

CITY OF WEST LAFAYETTE  
COMMON COUNCIL  
PRE-COUNCIL MINUTES  
DECEMBER 30, 2008

The Common Council of the City of West Lafayette, Indiana, met in the Lower Level Conference Room at City Hall on December 30, 2008, at the hour of 4:30 p.m.

Mayor Dennis called the meeting to order and presided.

Present: Bunder, Burch, Dietrich, Hunt, Roales.

Absent: Keen, Thomas.

Also present were City Attorney Burns, Clerk-Treasurer Rhodes, City Engineer Buck, Police Chief Dombkowski, Street Foreman/Equipment Operator VanMeter, Fire Chief Drew, Human Resources Director Foster, WWTU Director Henderson, Parks Administrative Assistant Kolb, and Director of Development Poole.

MINUTES: November 19, 2008, Special Council Meeting; November 24, 2008, Pre-Council Meeting; and December 1, 2008, Common Council Meeting.

PUBLIC RELATIONS:

Appointments to Redevelopment Commission  
Election of Council President for 2009

Councilor Hunt said I'm going to nominate Larry Oates and Diane Damico to continue on the Redevelopment Commission. That will be my nomination. They're both willing to serve.

Mayor Dennis said and they've both done a really good job, too. How do we do Council President?

City Attorney Burns said just a nomination from the floor.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS: None

Councilor Bunder said I have a question. Were we going to get a legal report at the beginning of January? Would that be on the agenda? Where?

City Attorney Burns said my understanding was that I would do a legal report, which means that you would have the month of January would be presented to you—

Councilor Bunder said in February?

City Attorney Burns said in February. And then monthly thereafter.

Councilor Bunder said okay.

Councilor Dietrich said Eric [City Attorney Burns], what kind of things will be in that?

City Attorney Burns said I'm not sure. I'm going to probably cover the major items that I've been working on, give an update on any litigation, as far as those things I can update on, and then respond to what folks seem to be wanting.

Councilor Dietrich said I don't know who to address this question to, but are City employees permitted to contact you for opinions or anything? Is there a different protocol or is that not his role?

Mayor Dennis said usually it doesn't come directly from an employee to Eric [Mr. Burns]. There's a process through—like a chain of command, supervisor, department head.

City Attorney Burns said there are certain people I work with, like the Wastewater billing office that I know to take the call and to work with them, but otherwise, it's mainly department heads that I work with.

Councilor Dietrich said all right. Thank you.

Councilor Hunt said and we have different lawyers for Redevelopment and Police Merit Commission.

City Attorney Burns said yes.

Mayor Dennis said different lawyers.

Councilor Hunt said yes, that's right.

**NEW BUSINESS:**

**Ordinance No. 1-09** An Ordinance Providing For Temporary Loans From A Fund Having Sufficient Balance To A Depleted Fund (WWTU to General Fund and to Parks & Recreation Fund) (Prepared by the Clerk-Treasurer)

Mayor Dennis read the ordinance by title and asked for questions or concerns.

Councilor Burch said what are they for? I know where they're coming from and where they're going to, but what is it for, please?

Clerk-Treasurer Rhodes said we paid back, today, all of the outstanding temporary loans to the Utility, leaving us with a cash balance insufficient to make payroll payments on Friday, January 2; and the City's contributions to the Health Savings Accounts; and pay virtually any bills in subsequent weeks. We are owed, actually, over \$1.9 million in property tax settlements from the County. It's a little bit low from my estimates.

Councilor Burch said so the County has not paid?

Clerk-Treasurer Rhodes said we have not received a complete property tax settlement.

Councilor Burch said mercy.

Councilor Roales said so, Judy [Clerk-Treasurer Rhodes], would it be necessary to have two readings to prevent default?

Clerk-Treasurer Rhodes said yes. Well, I can assure you I intend to make the payroll. Yes, it would be nice to have two readings.

Councilor Roales said my question to Counselor Burns would be, do we need seven members present to have two readings, or just a majority of the members present?

City Attorney Burns said you have to have a unanimous vote to put it on the second reading of the members present. And then a majority of the elected members to approve.

Councilor Roales said this was my question. I thought it was a unanimous vote to suspend the rules to—

City Attorney Burns said it is unanimous.

Councilor Roales said but not of seven.

City Attorney Burns said right. And the other thing, in case somebody doesn't know that you're going through this, paying it off in one day and asking it to be replenished, there's a requirement that it be paid off in the year that it was borrowed.

Clerk-Treasurer Rhodes said unless we declare an emergency.

Councilor Burch said how close will Parks & Recreation be without that \$200,000?

Clerk-Treasurer Rhodes said for example, I can tell you, they will probably have less than \$20,000 or \$25,000 in the bank, maybe less, because the rink is still closed.

Councilor Burch said so is that also for salaries?

Clerk-Treasurer Rhodes said exactly. It's to get us going. As I told you, we have approximately \$1,950,000 due to us in the entire property tax settlement. Of that, it's apportioned to various funds. \$1,671,724 belongs to the General Fund, and \$226,286.41 belongs to Parks, if we would receive it all. We certainly know we will not receive it all in January, because homeowners were allowed an installment payment plan that could extend out to April. But we are hoping that we will receive a significant amount of what is due to us. I'd say that we are missing about 25% of our levy at this point. And that is what is making the need for an immediate loan.

Councilor Burch said thank you, Dr. Rhodes.

There was no further discussion.

Resolution No. 1-09 Resolution Approving Interlocal Agreement For Lindberg Bridge (Sponsored by Mayor Dennis)

Mayor Dennis read the resolution by title and asked for questions or concerns.

Councilor Dietrich said in light of some of the things we've seen across the country on projects that have been aborted and those kinds of things, is there the possibility that, should the County decide to not fund this, we're left hanging for the initial cost, could that money be split? In round figures, I think I heard you say something about \$600,000 of start-up costs for us. Should they get two years down the road and the County just cannot fund the project, it's not going to happen within the four years, can we get verbiage in there that at least we get \$300,000 of that \$600,000 back, as a protection for ourselves? We're all entering this in good faith, it just seems to me that they have the right to pull the plug, and we're the ones hanging out for three-quarters of a million dollars.

Mayor Dennis said yes, that's possible, but not probable. Usually what they do when they allocate a project that's funded, they fund that whole project. Unless, you know, they built the bridge halfway across the bog and then they pulled out. Is it possible? I understand what you're getting at—

Councilor Dietrich said I'm more concerned with the same sort of verbiage we had about the Cumberland projects. That we all know and at one time had agreed to fund, looking at where we can come up with a cash cow in an absolute emergency, and, as Sheila Klinker says, it's raining. You know, if they decide to pull it in that context, it just seems to me that it would behoove us to say, "Okay, we understand why you have to do that," but we shouldn't be the ones hanging for the entire amount. At that point, we ought to be able to recoup half of our initial money and that kind of thing.

Mayor Dennis said what's your thought there, Eric [City Attorney Burns]?

City Attorney Burns said well, I think we can certainly do that. They've got \$27 million in the Bridge Fund, and the way they access that is they prioritize their projects and then they, as the Mayor said, they fund them. They say, "We're going to fund this," and that pushes everybody else away.

Councilor Dietrich said and actually this is given no special attention? It's just merely going to be in the rotation of that group?

Mayor Dennis said it's at the top of their list.

Councilor Hunt said three of us, the Mayor, Councilor Burch, and I, were at the Commissioner's meeting yesterday—

Mayor Dennis said and Diane Damico [Redevelopment Commission].

Councilor Hunt said and Diane Damico.

Mayor Dennis said from the Redevelopment Commission.

Councilor Hunt said and Commissioner Knochel told Diane [Damico] and me a little later that they were going to move it up in the priority. There's a 10-year priority plan, and it will go towards the top. He didn't say absolutely to the top, if I remember right. I think he said that from the panel.

Ms. Damico [Redevelopment Commission] said right.

Councilor Hunt said that was encouraging.

Councilor Dietrich said it all sounds encouraging. Again, I know we're entering this in good faith, but I still would like to see some sort of safety net there for us to at least split the cost, because we're going into this as a joint agreement. It ought to be joint all the way around. If this can't be funded, it can't be funded.

Councilor Hunt said I was wondering if maybe—because I was thinking a little bit differently, but kind of on the same lines—they've got a number there for \$6.5 million with a 6% inflation every year, but we don't have any numbers. And I was even wondering maybe we could agree to the \$174,000 that they talked about yesterday, and see what the feasibility study says and then come back with this. I thought that was something the Council should discuss. Because I don't know the advantages and the disadvantages of that, rather than saying, "Here, this is the local share."

Councilor Roales said in summary, then, I guess I would ask for clarification on why four years was chosen at (number) 5.

City Attorney Burns said it's required by State law.

Councilor Roales said that it be four years?

City Attorney Burns said yes. It cannot exceed four years.

Councilor Roales said because I guess my preference would be to make it three years, so that, you know, we don't make decisions for the next City Council. And so that, you know, that's the end of our term. I mean, this Council didn't make decisions for our term, and if it needs to be extended, the next Council could then hear that.

City Attorney Burns said yes, the four is because that was the maximum under the State statute.

Councilor Bunder said what is the role of the Redevelopment Commission? Are they the people who will pay the \$174,000? Or is that a City budget item?

Mayor Dennis said the money that is for the project is targeted from the TIF District. It comes from the Redevelopment Commission. But what we haven't received yet is the timeline of when that's going to be required.

Councilor Bunder said so it doesn't need to be on their January agenda?

Mayor Dennis said absolutely not. More questions?

Councilor Hunt said I've gotten a lot of questions since it was in the paper—maybe today, maybe yesterday, I don't know about it—so lots of questions. They had to do with environmental impact and a variety of things. So, David [City Engineer Buck], would you talk about—?

Mayor Dennis said Mr. [City Engineer] Buck, would you do me a favor and wow us with your wonderful engineering?

City Engineer Buck said that's one of the things that the engineering study will look at, in terms of the options. I call it a structure size and type study. It's a preliminary engineering study. Will a bridge be the recommended alternate? Will putting in two cul-de-sacs be the recommended alternate, closing the road? With 231 being constructed at Cherry Lane and Cumberland Avenue both having signalized intersections, how important of an arterial is it to come all the way into Northwestern and Salisbury Street? I mean, it's kind of a maybe way out there question, but it will get looked at, as well as the environmental issues. Opening up the waterway with a bridge will, of course, improve the aquatic qualities of the south lobe of the Bog, which is pretty stagnant right now. It's hard for the golf course to maintain, it's hard for it to sustain itself, because it doesn't get enough water circulation. It's not a large enough water area to prevent algae and cattails and things from growing around the edges continually. So the larger the water volume, the more that stuff can be maintained. A bridge would bring that open water and flow into that area. There's also the opportunity a bridge may eliminate the at-grade pedestrian trail crossing on the west side of the water, where we have a beacon flashing and an at-grade pedestrian crossing. It might be possible to get that underneath the structure, and allow it to come underneath like the golf cart path does for the golf carts on the east side of the water. There's a whole host of things to look at as well as exactly which type of bridge they'll look at. Will it be a bridge that needs to go way up in the air, span over the water, and have as great a distance as possible between the piers, to minimize the number of piers that have to go down in the water, all the way down, 40 feet down to bedrock or native material? Or would a structure that's closer to the surface of the water that might have shorter span and more frequent piers closer together be a better route to go? And look at the cost of both of those options, as well as probably some other ones. Not just the cost, but how long the structure will last, what kind of maintenance the structure would require. The County's going to be the one that owns the bridge, maintains the bridge, and builds the bridge; that's what the County Bridge Fund that all Tippecanoe County residents pay into goes for, and this one would be the first one in the City of West Lafayette. There are a couple in Lafayette, 18<sup>th</sup> Street over Ferry Street is one, and Twyckenham Railroad Bridge is the other. The City of Lafayette and the County kind of partnered on that one, in terms of who did the design and who did the construction. So the first step in this would be paying for that assessment of all the options, to see. West Lafayette would like the County to build a bridge. We're going out on a limb a little bit, and saying which kind of bridge will be built and why exactly. And then if the County agrees, yes, we agree that's the best solution for this issue, a bridge funded by the County. That's what it'll be for. Does that help?

Councilor Hunt said thank you, yes. I have a couple more, but go ahead. A few more.

Councilor Bunder said mine, I guess, is for Mr. [City Attorney] Burns or somebody. What happens to the current litigation? Where is the State v Atlas Excavating? Does that go away?

City Attorney Burns said it really doesn't. The litigation, we've had numerous contacts, obviously. For those of you not fully up to speed on it, the City's not a party to that litigation. We're involved to the extent that we were a Local Public Agency on the project. The sense was we needed to get the solution moving. There's litigation that's moving. It's on its course, and if we waited for that to be fully resolved, we might be waiting a good long time, because we have no control over that, not being a party to it. They're on separate tracks. I do know that they've earnestly talked about resolving it. Whether that will get resolved, I can't tell you. But this is a separate issue from that, and it does not really affect that issue, as far as how the litigation will go forward. And we don't need to wait on it. What it does, by necessity required, though, is that

we essentially are accepting the bridge, or, excuse me, the road. And saying, "It's over." We don't expect the federal government and the State government to come in and try and fix this eight years from now or whenever it got back onto the schedule. I'll leave that to Dave [City Engineer Buck], but that's at least two years away—

City Engineer Buck said I'll add a little bit to that and provide some more history. We asked the question of INDOT to Federal Highway, "Would you help us fix this?" And they said, "Everything except the part through the Bog." They did a redesign for the part that has pilings, and they said they would help connect and fund the project that would go to those two limits, but within those limits, Federal Highway's participation would not continue. So once we found that out, we asked the question, "Well, can we take it as-is, and look for a separate solution?" And the answer was "Yes," we could, so Federal Highway has kind of said, "These are your options."

Councilor Bunder said who gets the money if we win, or the State wins or if—?

City Attorney Burns said we're not looking for money. We, being the State, would. The taxpayers are being asked to pay, they don't have a counterclaim back against the construction company, so they're not seeking any money back from the construction company.

Councilor Bunder said what would they have won?

City Attorney Burns said I guess they would record as a zero.

Councilor Bunder said okay.

City Attorney Burns said so we have to pay zero. There's no counterclaim.

Councilor Dietrich said so the State of Indiana just has withheld—

City Attorney Burns said that's right, because the State and Federal Highway don't believe that things were done right, and so they—

Councilor Bunder said so they didn't pay Atlas Excavating. They did not pay the firm which is also implying in its litigation that the design wasn't right and—

City Attorney Burns said that's right. They paid them part, because I think Atlas is the one who repaved the road, and I think they paid them for that, because they knew they needed to get it repaved. But, in general, they are still very much at loggerheads about who's to blame and who has to pay. The State does not stand to gain any money from this litigation.

Councilor Bunder said what would have happened if the County had not agreed to build a bridge, if this resolution didn't go through? Who would have been responsible for fixing this? Would the State be involved again in another project?

City Attorney Burns said that's my understanding, is that we'd be put back into the hopper, and be behind everything else that's in front of us.

City Engineer Buck said and from point to point on the road, where the pilings are, would be completely our dollar locally. We would get 80-20 money for the areas outside, to tie back to the east and west ends of the whole entire section of road. But that area through the Bog,

through the part that has pilings underneath it, would be 100% local money, whatever that fix would be.

Councilor Bunder said even though it wasn't local money that put pilings in there?

City Engineer Buck said yes.

Councilor Bunder said apparently, Tinker Bell did that, in that strange—

City Attorney Burns said 80-20. Was that 80-20 money?

City Engineer Buck said that was 80-20 money that put that in in the first place.

City Attorney Burns said so we did put some in.

City Engineer Buck said yes. So again, we're at the mercy of the decisions of the Federal Highway Administration.

Councilor Roales said so today it's a State highway, or it's a road that was built by the State that is a City street?

Councilor Bunder said it's federal dollars.

Ms. Damico said it's filed in Marion County?

City Engineer Buck said the Atlas claim was filed in Marion County, because it was a contractor that had a construction contract with INDOT. We had another agreement with INDOT to do the entire project—design, right-of-way, construction. And we sent our check to INDOT when they asked for our 20% share (of construction). That process went along, and Atlas didn't agree with some of the answers they got, and they said, "We feel like we're owed more money." So that's why they're suing INDOT.

Councilor Hunt said David [Mr. Buck], before you sit down, a couple things I've gotten. Why didn't we build the bridge in the first place? And I know you have an answer to that. And the other is a person asked me why we just didn't change the subsoil, and they didn't have any idea what we had those pilings there. So would you give us a little history of—we did want a bridge... Most people don't know this.

City Engineer Buck said the City sponsored the project through our local planning efforts to prioritize projects that we do collectively in Tippecanoe County. We're all part of a Metropolitan Planning Organization, MPO, and we prioritize our projects, whether it's Creasy Lane in Lafayette or Tapawingo South in West Lafayette, or a project is in part of the County that is inside those boundaries. We prioritize those, to use our local share of the federal dollars that come back from the gas tax. Lindberg Road went through the process. It began in the early '90s for the original preliminary engineering studies, where we selected a design consultant to do a review of the area and recommend the best way to improve Lindberg Road from Northwestern over to McCormick, and widen it, because the old road was very narrow and had guard rail through the Bog that was very dangerous and needed to be upgraded, because of growth out that direction, not just in the City but also in the County. So the consultant put together a preliminary engineering study, very similar but much larger in scope, for that entire

mile-and-a-half segment of the project. One of the options recommended was a bridge. It went through that alternative, and the costs associated with it. It was not selected by the Federal Highway or by INDOT as the preferred alternate. The alternate to go through the Bog with a consolidation method—that's what it's called, where they basically pile up dirt and let it set and widen out, built two embankments is what it was proposed as, and then build a second one over the entire width, not just the north and south sides of the road, but the whole new widened area. That design progressed forward, after INDOT approved the preliminary engineer's report and eventually the design plans. So we pushed back, and I believe—I wasn't here then—but we said, "You know, we'd really like to talk more about this bridge option." And they said, "Well, you can pay the difference in local money." So it was significant enough more that the City went with the recommended alternate. At that time, it was all an okay idea, of course, and feasible to those involved. The design continued, the plans were prepared, the contract eventually went to letting, a contractor was selected, construction started, the widening effort started, and pretty quickly out of the gate, during that effort, there were not really clear instructions on how to install it, how fast to pile the dirt up, if there were any limitations as to how many feet could be applied a day. The contractor had good weather and made progress and, without additional instruction, piled it on rather quickly, I guess. And too quickly, because the weight of the new soil on top of the muck underneath caused shear failure, which resulted in a mud wave, and that's when work stopped, everyone regrouped and a redesign was sought to install pilings and a cap across the pilings. So that the road, asphalt pavement, that load could be transmitted all the way down to the subsoil that was native material and not peat moss and muck. Asphalt is a flexible pavement and, here again, because of the rulebook that we had to play by with the federal dollars, we could not select the sub-consultant to do that redesign work and that piling installation. It was up to the contractor to pick their subcontractors, so they went with a different firm than what the City had sought advice from and opinions from. That firm did a slightly different design. Yet a third geotechnical firm was sought to compare those two reports, apples-to-apples, and what would be needed to make them equal to each other. That work was done, supposedly, but still that cap layer that's across the top of the pilings was not of stone, it was of basically dirt. That does not have enough rigidity with itself to lock in and transmit those loads from the asphalt pavement, which is a plane surface, to the point supports underneath which are the pilings. That's why we see the draping. The pilings also didn't go far enough, because at the east end, you see the really big dip that happened. If the entire road were not supported with piles through the Bog, the whole thing would have settled and continued to do that. It might be partially under water by now. I don't know what kind of rate it would have gone down under, but hindsight is 20-20, of course. But, yes, I wish they would have built a bridge.

Councilor Roales said is there any fear of collapse of the road?

City Engineer Buck said we're not concerned that that's a likelihood. It's a possibility, because of the material, but there is fabric in one-foot layers underneath the pavement. There's about a foot of asphalt—more than that now that we overlaid it—and then underneath that, there's a layer of fabric, a foot, a layer of fabric. The fabric is very, very hard to punch through. It's very taut and strong in tension. So it's not likely that could happen. If there were a gap where that could happen, one of those pilings could punch out, but that would have to take a pretty large area of the road to do that, and a lot of weight. The biggest weight that the road sees is its own weight. If we were driving semi truck after semi truck across it, that would be different. But with just the normal passenger cars, that's hardly anything compared to its own weight. So it's going to be a slowly-progressing thing. It's something that we can watch for a long period of time. That's what we've been doing. It's kind of back now to where it was at the end of 2005, in terms of the magnitude of settlement between the supports, as well as the east end. And so some

time, depending on how this progresses, we may need to look at maintenance work to fill some of that in. But adding more weight is just adding more weight and progressing that movement, probably quickening the pace of it, too.

Mayor Dennis said and so it's not just waving, it's also dipping on the sides. The sides are starting to come in—

City Engineer Buck said yes, you can see the curbs are really rolling out.

Mayor Dennis said there are some of those geese who just step over the curb and walk across.

Councilor Dietrich said do we have average vehicle counts for that road?

City Engineer Buck said about 10,000 a day.

Mayor Dennis said more questions?

Councilor Hunt said what if we were to just approve—and I don't want to get, you know, over-managed—but it worries me the blank check thing. I don't know if it bothers anybody else. What if we just did the \$174,000—whatever it is?

Mayor Dennis said the feasibility study?

Councilor Hunt said yes, and the geotech, and the pre-engineering design.

Mayor Dennis said that's kind of what we're doing. That is the first step.

City Attorney Burns said it's the first step. I guess what you're saying is, "Why not do it in stages in this interlocal?" And I guess my response is when somebody has a pen in their hand, ready to sign, I like to get them to sign. Whether that's a person or an entity or anything else, because it's a good policy, if we think this is a good project, and the County is willing to commit to \$6.5 million of the Bridge Fund, then I think it would be in the City's best interests to get it all signed. And obviously as it goes forward, if it didn't look like it was a smart move, then we have the ability to pull the plug.

Mayor Dennis said yes, we have controlling interest. So if the feasibility study says cul-de-sacs, it's cul-de-sacs.

Councilor Hunt said by the way, one man yesterday thought we should make a gravel road—

[overtalking]

Mayor Dennis said if you've lived out there for 50 or 60 years—

[overtalking]

Councilor Hunt said well those answer my questions.

Councilor Bunder said yes, thank you. Thanks to all.

Mayor Dennis said any other?

Councilor Dietrich said Purdue has no standing in this whatsoever, even though they are neighbors to the Bog and share the Bog?

Mayor Dennis said I spoke with the folks at Purdue, and the first response was, "Make sure you involve the Friends of the Celery Bog.

[overtalking]

Mayor Dennis said which we will do.

There was no further discussion.

Resolution No. 2-09 Resolution Approving The Interlocal Agreement For Implementation Of NPDES Phase II Storm Water Quality Management Plan (Sponsored by Mayor Dennis)

Mayor Dennis read this resolution by title and said this was something that actually was started back in 1999. I found some files from '99, and believe that this has been before the Council before. The interlocal agreement came in front of the Council back in '05, and this is just a furtherance of that. Again, what kind of questions can we answer about this? And you understand the focus, what it is and what it's going to provide for? Because we've got the engineer guy here now, but in real basic terms, what it does is allow us to have another option for funding an unfunded mandate from IDEM. Basically, we have to clean up our runoff, and this is the mandated solution for that process. Lafayette's got one. The County—did they get theirs done?

City Engineer Buck said they haven't enacted this yet.

Mayor Dennis said but, anyway, it's something that we're all going to have to do, one way or another, anyway. And this is just step two in this process. It's a pretty standard boilerplate, like the one that I looked at in 2005.

Councilor Dietrich said can you talk a little bit about public education and outreach programs that deal with runoff water?

Mayor Dennis said yes, they actually have programs that are directed for different levels. You have a K-12 program. It's online.

City Engineer Buck said we have a website. The public education stuff is one of the ones that we do more of as a team, so we benefit a lot from having Purdue and Ivy Tech and the resources they bring to the table, in lieu of what we have as a City or the County or the City of Lafayette, for that matter. We have six minimum control measures. A couple of them deal with public involvement, public education, and those are the main ones that we do as a collective team. There's a couple that we do, one in-house and one with our own forces—maintaining our storm infrastructure, street sweeping, pollution control measures, things like that. This is a continuation of the one that's already in effect. Lafayette had requested a couple of modifications, based on what we know now to be more equitable for them and the County. Ours didn't really change, in terms of the costs.

Wastewater Utility Director Henderson said just FYI. The folks at IDEM point to the Tippecanoe County Partnership as a model program. We really benefit from this. We had our first stormwater audit earlier this year, and it went very well. The group works, and we'd like to continue that.

Mayor Dennis said more questions?

There was no further discussion.

COMMUNICATIONS:

► Police Chief Dombkowski said I do have an item. I was going to ask to set aside time on the agenda for Officer of the Quarter Award. That officer hasn't been chosen yet by the Exec Committee of the Merit Commission.

Mayor Dennis said are we going to do it under Public Relations?

Police Chief Dombkowski said we have in the past done it in the Beautification Award area, Public Relations.

Councilor Hunt said doesn't that committee meet Tuesday, though? Didn't I get it on the agenda for next week—the Police Merit Commission? Or do they have to meet?

Police Chief Dombkowski said they're going to meet Friday. That committee from the Commission will meet Friday.

Councilor Hunt said okay.

Mayor Dennis said so we'll add that—

Councilor Hunt said under Public Relations.

Mayor Dennis said under Public Relations, yes.

Mayor Dennis said thank you.

CITIZEN COMMENTS:

► Ms. Diane Damico [Redevelopment Commission] said Peter [Councilor Bunder] doesn't know this. Do you want to do an update of the Go Greener? Does it have to be on the agenda? I'll write it for you [to Councilor Bunder].

[overtalking]

Mayor Dennis said we'll put that in Special Reports?

Councilor Bunder said sure.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business at this time, Councilor Hunt moved for adjournment, and Mayor Dennis adjourned the meeting, the time being 5:08 p.m.