



**ZIONSVILLE TOWN COUNCIL
MEETING MINUTES
FOR
MONDAY, AUGUST 16, 2021
AT 7:30 A.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; Brad Burk, Alex Choi, Joe Culp, Craig Melton and Bryan Traylor

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 7:30 a.m.

B. Pledge of Allegiance

President Garrett: I'm going to give Joe a wave or a thumbs up before we... We got a pre-rise there, I like it, but... [chuckle] We good? Alright, please join me for the Pledge of Allegiance.

All: We pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

2.APPROVAL OF THE MEMORANDUM OF THE AUGUST 2, 2021 REGULAR MEETING

President Garrett: Very good. Alright. First, we've got the approval of the memorandum of the August 2nd, 2021 regular meeting. A copy has been posted. I will make a motion to approve.

Vice-President Plunkett: Second.

President Garrett: Second from Vice-President Plunkett. All in favor? Aye.

All Councilors: Aye.

President Garrett: Opposed? Memoranda of the August 2nd, 2021 regular town council meeting is approved by a vote of six in favor, zero opposed.

3. REQUEST TO SPEAK ON AGENDA ITEM

President Garrett: Any requests to speak? I think I've got one.

Amy Lacy: Yes, we do have one.

President Garrett: Very good. Erica Carpenter? So, if you can give your name and address for the record and you have three minutes.

Erica Carpenter: My name is Erica Carpenter. My residential address is 26 Cedar Crest. I also own 530 Home, which is located at 205 South Main Street. Good morning and thank you for allowing me time to speak with you this morning. I'm here to speak in favor of resolution number 2021-15, only as it relates to the appropriation for motor vehicle Highway Number 0708, improvements to what is commonly known as the PNC lot located at Main and Sycamore. The two reasons I support and encourage you to support this are, number one, more available parking, and number two, to create even if an interim solution, an entry that is welcoming to the village and to the town of Zionsville. First, more parking. And before I begin, I hope that you'd hear these comments as they are intended, not as complaints, but as... To share with you what we as merchants experience so that we can work together for the best economically feasible solution. We talk a lot about parking in the village, whether it is a real or perceived issue. And so, I want to share feedback with you from my real customers about their experience and ability to find parking. I pulled a few communications from the customers attempting to visit our town.

Erica Carpenter: I encourage you to think about this issue, not as it relates to us, the locals, but to folks who don't live here. From Briana, "Hello. I tried to visit your store today, but after 15 minutes of driving around and looking for a spot, I had to leave. Where should I try to park next time? We are from out of town and came just to go to your store, but gave up." From Tammy, "Hi Erica, I love your shop and spending the day in Zionsville, but what can you do about the parking? Every time I come, it is a problem. I live in Noblesville and we have two-hour parking, maybe try that." For the record, no, that's [chuckle] not my suggestion. As you know, people are already using the PNC lot, especially in the evenings and on Saturday mornings for the farmers market. Could we do nothing and just allow people to continue to do this? I mean, maybe, but I encourage, again, thinking about this from the perspective of visitors who may see cars there, but no signage or lines and not be as willing to park there. And then, secondly...

[background conversation]

President Garrett: I paused your time, go for it.

Erica Carpenter: Okay. Thanks. Secondly, and I'm trying to read the tea leaves a little here as to what some of your objections might be. Why would we do this work when a newer and larger, better Gateway is on the horizon? And to that I say it's been a year. A year since the building was torn down and not much has physically happened. In my estimation, it's going to be years and not months for the larger vision to come to fruition and the development to occur. I hope we are all in agreement that the current state of the PNC lot is not how we want the entrance of our town to look, even for a shorter time period. Let's create a welcoming, clean, cared for entry that is representative of our beautiful village and town, while the larger Gateway Project is underway. To recap, and I hope that I've communicated that I want you to think about this as a visitor, not as we locals think of it. We want to think about what they see when they arrive, the ease with which they can navigate parking, and how that will impact their return to Zionsville again and again. Thank you.

President Garrett: Amy, any other speakers this morning?

Amy Lacy: No, that is all I received.

4. MAYOR/ADMINISTRATION UPDATE

President Garrett: Alright. Is there a Mayor Administration update?

Amy Lacy: No Mayor Administration update today.

President Garrett: Alright, maybe next time.

5. OLD BUSINESS

A. Electronics Meetings Policy Resolution – Resolution 2021-13

President Garrett: Old business, we've got electronics meeting policy resolutions, Resolution 2021-13. This actually doesn't necessarily need to be on the agenda because there aren't many changes here. We voted on this last time, and I think just for clarification purposes, this is really a resolution for how the council handles if there is a need to go remote. It's not necessarily how the public is able to interact with the council. That's really through the rules that we've set up, but basically the setup is in a way that if the council is present, we want everyone to be present, and if the council is remote, then we would allow access for everyone to be remote. So, pretty straightforward and it's somewhat dictated by the state as well. Heather, anything to add to that?

Heather Willey: Yeah. And I would just say it's been a little bit confusing maybe for some of the public because we've been operating pursuant to the governor's emergency order. The legislature actually allowed for a permanent opportunity for electronic meetings which is different than we've had prior to the pandemic. So, this would not impact an emergency order. So, if we're on... The entire council's meeting electronically due to a public health emergency or any other public emergency, then the public would also be able to interact electronically just like we have done over the last several months.

Heather Willey: This is really governing a longer term change, so that if a member needed to be electronic for some reason and wanted to request a permission to do so from the president of the council, this policy is really set up for how that individual would be required to participate and we have information included in the resolution, for example, about ensuring that if you were a member participating electronically that all the members of the public could hear you, see you, we would take a roll call vote to make sure that the public understood how you were voting. So, it's really about governing the member participation. So, just to make sure it's not confusing with the electronic meetings policy during a public health emergency that, that's still going to go by the state's rules.

President Garrett: Excellent. Councilors, any questions on that? Pretty straightforward? Very good. That is it for old business.

1. 6. NEW BUSINESS

A. Consideration of an Ordinance Amending the 2021 Salary Ordinance

President Garrett: New business. First we go to consideration of an ordinance amending the 2021

salary ordinance. This is Ordinance 2021-09. Jo Kiel, are you coming up? And I have also got Megan Nail here as well.

Human Resources Director Jo Kiel: Thank you. In preparation for the 2021 budget, we identified a need to create a compensation study to guide how we hire and retain employees. The compensation study itself was funded in the 2021 budget, and we've now developed a comprehensive strategy based on market data, as well as providing a framework to go forward with. I have included Megan Nail, she is the Vice-President of Total Rewards Practice with First Person Benefits Advisors, big title; to go through, give a little bit more information on how the project developed and... Well, we are both happy to answer any questions.

Megan Nail: Good morning.

Megan Nail: Thank you. Sure, okay, I can start in the interest of time while we get that solved. Today I want to talk a little bit about the compensation work that we have done leading up to our recommendation today. So, our goal was to create a compensation strategy that guides how we hire and retain top performing employees here at the town of Zionsville, achieve internal and external equity, so both within the town and outside to the greater market, reduce turnover, and then also increase our employee loyalty, engagement and performance. And what we did was really put together a program that was based on relevant and current market data, and then also, as Jo said, to provide a framework for both now and in the future on how compensation is handled here. So, we had a couple of key steps to this process that we went through. First we updated and reviewed all of the job descriptions. Actually, Jo, and her team did that, and with that process as a foundation, we really gathered input from the employee, the department head and HR to make sure that we had a solid understanding of what those jobs were going into the compensation program. And then we had to, once we had the job descriptions updated, second, go out and compare those to the market. And you may wonder exactly who we compared that to. Thank you.

Megan Nail: So, as I had said, first we reviewed the job descriptions and updated them and then compared them to the market. We really used a variety of compensation survey sources to do that market comparison. Of course, we focused on government, public administration and municipalities within the Indianapolis metro. We're really looking at those who are similar in employee size, revenue and operating budget. And then you can see there that we included specific surveys from other municipalities, including Lebanon, Whitestown, Carmel, Fishers, Noblesville, Westfield and Brownsburg along with others. So, we really tried to take a comprehensive view of what the market was in compensation. So, then we use that data to create salary ranges based on what that market data was, and you can see there's a range: Minimum, midpoint and maximum. And we took the market data that we gathered and we based the midpoint, that middle point of what the range is, on the middle of the market data or the 50th percentile. And these salary ranges and the way that we put them together really represent compensation best practices, and the relationships between the positions at the town of Zionsville.

Megan Nail: The nice thing about having salary ranges is they provide a meaningful opportunity for employees to grow financially within their current role, so as they gain additional skills, experience, job performance, it gives them a chance to really move forward and gain that salary increase within their role. So, when we talk about how this would be implemented in practice, the ordinance would really show the entire range, but the budget itself would be actual dollars. So, how that would work, and we've done this with other municipalities, I'll use Plainfield as an example. We would have the range for each position, and then you would send a budget for what the overall increase would be for that budget year. So, for example, say it was a 3% increase, we would create that budget, you would create the budget, and then we would figure out how to allocate that within

the range that each person is within their salary range, but we can also recognize those things like performance and growth and so forth.

Megan Nail: This really allows for flexibility and recognizing individual performance and other factors, but appropriate budget controls that we would work within as all of you would establish. So, as we looked at how your current employees individually compared to those new ranges, there are just a few employees who are below the minimum of what the new ranges are, so we would be asking for additional appropriation to bring these employees to the minimum of the new range, so they're within what those market salary ranges are. And then compensation increases going forward, again, as we said, we would bring employees to the minimum of the salary range if needed, and then just continue to refine the performance evaluations and use them as a tool to recognize that high performance with increased compensation within the established market range. Jo, is there anything that I forgot that you wanted to add?

Jo Kiel: I think that's good. We'll answer specific questions.

President Garrett: Thanks, Jo. Thanks, Megan. Councilors, any questions on this ask, and what this means?

Councilor Choi: So, when you look at the compensations of those that fall below the minimum, why wouldn't you want to bring them at least to the bottom of the... Not just to the minimum, but a little above the minimum, because you're pushing them to the bare lowest to make them competitive?

Jo Kiel: What we would like to do is today or with the next pay grade, bring them up to the minimum, we'll continue to work through what is the process to bring people. The goal is eventually for people to be at least the midpoint, but today, number one, that's a much bigger compensation ask, and so we want to... First steps are getting them to the minimum and then we'll work through how everybody kind of moves through those bans.

Councilor Choi: Okay, so you do have a long-term plan to get them to a...

Jo Kiel: Sure, yes, we will have a long-term plan.

Councilor Choi: And this may be a silly question, I think I know the answer to that, but in compensation plans for municipal employees, are there ever any structures built in where there is an incentive plan during... A bonus structure or a performance bonus instead of getting pay raises throughout the year? You know what I'm asking.

Megan Nail: Yeah, using more of a bonus or some instead of a base pay increase. That I would say is not very common in this particular industry, we know in private industry, that is common. I think it's something you could consider, but at this point, I think focusing on the base pay would be most common and probably most prudent at this point.

Councilor Choi: Okay.

Councilor Melton: Quick question. So again, I think I kind of touched on this earlier, but when you go to budget, you're not going to budget based off of the maximums of all these salaries, is that correct?

Megan Nail: Correct, it would be budgeted off of just a common percent, and then we would work within that to determine where people fall within the range. No, it would not be budgeted off the

maximum of the salary ranges.

Councilor Melton: Thank you.

President Garrett: How often do you have to re-survey to make sure the ranges are appropriate?

Megan Nail: We could look at depending on how the market moves which we're seeing a lot of market movement right now. If we needed to in the midterm, we could bring the ranges up by a percentile each year, a certain common percent to reflect that, but in general, a full market study would be every couple of years. It's pretty foundational work so you don't have to do that every single year.

Councilor Burk: Yeah, similar question, when was the last time we did this assessment?

Jo Kiel: I don't know. There's pieces and parts of what appear to be surveys, and I've been here just more than a year, so based on files that I've seen, there's pieces and parts of that, but I don't know when the last full-blown town-wide survey was.

Councilor Burk: Yeah, so we may just be playing some catch up?

Jo Kiel: Yeah, absolutely.

President Garrett: Jo, there's an additional appropriation request next related to salaries, is that related to then the ranges?

Jo Kiel: Yeah, it's \$26,000 to bring people up to the minimum, the additional expense for 2021 will be \$26,000, and then we'll roll those base pays into 2022, into the budget for 2022.

President Garrett: And given that's on the same agenda, and this is an ordinance that requires two votes, is the ask here if the council approves to suspend the rules and go through, get this all done today?

Jo Kiel: Yes, that is...

President Garrett: Okay. Councilors, any other questions? Well, I'd make a motion to approve. I think it's a good idea. I appreciate, Jo, you doing this.

Councilor Culp: Second.

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

All Councilors: Aye.

President Garrett: All opposed? Ordinance 2021-09 is approved on... Or is introduced on first reading with a vote of seven in favor, zero opposed. I will make a motion then to suspend the rules, so we can vote on this twice today. Is there a second on that?

Councilor Traylor: Second.

President Garrett: Was it Councilor Traylor?

Councilor Traylor: Yes

President Garrett: Well, it's Councilor Traylor, Amy. All in favor of suspending the rules?

All: Aye.

President Garrett: All opposed. Motion to suspend the rules does pass with a vote of seven in favor, zero opposed. And I'll make a motion to adopt ordinance 2021-09 on final reading. Any seconds on that?

Councilor Burk: Second.

President Garrett: Second by Councilor Burk this time. All in favor?

All: Aye.

President Garrett: All opposed? Ordinance 2021-09 is adopted with a vote of seven in favor, zero opposed. Thanks, Jo.

B. Consideration of an Additional Appropriation Resolution – Resolution 2021-15

President Garrett: Next, we've got a consideration of an additional appropriation resolution, this is Resolution 2021-15. There are actually a lot of different moving pieces here. We've got some from salaries, some from Mr. Lantz, some from Mr. Logsdon from Parks. This is also a public hearing. So, what I'm going to do is I'm going to open the public hearing if anyone wants to speak on this matter. I know Ms. Carpenter already spoke originally on this matter, but if anyone else wants to speak on this, I've got proof of publication. Please feel free to come to the podium. Alright, I will close that public hearing, Councilors and Public, what we're going to do, what I'd like to do is go through this one by one, and then in a situation of parks where we have three requests, go through those one by one, so they'll actually be five votes by my account here on what we're going to talk through here. So, the first up is a general funds appropriation for salaries. Jo, are you presenting on this?

President Garrett: We're doing online presentations, Heather?

Heather Willey: Well, I think we were going to until the September reading when we...

President Garrett: Got it.

Heather Willey: Change the roles, but for the administration probably, next time they should be prepared in-person.

President Garrett: Okay. Tammy, are you there?

Amy Lacy: I just promoted her. She should be there now.

President Garrett: Tammy?

Chief Financial Officer Tammy Havard: Hi, I am here.

President Garrett: Gotcha.

Tammy Havard: So, this additional appropriation, as was mentioned in the previous presentation,

was to bring the employees up to the minimum. So, it's a small request for the amount that you see, less than \$30,000, and we would be asking for council approval. This would be effective in the next pay period, through the end of the year.

President Garrett: Very good.

Councilor Choi: Hey Joe, could we get the volume up a little bit? I'm having a hard time hearing.

President Garrett: Councilor Choi, do you need Tammy to repeat that?

Councilor Choi: No, I...

President Garrett: You got it?

Councilor Choi: Yeah.

President Garrett: Okay.

Councilor Choi: I got the gist of it.

President Garrett: Councilors, any questions for Tammy on this? I'm sure Jo can answer them too, if we needed her, if they were not financial necessarily but just conceptual. Any motions on this? Well, I'll make a motion to approve because I think it is good for our employees and our employees are good for us.

Vice-President Plunkett: Second.

President Garrett: Second from Councilor Burk. It wasn't a question, it was an explanation point, did I hear that right? Did you second it?

Vice-President Plunkett: I did.

President Garrett: Oh. Seconded by Vice-President Plunkett. Sorry. Thank you. All in favor?

All Councilors: Aye.

President Garrett: Opposed? Alright. The general fund salaries additional appropriation of Resolution 2021-15 passes with the vote of seven in favor, zero opposed. Next, we've got the motion on the motor vehicle highway appropriation for the parking lot. Sir, Lance, are you speaking on this one?

Department of Public Works Director Lance Lantz: Sure, happy to. Good morning. Most of you are familiar with this site, it's been in gravel since the demolition of a couple of buildings about a year ago. We've done some inhouse design on a parking lot schematic that we'll extend, basically what we call a "friendly parking lot" there to the south. It will eliminate one drive cut on to Main Street, so there'll be an entrance off Main Street, entrance off 1st Street to this parking area. And it will provide 46 new parking spaces downtown which more than doubles the existing friendly parking lot. Happy to answer any questions you may have.

Councilor Culp: I have a question on that, I was driving by there yesterday I was thinking about this. Will the whole thing be torn up so it's all even grade between both sides? Because if you see, there's three weird parking spots right by where it touches the gravel. Would that be extended so

they can be...

[overlapping conversation]

Lance Lantz: Yes, where the Locksmith building used to be, yes, that is going to be made hard surface and parking will be available there as well.

Councilor Culp: I guess my question is, does that... \$125,000 I believe is what the request is...

Lance Lantz: Correct.

Councilor Culp: Does that include tearing up the old one so it's all level, or are you just adding on to the current one?

Lance Lantz: Both. There is a blending of elevations necessary to tie into the existing one, so yeah, this is... It gets into that, the south end of the existing parking lot just enough to correct one little low spot as well as make a smooth transition into the new area.

Councilor Culp: Now will you keep that same opening on 1st Street that's there.

Lance Lantz: Yes.

Councilor Culp: And then you're going to add one on Main Street as well?

Lance Lantz: No, we're taking one away on Main Street. There are two on Main Street currently into the old site and one on 1st Street. We're taking out the southernmost entrance off of Main Street, which is the one closest to the traffic signal.

Councilor Culp: The one that used to go to the bank?

Lance Lantz: Where you used to come out of the bank?

Councilor Culp: Yeah, yeah.

Lance Lantz: Yes, that one goes away.

Councilor Culp: Yeah, I was just trying to get a visual of how this'll look.

Lance Lantz: Sure. But the existing street cuts remain the same.

Councilor Culp: Okay.

Councilor Choi: So, knowing nothing about how gravel spaces work, is there... Much... In deference to Erica's point about needing more parking spaces, is there something we can do with that gravel space to temporize it until we get the master plan or the plan in place to... For the Gateway Project of lining even the gravel and... Because it seems like if we're going to do something in the next year or two that, spending \$125,000 is a waste of money if we're going to redo that for an additional purpose in the future. We can put up a temporary sign that says, "Parking available here", and then even over gravel to line the space. I don't know anything about...

Lance Lantz: There's really no practical way to mark gravel because it would be obliterated very quickly through use. The biggest... We would have to enlarge the gravel because right now the

gravel was just put in place where the old facilities were ripped out. So, it would have to be enlarged, you have to expand the gravel, so we would have to do some work to a gravel lot. But the biggest problem with that is ADA accessibility for all types of users. Gravel is not considered an ADA surface, so it is not an accessible parking lot, if it were just gravel.

President Garrett: You don't have a gravel parking lot? I'm with Councilor Choi, spending... If I told my wife I wanted to spend \$125,000 on something I was going to rip up in three years, she wouldn't be happy with me. And I don't know how happy the voters would be if we said we're going to spend \$125,000 of their money. If it was a permanent solution, I have no problem with it. But can we not promote it as parking if it was gravel, if it's not ADA accessible. Can we add a few additional spots? Are there other things that we can do outside of temporarily paving something for a year?

Lance Lantz: Perhaps, but again, the management of the site would be probably difficult because it would be constant maintenance. I can't think of any way to stripe this, to tell people where to park that would be reliable at all. It would either be like a weekly or bi-weekly exercise to go down and repaint stones, I guess, I don't know. Certainly, existing gravel... Our development standards don't allow for gravel parking lots, so we would be flying in the face of our own development standards. But certainly, I recognize that this is a temporary. How temporary is that going to be? I don't know. But we could make some accommodations in the gravel area, but we'd have to revisit that. I don't know if I can speak to the specifics off the top of my head this morning.

Councilor Culp: You can't plow that either, can you?

Lance Lantz: No, you can't plow gravel.

President Garrett: Can you come back with some other ideas before we just write \$125,000 check?

Lance Lantz: We sure can.

Councilor Burk: Or do we know anything about timeline on the...

Councilor Culp: That was my question...

Lance Lantz: Gateway Project?

Councilor Burk: Gateway Project, do we have any?

Lance Lantz: I don't know, but we've all seen development occur, and I think that the minute you have a project, you're probably at least a year out. So, I don't know, I can't speak to the timing of the Gateway Project, but...

Councilor Culp: Who would be the person? Because I think I would like to hear that presentation before I vote on this because I want this done. And I agree with everybody else, is if we're just going to tear this stuff in a year. Therefore, if it's a five-year plan, I have no problem paving this.

Lance Lantz: Okay, we can certainly pull together some information on the Gateway to put some type of timeline to it. I'm not pushing for this at all, but we have a contractor in place, we have not pulled anything, but our intent was to change order this into an existing contract. So, we are backing up against the end of the season and the opportunity there. So perhaps if we can come back and make some type of decision at the next meeting, we could still get that in there yet this year.

Councilor Culp: Okay.

Councilor Melton: I have a question, Lance. Is it possible that... I know gravel is permeable, right? For rainwater and so forth. Is adding this surface going to potentially create any flooding opportunity for north of the village, or excuse me, not north of the village but into the village? Is there any flooding? Are we doing anything for drainage? Are you just laying out asphalt and no curbing ?

Lance Lantz: The lot will be sloped to the existing drainage patterns. Now, gravel, a type 53 gravel, which is down there now, is considered impermeable. You might as well have asphalt because of that gravel's composition. So once it's down and patted, it seals itself up. But there's more than adequate drainage along Main Street, goes to a 30-inch storm sewer, so... And remember the site used to be largely impervious surface as well. So no, there's not any concerns on that.

Councilor Melton: The drainage, okay.

Vice-President Plunkett: Does this request include signage or anything like that, to Erica's point, being able to direct people that this is a parking lot, that they can park there.

Lance Lantz: We can make it include signage, sure. [laughter] We have a small sign, we have signs on the Main Street, says "public parking", we can mimic those signs as well to make it clear to people they could park there.

President Garrett: So, I think what would be helpful, Lance, I guess, is two things. One is, I think it is important to understand, this is not necessarily on you, but whoever owns the Gateway Project understand, where is that, what's the timing, what's the likelihood of it happening, all these sorts of things. And then I think my ask would be as if you would also be prepared to come up with alternatives to what this is. What are the costs of those alternatives, what is the benefits of those, what are the detractors of those?

Lance Lantz: Sure.

President Garrett: To give us a full picture. If it's \$15,000, making up numbers, to have more gravel, more signs, striping it every two weeks, because we're going to tear it all up in a year, it got to be important for the council to...

Lance Lantz: Sure. Happy to do that.

President Garrett: So, with that, I would make a motion to continue this request for appropriation until the next meeting.

Councilor Culp: I would second that.

President Garrett: Second from Councilor Culp, all in favor of that continuation?

President Garrett: Aye.

Vice-President Plunkett: Aye

Councilor Burk: Aye

Councilor Choi: Aye

Councilor Culp: Aye

Councilor Traylor: Aye

President Garrett: Anyone opposed to that continuation?

Councilor Melton: Nay.

President Garrett: Okay, the motion to continue the additional appropriation for MVH on the parking lot passes a vote of six in favor, one opposed.

Councilor Traylor: Yeah, just before we move on, I got to pass down the signature page for this resolution. I know we are voting individually, but in the resolution itself...

Heather Willey: So that's only for the salary ordinance, so I...

Councilor Traylor: Okay, alright.

Heather Willey: Sorry to confuse you all. So, we're going to have a signature page since they were all put together. You'll have the signature page at the very bottom, it'll say what it's for. It should say "salary ordinance", or "salaries" at the very bottom. So, as we send them down, we're doing them one at a time.

Councilor Traylor: This is Resolution 2021-15, right?

Amy: Go to the bottom of the signature page.

Heather Willey: Just hand wrote it, just so it... So that it says "Salary" since they were all lumped into one.

Councilor Traylor: I see, okay, alright.

Heather Willey: The ordinance was prepared with everything, so we're just going to do them one by one on the signature page.

Councilor Traylor: Okay, I see it's not...

Councilor Burk: We weren't expecting that Thomas Jefferson's style.

Heather Willey: Yeah.

Councilor Traylor: Yeah. I'm not sure which one of you is the doctor, but...

President Garrett: Yeah.

[laughter]

Heather Willey: That would be me, it's... Part of my writing gets worse by the day.

President Garrett: Bryan, are you okay with that?

Councilor Traylor: Yeah, I'm good with that, I just didn't understand what I was looking at here.

President Garrett: Very good. Next, we've got three requests from the Parks and Recs. Jarrod, if you don't mind... Won't mind coming up? What I'd ask you to do is just talk about one and then

we'll vote on it, and then talk about another, and we'll vote on it down the line.

Parks and Recreation Director Jarrod Logsdon: Alright, good morning, councilors. Before you are three projects, the first of which is in response to a very kind donation that is on the table for the town. Jim and Nancy Carpenter have purchased 216 acres of the old Wolf Run Golf course with the intention of turning that into a nature preserve. Now on that site also there is a large club house, which could potentially be the permanent home for our nature center, which has been a staple in this community for the last 19 years. Before you is a request for the services of master planning that site to better understand what restoration options are available, what park amenities we can implement, and whether we can rehabilitate the existing structures, or if a new facility would be needed. So, this is kind of time-sensitive, as the Parks Foundation comes online, which will be a new funding mechanism and support and partner for the Parks Department as we move forward with planning large projects in the future if so. The hope is to begin this project this fall, wrapping up next spring, to have documents ready to begin to advertise and publicize the future Park that's coming online, as we ask for donations and appropriations in the future for those projects. So, we request to work with REA on this and encapsulate the vision of the Carpenters as we set out to nearly double the park land in our facility that are in our parks system. So that's the first one on the table.

President Garrett: And Jarrod, the total amount here is \$150,000, is that correct?

Jarrod Logsdon: Yes.

President Garrett: Good. Councilors, questions? I know many of you have toured this land, and again, we're grateful to the Carpenters for their generosity in this manner. Any questions on this?

Councilor Burk: Jarrod, has it been donated or is it... My understanding was the proposal was that there could be a donation as long as the town was making a financial commitment to purchase.

Jarrod Logsdon: Correct. It's kind of a hybrid. So, the land was purchased for a larger sum than the Carpenters would ask as the town becomes involved in that and the plan transfers over. So, it would be a partial purchase and also partial donation as the town accepts the land.

Councilor Burk: So, this is \$150,000 to do kind of a preliminary study right?

Jarrod Logsdon: So, this would lay down the conceptual planning of the site, encapsulating what we envision for the nature preserve as far as habitat restoration, and park amenities. And also take a comprehensive look at the existing infrastructure. Nice thing about our golf course is there are some pathways, and bridges, and a club house, which if we can salvage that, it already looks like something from Jurassic Park. It fit right in with the nature centered theme, that could potentially go out there. Any pathways, at least the foundation of removing the asphalt and repaving is already going to have that compacted ground. So, it's nice to be able to accommodate those paths and save a little money there. But the Carpenters on their own merit are already beginning restoration work as well as engineering studies on the bridges. So, this master plan would envelop those studies as well as we move forward. As well as provide an opportunity for public engagement in the final steps to make sure that both the town's vision and what we need in our park system is upheld, the Carpenters' vision's upheld, and also the public have the opportunity to weigh in as well.

Councilor Burk: Yeah. I had a chance to tour it. It's pretty remarkable what just happens to be available, and I agree with you. But what's kind of shocking is how in disrepair some of that's already happened, even the bridge is like, be careful that we don't fall in...

Jarrod Logsdon: Absolutely.

Councilor Burk: And the paths and everything else. My concern is spending \$150,000 and the council at some point is going to have to make a determination of what we do with this in terms of funding. And my understanding is this is \$3 million or \$4 million. Now, there's a foundation set up, but that's a huge outlay, and I'm not sure what the council or this town is going to be on the line for. And \$150,000 is a lot of money, if in fact we don't have an appetite or we don't see a path forward, particularly in my opinion, how much money is the foundation going to be able to raise towards... They may raise all that. There're generous folks in this town who may want to underwrite the whole project. So that's my only concern when I saw it, I'm like, "This stuff just makes perfect sense. The price tag looks pretty steep to me," not knowing what the full outcome is going to be from the town. So, I'd hate to outlay the cash, and then we decide there's not a funding mechanism, or the foundation couldn't raise the kind of cash they need to. And is this town prepared to spend a few million dollars to do this. I don't know that that's... If we would or wouldn't. So that's my only concern, is the price tag with some uncertainty of what's happening down the road, if that makes sense.

Jarrold Logsdon: Absolutely, it makes perfect sense. And that this was our effort of due diligence to kind of understand before we accept this gift and look at funding and transferring the land over. To understand what those costs are going to be, not only for our facility, but also what it's going to take to create this into a park. An old golf course that's kind of let invasives and other components of nature take back over. So doing our due diligence to ensure that this is something that we can make successful as we plan for the future.

Councilor Traylor: This is the piece you'd bring back to us to see if it's worth it?

Councilor Culp: Absolutely. We would have numbers for renovating the facility, transforming the park land into a park. And kind of a phasing, if that was necessary on what that would look like.

Councilor Choi: You and I have a tour this afternoon, so we haven't... I think the rest of you have all seen it, Joe and I are going up this afternoon to take a look at it, and so we'll defer to you on whether you think it'll be worth it. But one of the things when I was campaigning was that by and large, the residents of Zionsville value their Parks and Recreation in Zionsville almost above a lot of other things. So, it seems like that this is something well spent to invest in such a large area that would be a big benefit to the town. So, I'm supportive if those of you that have visited already think that it's worth looking at, so I'll defer to you guys as to whether it's a good investment to take a look at it.

President Garrett: Would it... I'm sorry, Jason. We could, if we wanted to defer this until next meeting, so you can both have a chance to look at it. I'd want you to make...

Councilor Choi: You said it was time sensitive.

Jarrold Logsdon: Just the larger picture of getting these site renderings and understanding costs as we move into next year with the Parks Foundation. So, time-sensitive relative to 2021, getting this started.

Councilor Choi: I would be okay; I would be happy with that.

Councilor Culp: Yeah, I'd be happy with that too.

President Garrett: Okay, Jason, we won't stop the conversation, but just an option we have available to us...

Vice-President Plunkett: I was just going to ask you, you mentioned that the Carpenters were doing their work, and this is to start some of our work. I'm assuming that this master planning would include them all along the way, correct?

Jarrold Logsdon: Absolutely yeah.

Vice-President Plunkett: I just don't want everybody going separate directions, and then you come back to something that they didn't see that the vision.

Jarrold Logsdon: Absolutely, they would be the primary stakeholders along with the town, and every step of the way, it's going to be a united vision prior to even releasing it to the public to have their input for the final kind of pieces.

Vice-President Plunkett: Great, thank you.

President Garrett: Any other questions, councilors?

Councilor Melton: Is it public information yet what the Carpenters are willing to donate versus what we're going to actually spend on this project?

Jarrold Logsdon: I don't know that that's been released to the public yet, and I wouldn't want to speak for the Carpenters. I'm sure they'd be happy to present as well. I just think it's a unique opportunity that they have done these large purchases and restoration efforts around the country, so the fact that they're willing to invest in Zionsville and do that right here where they've called home for the past couple of decades is monumental and just speaks to the volume of our parks system and Zionsville as a whole.

President Garrett: Well, personally, I want everyone to feel that we're making an informed decision. I think this is important to do, but I want you two a chance to tour it, like some of us have, just watch out for the ticks. Right? So, I would make a motion to continue this request.

Councilor Melton: Second.

President Garrett: Through the next meeting. There's a second from Councilor Melton. All in favor for continuing?

All: Aye.

President Garrett: Aye. All opposed? Okay, so on... I'm trying to read this right. Resolution 2021-15, the Carpenter Nature Preserve master planning will be continued by a vote of seven to zero to the next meeting. Next, we've got the conceptual planning for a community center, Jarrod.

Jarrold Logsdon: So, identified in the previous current master plan was the need for indoor recreation facilities. One of the common complaints is we have an amazing parks system, but as the snow starts falling, our recreational activities become limited and a large portion of our community goes to other communities for those services. So, this is just that first step to kind of conceptualize what Zionsville would want inside a facility. I understand what that footprint would look like, begin to analyze where that would make sense. We have two sites within the conceptual planning document to look at, which would be Zionaqua's 12 acres, they've agreed to move forward and look at this, as well as 875 next to Heritage Trail Park and just understanding whether those communities... A community center with the needs of Zionsville could fit in either of those

locations or if there's some limiting factor where we need to look somewhere in the future. So, this is a very large project, five, 10, 15 years. It just...

Jarrold Logsdon: The timeline is variable, but this is that first step in that direction. And it'd be nice to include this foundation into the next master planning to gauge the appetite as we move forward. So this conceptual planning would not only survey the community extensively and create a lot of community engagement to understand what goes in the facility, but it also gives us a staffing plan, maintenance operations upkeep, and then final price tag for the facility as we move forward and make better educated guesses in the future as this forms. Earlier this year, the Parks Department issued an RFP for these services. We had seven firms respond from that, we created a review committee of department heads, the mayoral, administration and parks support, and we whittled it down to four firms who interviewed in person or virtually. And from those unanimously, the review committee selected Perkins & Will. So, the request is for \$125,000 to conduct this conceptual planning community engagement study with Zionsville.

Councilor Choi: So, I'm guessing you reached out to other municipalities in the area. Are they at a point where they feel that their capacity is reaching certain limitations where they would welcome another community center in neighboring community to be able to decompress what they're feeling as well?

Jarrold Logsdon: Actually, the trend of the Indy Metro right now is to build these facilities. Fishers is also bringing one online, Lafayette just brought theirs as well. And there are a lot of concerns, especially in the COVID era of, what if you have this facility that no one can utilize, but these aren't the traditional workout room and who all these facilities really are for the community. They're supposed to be versatile, they're a meeting space, they're municipal Action Centers as emergency strikes. So they really are multiple hats under one roof, so... Part of the nice thing about this is, as a town, we would also guide how this, essentially a business plan for the facility is shaped. And for instance, in West Lafayette, their goal was to create this as a net neutral facility, so as those costs for operations and upkeep came about, they would also create a revenue to subsidize that completely. So as we would move forward in that study, we would set those benchmarks and create a system that could support that. So not to be a continual drag or reoccurring cost on the tax dollar, we would set the parameters of what we found acceptable in our community for recreation and indoor community gathering spaces.

Councilor Burk: Jarrod, what I'm concerned about is, it was just a month ago, this body passed a 20-year bond to build a new library system that's going to be in Whitestown. And when I asked a lot of questions about what's the future 20 years out, 10 years out, five years out of libraries, and I appreciate it, and I was the person who voted no on this council, was that in essence what I heard was we're building a community center. Yes, there may or may not be books, I don't know what electronics will look like, but it was... This is a great place for meeting space, this is a great place for a number of the things you already mentioned. My concern is polling the community on what they want, they already have. It's going to be built, they just don't know it's there yet. So, we're in essence, you're asking people very much the same questions they answered before when they were in favor of the library.

Councilor Burk: So however you do this, it'd be hard for you to say, "These things are coming, you don't know they're here yet, what do you want?" I'm afraid we're going to come back with a report after we spend \$125,000 of... We have full support for a community center, and then we're going to end up with duplicative services after we spend millions of dollars. So I don't know what the answer is other than that, that facility is not in place yet, we don't even fully know what it's going to look like, other than... And what I heard a lot of was, it's going to be a library, but it's also going to be a community center. All of Zionsville is paying for that because we're going to drive up

there and use it. So, my concern and I've voiced this which was not only Zionsville, but Whitestown have both talked about building community centers, and is this going to some way get in the way of us being able to build something here, and I think it very well may. So I have a lot of concerns that we're going to spend a lot of money to ask people for something that is already coming and they don't know what it is yet, and we're stepping on our toes, and I know we can't wait till that's fully built and in operation, but it's just a messy situation which is one of the reasons I tried to avoid the bond issue in the last meeting.

President Garrett: The Monon Center in Carmel which I think is very nice, cost \$55 million to build, and they started upgrading it already and it was built in 2016. I've not had anyone coming to me and say they want a community center. I have no desire to spend money on a community center, and I don't have any money to... Have desire to spend money on planning for a community center. So, I think to Councilor Burk's point, you're going to ask people and they'll say, "Oh yeah, I do want that," and then how do we pay for it? So, this is a no for me. If it goes forward, that's the will of the council, but it'll be a no for me every time this comes up.

Councilor Choi: For me, I've had a number of people that ask for some place where they could gather and some place that is more like a Monon for the area, but it's... How strong that sentiment is, I have no idea. And do we really have the appetite to spend \$55 million for that? I don't know, but I feel like we should get a better assessment of what the public really wants before we go into this. So, I'm not opposed to doing this, but I'd like a better understanding of what the community wants before we go outlay this.

Vice-President Plunkett: Well, I think if you ask the community, they want sidewalks [chuckle] and connectivity, and that's what, at least in my district, and this is where this would go potentially over in 875, in my district, and I've got people more concerned with having access to the village from out by Craig and I to allow for connectivity. Even the one that was mentioned earlier in West Lafayette was \$34 million, that's a lot of money to put into, to Councilor Burk's point, to put into something that potentially is already going to be built in the neighboring community, and not to mention what they're going to do at the rec site when they finish their community center over there. There's going to be a lot of opportunity around here, so I'd...

Councilor Choi: And one of the questions, Jarrod, that I asked was because of what the neighboring municipalities were saying about their community centers is because we do... It's because although we're Zionsville and they're Carmel and we have Lebanon and all that, we do share resources with each other, and it's not just out of civic pride we should build our own community center, are they at a point where their capacity's exceeded so that we need to basically pony up and build our own so that we can start adding to the capacity of other people to provide that service as well, that... That was why I asked that question is... And I don't know the answer to that because I haven't been to the Monon Center in ages. So, we don't know what that looks like. But to that point, do we need to spend \$55 million? I... Maybe you guys have been to the Monon Center in the wintertime more recently than I have, whether or not they're over-crowded. So out of convenience's sake of driving 15 minutes more, is it worth it to build a Zionsville one? That, I guess, is the question.

Councilor Culp: I've never used the indoor part of that. It's always the outside water park.

Councilor Choi: We did when the kids were younger.

Councilor Culp: You did go work out and plan...

Councilor Choi: Yeah.

Councilor Burk: I don't know that would be \$50-some million. That's the other question. It may be that it's \$20 million, we don't know. I'm just... And I'm in favor of a community... I think we do need a community center. I'm just of the opinion that we may have just built one without fully knowing what all that's going to accommodate. I'd be willing to, again, ask the community what they're interested in. I just think it's hard to ask people what they're interested in, and I know you're going to get it favorable, I can guarantee it, it's just a question of how would you ask those questions in light of the fact that we already have a library that is going to be serving in some capacity to meet some of those needs, if that makes sense. And is there a way, Jarrod, to trim this back from \$125,000 to do something else, and do we even have enough information in your opinion to have a really valid survey without knowing what's fully going to be coming? And it's already... We've already made that investment. That's going to be a significant footprint. I know it's in Whitestown but that's the decision that we made.

Councilor Choi: So, Jarrod, this \$125,000 you're asking for, what is it going towards exactly?

Jarrold Logsdon: So, this \$125,000 would be for three events and a campaign for community engagement to better understand what Zionsville would like in their facility. It would also take a regional temperature of the market of what amenities are out there. So completely agree. We're not looking to duplicate what's right next door, so we would provide something unique and what is requested in Zionsville, but not to be a mirror image of any nearby facility at all. This would encapsulate what the community is recommending, understand the footprint of what that would look like. So, the largest component is whether this includes aquatics or not. So that is going to add to the price tag exponentially. So, if Zionsville doesn't request a 50-meter pool or more indoor swimming space, then that decreases our price tag, we understand that, it decreases our footprint and we can look at that. It's just there are some unknowns and this was to take that step to better understand what Zionsville wants today, what's going to serve them for the next 50 years.

Councilor Traylor: Was there a poll or something that was already done that led us to the idea that this was a need? Because I'm... Like you said, I'm not hearing it from people. People come and ask for stuff all the time, and this is one that I'm not hearing. So, I'm just... What spurred this?

Jarrold Logsdon: It has been identified and mentioned in the last two master plans over the past 10 years. It has shown up on our studies of the community. We might have a closer pulse of the recreation enthusiasts of our community because that's who we directly serve most often. This was just, again, preparing to take that next step and should that be required on the next master plan, we would have this conceptual planning done by February to include in that for next year, which would create the 2023 adoption of the next master plan.

Councilor Burk: Jarrod, it just seems like it's a hefty price tag. Why would we not... And I get that this is five years down the road, and again, I'm in favor of the concept, and in fact, I like the aquatics component myself that's just me personally without seeing anything else or any data or any price tag. We're budgeting now for 2022, and I know I'm going to be meeting with you after this meeting to look at budgets. Why is this something that can't be considered for the 2022 budget, knowing that the timeline is pretty far out, and we're trying to still get a better sense of what is going to be happening at the Whitestown Library? I get that you want to get this done, but I feel like we're maybe forcing in a pretty big price tag in 2021 when we could also roll this into 2022... It doesn't feel like, as opposed to say, salaries, we need to do that now, we need to bump those up. That was \$26,000, I mean we could spend another \$26,000 and get everyone in this town to mid-range. I'm aware of not just where each penny is going, but what else could we be doing with those dollars to benefit current employees of the town?

Jarrold Logsdon: And that the expedition of now as opposed to 2022 is just to ensure that this... The community surveying was conducted over the winter, and then this document could be folded into our master planning as we begin that with the 2022 year.

Councilor Traylor: I would highly discourage doing any polling this winter, only because I don't... I'm just guessing, but I don't foresee this building getting re-opened any time before the end of the year. I don't have any say in that. If I had a say, it'd be open today. But if you poll people and ask them what they'd like, and one of the options is meeting space, we've got a lot of meeting space here that they cannot use, so they're going to say they need meeting space because you're polling them at a time that we've cut off their meeting space.

Jarrold Logsdon: Understood. Yeah.

Councilor Traylor: I would not poll anyone until at least this building's been open for a while, and I can't get a timeline on when that'll be.

Councilor Choi: I want to qualify something I said earlier. I do have residents asking for a community center, but I think what... I want to qualify what I meant before, what they have been asking me for is something more akin to what we are envisioning with a library, not an aquatics center, not like a Monon Center or something to that effect. In my mind, what they're talking about is a place where the community can gather, have receptions, events, things of that nature. I don't think that the aquatic center is necessarily what they're envisioning. Yeah, I don't really have much of a care one way or the other on this. I feel the leanings of the rest of the council.

President Garrett: When we built this building it cost \$10 million, and it was pretty controversial. And we had to find some pennies to do it. And it was the right decision. I wish it was open too, Councilor Traylor. It was the right decision to do it, but it was hard to fund it, but we found a way, and again, I think it was a good idea. My concern is spending \$125,000 to ask the community is... You're asking them, "What do you want?" There's no sort of budget cost implications for that. So yeah, I'm sure, I'll take a bowling alley, yeah, I'll take a diving pool, yeah, I'd love that. But when it all comes back and it's \$50 million, \$30 million, whatever it is, we can't figure out how to pay for it, or how do you pay for it? I think that's the missing piece. Right? Now we spent \$125,000, ask people for their opinion and their opinion is they want something and we have to tell them we can't have it because we can't afford it. Well, now we just wasted \$125,000. So, I think that money can be better spent. I think it'd be better spent on things like the Carpenter Nature Preserve, quite honestly. That is my take on this request. Any other questions on this, Councilors? I appreciate you standing up there Jarrod. Alright, any motions on this?

Councilor Traylor: Motion to deny this \$125,000 for the planning of the community center.

President Garrett: There's a motion to deny from Councilor Traylor.

Vice-President Plunkett: Second.

President Garrett: Second from Vice-President Plunkett. Amy, I'm going to do the roll call. And councilors, if you are saying yes when she asks your name, you're saying yes to the denial or saying no then you are against denying the request. Amy.

Amy Lacy: President Garrett.

President Garrett: Yes.

Amy Lacy: Vice-President Plunkett.

Vice-President Plunkett: Yes.

Amy Lacy: Councilor Burk.

Councilor Burk: Yes. And Jarrod, I'm saying that in the context of this vote today, not that we don't think that there may be value down the road.

Jarrod Logsdon: Thank you.

Amy Lacy: Councilor Choi.

Councilor Choi: Yes.

Amy Lacy: Councilor Culp.

Councilor Culp: Yes.

Amy Lacy: Councilor Melton.

Councilor Melton: Yes.

Amy Lacy: Councilor Traylor.

Councilor Traylor: Yes.

President Garrett: Okay, so motion for the community center conceptual planning is denied by vote of seven in favor, zero opposed. Last up here we've got golf course path improvements.

Jarrod Logsdon: Yeah. So early on in surveying our parks and golf course, this was quickly identified not only through my observations, but also feedback from the users of the course, just the condition of our car paths, how they've deteriorated over the year due to seasonal flooding and other situations that have just eroded the car paths. So, the flooding issue and getting rid of that water quicker is something we're working on internally to incorporate into this as well. But before you is a request for \$450,000 to improve the most deteriorated components of the golf course pathways and lay in and attach on to the conditions of the car paths that are still acceptable, and also to change a little bit of grading and make some of the pathways a little bit more safe. So, some of it is gravel at this time, which experiences seasonal wash-out. And just riding around them, it's not that fun of a ride after you bump around for a while. So just to improve the quality of our course. We just started leasing new golf carts, which people are very appreciative of. No longer are they sticking to the duct tape on the seats, but they have a nice ride.

[laughter]

Jarrod Logsdon: So, this goes in hand with that, making that capital investment to improve play at the course. So, we're having an exceptional year at the golf course. To give you a little context, in 2016, we had about 60 rounds of golf played per day, right now we're featuring about 123 rounds per day. So, we've just seen exceptional growth ever since the pandemic took hold. Golf became a safe sport you could do on your own. And from that, I think there's a rebirth in our community in the region and the nation, honestly, about golf, and there's a renewed interest. So I'd like to make this investment in the facility and improve the experience as more and more people in Zionsville

and the neighboring communities experience our municipal course. And the reason for the appropriation now as opposed to next year is to limit our disturbance in the next year, so this fall we're going to tear up the course, have to recede and let those greens heal. So doing that now as opposed to impacting most of the 2022 season seems advantageous to me, especially as we're having record revenue every single month.

Councilor Traylor: And no knock on you at all, because I think you're doing a phenomenal job there at the parks, and you weren't here last year for budgeting, but just look for these things...

Jarrold Logsdon: Absolutely.

Councilor Traylor: Yeah, going forward I know you weren't part of this, I totally understand the ask. But yeah, just as you're going around the parks, look for these things so we can put them into the budget rather than ask for additional appropriations.

Jarrold Logsdon: So yeah, kind of the vision, my vision of what the department is, you have to split growth and upkeep 50/50. You can't have something nice, new, and shiny and then something else deteriorating, so, absolutely.

Vice-President Plunkett: This is just for the car paths too, correct? This isn't a redesign or anything of the...

Jarrold Logsdon: Correct. So, our golf manager Mike Wall has a fantastic idea about changing the layout of the course. So currently hole one is right next to Temple Road. And as you start your morning, get your bearings and a lot of those golf balls heads straight towards the road where vehicles travel...

President Garrett: I'm trying to fix that slice, Jarrod, I'm working on it.

[laughter]

Jarrold Logsdon: Yeah, so with the changed layout, this would change where the par fives are, they wouldn't be back-to-back necessarily. People would be warmed up. And by the time they are near Temple Road, it's in the middle of their game. So it should just create a better user experience and also reduce some of those conflicts we see with the golf courses and roads.

Councilor Burk: Jarrod, I'd like to think... I appreciate that more people are golfing, and obviously that means we're generating more revenue through this. I'd like to think that in time, the game itself is paying for most of the improvements. What's the net on each round play? It sounds like we're really doing well with folks playing. Do you know off the top of your head?

Jarrold Logsdon: The net per round, I don't... I know that we are generating \$70,000 to \$80,000 a month, so we're projected approximately \$425,000 based on last year's numbers for revenue and our operating expense is around \$235,000 usually, so quite the profit we're making right now, and that's going to be held on to, because we have a 60-year-old building right there. So, we're going to have to look at that in the next decade as well potentially. So, it is the ambition for the golf course to be self-sufficient, and they just need a little nudge right now and a little investment from the larger Parks Department.

Councilor Burk: Thank you.

Councilor Choi: So when will we see that kind of planning where the golf course is self-sufficient?

Because this is a... I'm very supportive of a community golf course, but \$450,000 is a huge outlay for this kind of project especially when we're denying \$100,000 here and \$100,000 there as being excessive for other projects.

Jarrold Logsdon: So, this larger price tag is what happens when you let things kind of deteriorate and fall away. So, this is more comprehensive. With preventative upkeep and maintenance, we can address these all along the way, patch holes, patch cracks, fix rough spots, and that can be all absorbed within operating. So, the goal is to make this investment now and not have to make it for a long time again. So preventative maintenance just reduces the price tag on everything moving forward.

Vice-President Plunkett: This has been a long time coming too, right? Ever since I've been on the council, every year it seems like we're talking about trying to find money to do it so...

President Garrett: Jarrod, my only concern with this is the timing. And what I mean by that is the first request here was the Carpenter Nature Preserve master planning, which we've continued and hopefully, Councilor Culp and Councilor Traylor have a good experience out there. It's something I think we should do. \$450,000 is a lot of money. Personally, I kind of love to see if we did approve it for master planning to come back and say, "Here's how much money we need for that piece, and here's how much money we've got." We've got \$450,000 or less. We worry that we'd spend it here and then suddenly say, "Jeez, we could have better spent it there." It's kind of my only hesitation in saying yes today again. To Vice-President Plunkett's point, it's been a long time needed. I've bumped along those courses. It's in good shape, the courses outside the paths, but that's my hesitation is the timing is to say, "Alright, why don't we master plan this figure and how we fund that? And if there is a leftover, let's spend it on the golf course instead of spending it now and sort of vice-versa."

Jarrold Logsdon: And the only thing I would say to that, I guess is when the Parks Department folded into the larger general fund, there were funds earmarked specifically for parks from our reserves. So, this would come from that understanding that, which was kind of set aside for these capital improvements. So, we have brought this before the Park Board and they are in support of this investment knowing that it'll decrease our earmarked funds moving forward. And really, the advantage of this fall is to not impact the entire 2022 season because next year we'd have to wait for things to be less soggy and for the asphalt to be at the appropriate temperatures to cure, which is going to close March, April, which are our early bird two months of the year. So when you're only generating revenue for six months out of the year, we're just trying to limit that impact moving forward.

Councilor Culp: Looking at this, it's a revenue-generating department. I think it's worth the investment because it's going to pay itself off eventually.

President Garrett: Sure.

Councilor Culp: And that little course is gorgeous, and they put that sprinkler system and you guys, it looks awesome.

Jarrold Logsdon: Mike and his team are doing a fantastic job. We're incorporating some natural elements with the native grasses on the edges and that was well-received.

Councilor Culp: That's nice. That's really nice. I guess my only point is that I have no problem investing into something that makes money.

President Garrett: Sure.

Councilor Choi: So, are you saying this appropriation that you're asking for was originally earmarked in the reserves?

Jarrold Logsdon: This specifically was not delineated from that reserve. That is a large lump of cash that was folded in and earmarked when the consolidation happened at the beginning of this fiscal year.

Councilor Choi: How much was it those reserves?

Jarrold Logsdon: \$3.2 million.

President Garrett: Yeah.

Councilor Choi: Alright, so we have money in those.

President Garrett: It was this and was it fire or was it the other one?

Heather Willey: Yeah, I was just going to remind the council that one of the things we did is because those two budgets were being folded into the general fund budget, we did ask that they come back with each project for an additional appropriation request so that we can evaluate case by case what the council wanted to spend versus just having the administration be able to make those decisions. So, I think that was a good point that you made, Jarrod, that this was something that I know had been talked about kind of conceptually by the Parks Department previously over the last three, four, five years maybe so...

Jarrold Logsdon: And I'll note one more thing, \$100,000 was allocated within the golf fund for this year, already approved. So, we would not spend the full \$450,000 of this, this is just contingency, and rather than put a Band-Aid on something, improve this for the next foreseeable years and not have to worry about it for a while so...

Councilor Melton: So, what portion of this \$450,000 is going to be used for correction of drainage on the course? Do you have any idea? Are you budgeting \$100,000 for drainage?

Jarrold Logsdon: So, for drainage, yeah, approximately just under that, around \$80,000 we're saying, but a lot of that engineering work is hopefully going to be conducted in-house. So there's going to be cost-saving on the engineering with that. We're working with Lance. So to incorporate those changes alongside this project this fall, to improve drainage immediately. Now, it is a tricky site. You can imagine being in a floodplain, there are some issues. So half of the site we're looking at improving with gravity drains, but the other half is going to have to look into a larger permanent pump system to move that water across the course. So that'll be the next capital investment within the golf course as they generate revenue.

Councilor Melton: And again, that has nothing to do with the \$450,000?

Jarrold Logsdon: Correct.

Councilor Melton: Okay. I'm a big fan of taking our assets that we currently have and making them continue to serve into the future, and whether it's a parking lot that already exists or these paths that are just beyond deterioration, and really, I hope we... I'm for this.

Councilor Choi: Move for approval?

President Garrett: The first from Councilor Choi, second from Councilor Culp. Amy, I don't think we needed a roll call here. All in favor?

All Councilors: Aye.

President Garrett: Aye. Opposed? Okay the golf course path improvements, which is a part of Resolution 2021-15, is approved by a vote of seven in favor, zero opposed. Thanks, Jarrod appreciate it.

7. OTHER MATTERS

President Garrett: Councilors, any other matters?

8. APPROVAL OF CLAIMS

President Garrett: We've got claims. Any questions on claims from any councilors?

Councilor Traylor: Can we get clarification on the legal that we...

President Garrett: Yeah, so you guys will notice there's as a carry-over claim from last month for another law firm that was added to the mayor's budget. And claim, following the meeting, we were told the claim was used for consultation for the Municipal Action Center. For me, personally, it all feels like an effort to circumvent the appropriation denial from March, but in communicating with our attorney, she's kind of instructed us to pay the claim in an effort to avoid any legal fees or late fees as it was a budgeted expense. I would note the description is different on this recent claim, which I think helps me as it's listed as a process re-engineering, a little more transparent so...

Councilor Traylor: I'm curious, just from the legal standpoint. We approve a budget, and then if the administration goes and signs a contract that wasn't within that budget, I understand that there's a legal risk of being sued for that money. What power, authority... How do we control not over-spending the budget, if we're going to be... I don't understand that.

Heather Willey: Yeah, so it's my understanding that that particular claim came out of the personal services portion of the budget that was approved by the council, so there is a certain allocation that was given.

Councilor Traylor: Right.

Heather Willey: As we go forward to 2022, one of the things that we've talked about is potentially limiting the amount that is in personal services. If you wanted to have more transparency on the frontend, then there would have to be an additional appropriation request made so that the council and the public understood further sort of what that was going to be used for and that there was a buy-in, that that money was a good investment. But given the fact that it was already out of the personal services allocation, that's where the contract was signed for. There's budgeted money available, I think it's more about what it is being spent on, and so my concern in talking to council leadership is this was the services rendered by a vendor, and I don't think it's fair to put the vendor in a position to not be paid for services provided. It's really more in the communication between the administration and the council on spending priorities.

Councilor Traylor: No, I totally agree, it's not the vendor at all, but I also don't know that there is

any money left in that bucket. We haven't gotten an update on what's been spent through the year in any of the budgeting. I'll say that I would like to see... Before the next claims, I'll go ahead and vote on this... But before the next claim from the administration, I'd love to see what we've spent year to date, because we have no idea of what we have left. We haven't been provided that information since the budget was approved.

Heather Willey: And I will say on this particular claim, one of the additional pieces of information that we were able to get was a copy of the contract. So, I did review it. It was just for the public. The claim that we're referring to is for Faegre Drinker and Biddle, and it's actually on the consulting end. They have a consulting arm of their law firm that's not traditional legal services, they weigh in on a variety of different sort of process-oriented projects, which I believe this is what that was for. But we did review it, and again, I think just ultimately decided that the vendor had completed the work, the vendor had performed services that were contracted for and wasn't really fair to put the vendor in the position of not being paid.

President Garrett: Here's kind of I think what happens, Council Traylor, or how it gets frustrating, and I share that frustration is we are presented with the budget that says, "We are going to do A, B and C," and we say, "That sounds like good," and we approve it. And in the case, for example, of our Mayor's Action Center, we said, "Well, we don't want to spend \$300,000 on a brand new building." And so instead of them saying, "Okay, we won't do it," they said, "Oh, alright. Well, we're just going to... Instead of spending A, B and C, we're going to spend it on the Mayor's Action Center," and we have no visibility to that. And so what's not being communicated is when an appropriation is requested and denied, and then money has shifted around within the fund, which is within their right, what is now not being spent that was communicated to the public and to this council and sold to this council the past budget that is being used now to pay for things that we didn't agree to?

President Garrett: And so through that appropriation process, we can say, "Alright, we agree we should spend on A, B and C," and if something changes, and sometimes things change, it's the responsibility then of that department that is making the change to come back to this council and to the public and say, "Okay, A is no longer valid, we need to do D," and there is a public discussion about that change, there's a vote on that change, there's an agreement or a disagreement on that. And I think that helps put some controls around what we... I shouldn't say we. I feel right now, there's not a lot of clarity on what's happened, so I share that frustration and I think we're learning from those mistakes and can put those guardrails in place not as something that is an impediment to getting things done but allows for the communication of what is intended to be done and what changes happen.

Councilor Traylor: Yeah, there's a job we were elected to do, and I feel like at a certain point we're not... We're not doing a good job if we can't keep track where the money's going.

President Garrett: Correct.

Councilor Traylor: Yeah.

President Garrett: Correct. Any other conversation on claims? I'll make a motion then to approve claims.

Councilor Choi: Second.

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

All Councilors: Aye.

President Garrett: Aye. Opposed? Very good. Claims are approved by a vote of seven in favor, zero opposed.

9. ADJOURN

President Garrett: I'll make a motion to adjourn.

Vice-President Plunkett: Second.

President Garrett: Second from Vice-President Plunkett. All in favor?

All Councilors: Aye.

President Garrett: Aye. Any opposed? Alright, motion to adjourn is approved by a vote of seven in favor, zero opposed. The next bigger town council meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, September 7th, 2021 at 7:00 PM, in the Zionsville Town Hall Council Chambers. Please note the date shift because of the Labor Day holiday, and final notice would be posted in compliance with Indiana Open Door Law. Thanks everyone.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:48 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Amelia Anne Lacy, Municipal Relations Coordinator
Town of Zionsville