7:30 AM, in Zionsville town hall council chambers, as well as electronically via Zoom. Final notice will be posted in compliance with the Indiana open door law. Thank you, everyone. Meeting was adjourned at 8:08 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Amelia Anne Lacy, Municipal Relations Coordinator
Town of Zionsville