

**Enrolled Memorandum of the Meeting
Study Session/Meeting (Convened Electronically/Hybrid)
Twenty-Ninth Town Council of Highland
Monday, June 6, 2022**

The Twenty-Ninth Town Council of the Town of Highland, Lake County, Indiana met in a study session on **Monday, June 6, 2022**, at 6:30 O'clock P.M., in the regular place, the Highland Municipal Building, 3333 Ridge Road, Highland, Indiana.

*This meeting was convened as both an in person and an electronic meeting. Some persons were participating remotely on a Zoom platform that allowed for real time interaction between and among all of the Town Council and supported the public's ability to observe and record the proceedings. People were able to participate in person and remotely, allowing for all councilors to be simultaneously seen and heard. When the agenda item provided for public comment, this was supported as well. Councilor Toya Smith, Councilor Mark Schocke, Councilor Tom Black, Councilor Roger Sheeman, Councilor Zemen all participated in person.

The meeting was streamed live on the Town of Highland, Indiana Facebook page and participation was supported by the Zoom on-line communication platform.

Silent Roll Call: Councilors Bernie Zemen, Toya Smith, Mark Schocke, Tom Black, Roger Sheeman, were present in person as indicated. The Clerk-Treasurer, Mark Herak was present to memorialize the proceedings. *A quorum was attained.*

Officials Present: John P. Reed, Town Attorney was remote. Ken Mika, Building Commissioner and Ed Dabrowski, IT Director were in person.

General Substance of Matters Discussed.

Discussion: Presentation from Parker Criswell, Senior Accountant of Reedy Financial

Group. Mr. Criswell's remarks were based (attached) as a result of RFG's review of Highland's personal property assets and assessments. Overall, the Town is in a great position to weather the storm, that is continued discussions to reduce/eliminate the Business Personal Property depreciation floor.

Introduction

In accordance with Reedy Financial Group's ("RFG") engagement with the Town of Highland (the "Town"), we have prepared the below report, detailing RFG's study of the Town's business personal property environment. By providing this report, RFG hopes to provide Town Officials with a clear understanding of the business personal property assessments currently within the Town's underlying tax base and the impact that potential legislation might have on Highland taxpayers.

Project Summary

During the 2022 Legislative Session, multiple bills were drafted, by both the House and Senate, aiming to reduce or eliminate property taxes on business personal property assessments. With the assistance of allied State Legislators and State Organizations, all bills were killed before being passed to the desk of Gov. Holcomb. Despite avoiding these impactful bills this session, it has been promised by legislators that the topic will arise in future sessions.

Municipalities across the State rely on personal property assessments to avoid higher tax rates, increasing circuit breaker credits, and budgetary funding issues. It is imperative that, as legislative discussions come back around, local officials understand their community's personal property environment and the impact any future legislation might have to their community and to taxpayers.

Highland Civil Town – Current Assessments as seen below, Highland's current taxing base relies firmly on real property assessments. This greatly reduces the Town's sensitivity to any reduction in personal property assessments as will be seen further in our analysis.

Highland Civil Town – Business Personal Property

Upon receiving the Town's personal property database from the Lake County Auditor's office, each personal property form filed by Town taxpayers has been studied to identify value of current assets and where they are within their useful life. This data identifies what assets are currently at the 30% depreciation floor, and thus, would be in danger of reduction, should this floor be removed by legislation. Our findings are as follows:

As of 2022, the majority of the Town's personal property assets are "young" and are not at the 30% floor, as shown by the "% Currently at Floor" column; however, as these assets continue to be depreciated throughout their life, these percentages will continue to grow.

Highland Civil Town – Legislative Impact

The below charts detail the level of impact that potential legislation aimed at reducing or eliminating personal property tax would have on the Town. Our studied scenario includes the following assumptions:

1. All Town property tax rate components have been sourced from the DLGF's 2022 Certified Budget Order
2. The 30% depreciation floor has been fully removed from personal property assets
 - a. Drafted legislation included a potential "phasing-out" of the floor. For the purposes of our analysis, we have assumed the removal would be effective immediately If legislation were to eliminate the 30% depreciation floor, local

personal property assessments within the Town would be reduced by 18.42%, causing for the below property tax rate increase:

The resulting minimal rate increase is due in part to a few items, of which some have been previously discussed:

1. Personal Property only makes up 5% of the Town's current tax base
2. Personal Property assets within the Town are relatively young, and have yet to reach the 30% depreciation floor
3. State assessed utility personal property has not been included within the analysis (roughly \$21m for 2022).

Assuming this minimal property tax rate increase and Lake County Property Tax Relief Credits remaining static, RFG does not anticipate any significant impact to local taxpayers or to Town operating funds in the form of circuit breaker credit increases. Any impact to either incorporated taxpayers or the Town would be diminished in the short to medium term.

Rather, the Town should look at reductions / elimination of the personal property depreciation floor as a cumulative longterm opportunity cost. That is, over the course of many years, such reductions would ultimately limit the Town's ability, to some degree, to generate property tax revenue along with the growth of personal property assessments.

Once you have had the chance to review our above analysis, please do not hesitate to reach out for any further discussion!

Thanks, Reedy Financial Group,

Thank you again for everyone tonight, again, my name is Parker Criswell and I am from the Reedy Financial Group. We've had the pleasure of working with Michael Griffith in the past but prior to him, leaving his position with the Town and becoming a State Senator. He had discussed with us wanting to look and see a lot more in depth of what the potential personal property legislation would impact if any at all those might have on the Town of Highland. The State legislators, do an excellent job of discussing and portraying county by county impacts, but not necessarily all the way down to the municipal level such to the town itself so that being said. I, along with a few others, we were able to obtain some information from Lake County Auditor's office and we're able to take a deep dive into Highland's assessed value underlying assessed values and that's how we've quantified this report in front of you guys tonight. So, at any point I'm pretty informal when it comes to presenting, so if anyone has any questions, comments, concerns feel free to just throw them at me whenever. So, to start off with we looked at the Town of Highland pretty generally. So, looking at just what current

assessments are within the Town. So, what are your guy's tax rates, made up of when it comes to comparing those to your property tax levies. So that's where we see that middle section there on page one, so we see that, for the past three years from 2020 to 2022 certified that assessed values within the Town have floated anywhere between \$1.1 and \$1.2 billion. Comparatively to personal property assessed values which obviously is the topic of discussion tonight we see that we're only around anywhere between \$64 and \$61 million. It's a great positioning especially whenever it comes to the State legislators potentially wanting to move municipalities away from depending on these assessed values, we see that personal property only makes up roughly 5% of your guy's assessed value. What does that mean. It means that if those assessed values were to be reduced drastically due to a change in legislation your guy's property tax rates impacts to your taxpayers would be insulated, and so there wouldn't be as large a tax rate increase to the local tax payers tax bill. Moving down next, we do jump a little bit deeper into personal property itself and that's where we see this next section at the bottom of page one. Within Indiana personal property, which is reported directly from developers or from company owners in those assets are signified or organized into one of four depreciation pools, each of which depends on the life of the asset. We see within Highland, a very large percentage of your overlying personal property values exist within the appreciation pool number two, so the life of the assets mainly within Highland is five to eight years. Why is that, it's mainly industry driven. I'm not too sure on why industry really drives Highland but it definitely seems like there is something more evident and that's why the majority of your personal property assets are in that bucket there. The far right column of that is the percent currently at the floor and for those that don't necessarily know what that floor amount is that's kind of what the legislators have been pinpointing and talking about. Whenever it comes to drafting new personal property legislation within the State, each of those pools has asset that moves throughout its life, the company is allowed to depreciate a certain amount of that assets value. Within Indiana, whenever that assets is supposed to be depreciated past 30%, State legislation prevents that and then these assets sit at the 30% for the for the remainder of its life. Within Highland as all we looked at here, the percent or the floor is very low, meaning that we have young youthful assets within the Highland, none that are super old or close to expiration towards the end of their life. Again, another great positioning for the Town whenever it comes to legislators in future sessions continuing this discussion, as far as the removal of that floor. It's quite a bit so far but there's a couple more topics I wanted to touch on with this report. Are there any questions at all, from this point. If not, I'll keep running forward just a couple more. This next part is where I really get into OK, so now that we understand where we're at now and we understand where's Highland so what's the actual impact to Highland, so that's where we have this chart that's on the top of page two and we see that the certified values with the 30% floor we're roughly at about \$40.8 million. So, of that your guy's tax rates, what the assessed value is that they're set off about \$41 million that's based on personal property values so now let's say that legislators draft a bill that says we're going to remove this 30% floor. We see now, we are at \$33 million, just like that snap of a finger simply, of course, once legislators are going to drop these bills they're going to be easy, then it's not just going to be a quick swift movement but, over one year or two years, that is going to settle in, and you are going to see a reduction of assess values, simply because of a new bills. So that's about an 18.42% reduction to

Highlands personal property tax bill pool. So, all in all I hinted earlier about impacts, the taxpayers and tax rates inevitably. What that looks like for Highland again because Highland does not rely very heavily on personal property values, you have a very strong real property base and because of the LIFE the useful life of your assets within the incorporated boundaries. There really isn't a large impact to the town of Highland should legislation like this go into effect so comparing certified rates and then pulling out that loss of assessed value due to a new proposed to bill, we would really only we would see less than a cent increase in property taxes or excuse me, property tax rates so again, this is our analysis. The increase would only be point \$.0049 cents so again very low. Like I said really it just falls down to Highlands in a strong position as far as your real property percentage of assessed value to personal property is extremely well, some one of the best I've seen actually. We've assisted Aim this year and their efforts to kind of combat these bills, as they arose and we studied various municipalities across the state and from what I can say confidently is that Highlands in a really good position to battle, I guess, you could say any of these legislations, as they continue to arise. Nothing past this year, thankfully, but as we've learned from the past, if something gets brought up more than likely it's gonna get brought up again in the future.

Councilor Sheeman restated what Parker has been saying, basically you're saying, as your municipality, the impact on this to Highland is going to be very, very small or practically nothing right.

Parker Criswell responded, Exactly, especially since the way Indiana tax caps work. If any tax payers are already paying 1% of their tax bill, even if there was a rate increase they wouldn't feel the burden of that rate increase because of the tax caps. I've seen some communities, such as those in like Howard county, Madison county, Clinton county the ones that reliable more heavily on personal property, they've seen anywhere of 20 to 30% of assessed value decreases just because of the removal of that 30% floor. I'm not saying that a bill like this would be great for the town of Highland, I don't think this bill would be great for any municipality across the state, but I will say that the Highland is in a good position.

Parker then started talking about the circuit breaker and the discussions he had with Michael. In discussions with Michael as well, there was one other topic that we annually, complete the circuit breaker impact for the town basically as rates continue to increase, what is that going to look like, as far as the circuit breaker the impact to the town's operating budgets. The Clerk-Treasurer asked about the circuit breaker projections Reedy had supplied Michael. The 2022 circuit breakers are now on the DLGF home page and Highland's is nearly double the amount Michael used in preparing the budget. To be honest, I would have to look more into it as I was not the one who was on that team. That does that does seem odd to me that it's that big of a discrepancy. I know Michael work with us in the past, because our numbers were oftentimes closer than the states. I would love to look into that and then reach out with any items that come to mind but I couldn't tell you off the top of my head without looking into it. Maybe someone within your taxing district, levied new debt that we were unaware of.

Discussion: Consideration of an Anti-Lobbying Ordinance for Former Elected Officials: Councilor Schocke drafted an Anti-Lobbying Ordinance prohibiting former elected officials from lobbying/representing petitioners before the Board of Zoning Appeals and/or the Plan Commission.

Councilor Schocke, circulated the Ordinance prior to the Memorial Day Holiday, began by saying I just thought it might be a good idea to put some ordinance on the books to prohibit any former elected official from coming in and representing petitioners before certain boards, because I don't think that's in the best interest of our Town. Our federal system has a ban on lobbying, for I believe two years for members of Congress, then after that they can lobby, but we all know, in practice that after they leave Congress, they typically go to a big lobbying firm, and basically get involved in special interest group, come back and they use their access to push this legislation or whatever cause and in the meantime they're making a lot of money doing it. There's some federal legislation that's similar to this on the federal level sponsored by Congressman Jared Golden out of Maine to permanently ban lobbying for former Members of Congress. If we look at the various state's legislation nearly all of them have some form of lobbying bans for at least a period of time. Indiana has a year long ban following being a member of the legislature, Illinois has a year long ban as well. Florida actually has a constitutional amendment which is a six year ban so it's something that's seen regularly. I also copied Mr. Reed so he could review it from the legal side. I also had the idea of including Redevelopment or any other branches of government where lobbying by former elected officials take place. We did not sign up for this job so that after we're done with our terms that we can come back and functionally make a ton of money by representing special interests, interest groups. Lobbying can be positive force in democracy but can also be a mechanism for powerful groups to influence laws and regulations at the expense of public interest. This may result in undue influence or unfair competition to the detriment of effective policymaking. I would like to introduce it maybe at the next meeting or at some meeting thereafter. I'm open to amendments suggestions. I wanted to give everybody plenty of time to review this and express any thoughts or concerns.

John Reed who was participating remotely, did review the Ordinance Councilor Schocke sent out and commented he didn't see anything about it, that would make it unlawful in its application or unconstitutional in any way. As Councilor Schocke reported, these bans are not uncommon in other places. I didn't know if it was intended to be only for officials that were involved in either elected or appointed in the Town of Highland or if it was blanket for any elected official everywhere.

Councilor Schocke commented that I made it broad so I wanted to include everybody because, like under my definitions, I have any elected position, federal, state or local office within the State of Indiana, at any time, so I mean that would in that scenario that would apply to that individual.

Councilor Black expressed fear if we enact an Ordinance like this, so broad that we may be, you know, cutting off our nose in spite of our face. There's a limited number of professional people you know within the county and within the region, who have had either elected or appointed positions and when we're trying to attract business and things like that to Highland we want to make sure that the best do come to Highland and that we don't you know exclude them from the process.

Councilor Schocke responded that even if you place a temporary suspension, say two years after your position is expired, we don't lose their experience, but they also are not put right back in where they're helping on a deal that was getting started before they left office. I see you're concerned, I open to them. I'm open to take off federal and state officials and leave it local or just specific to Highland. I just thought the whole goal of public service is to help the people not to take that experience and cashing in at the bank right afterwards, so I was trying to temper that by making it restrictive but look if you guys want to change it, you know, I'm open to that idea.

Councilor Black responded that's the thing I don't see, are we looking for a solution to a problem, we don't have. Do you have any idea how many people have come before the Plan Commission or anything like that that have had this type of situation.

Councilor Schocke responded, if that's the situation then, I guess, we have nothing to worry about right but it's the perception. It would apply to me and everyone else. I guess it's a pretty good pledge to the public to say this is where our ethics lie, this is what we're in it for, we're not here to make money we're not here to be self-interested, we're here to put the community first and so that's exactly why I want to put it out there, whether it's a problem in the past or it's a problem in the future, I want to say hey look it's not going to be a problem for me.

Councilor Smith asked Councilor Schocke, are you bringing this up because it's is a problem or it could be a potential problem going forward.

Councilor Schocke responded that the election cycle is only like a year and a half away and if some of us decide we're going to go in cash in and be out of public service. I want to prevent that problem before it ever happens. And we do know it's a problem on the federal level, and we know it's a problem on the state level.

Councilor Black added, that he's concerned there is a limited pool of people to choose from there, you know if you've got Joe Senator versus Joe Plumber who come into lobby, so the Senators are going to make a lot more money, but if you're looking at former council people and things like that, there's not as many, the pool of professionals out there is smaller because we're in such a smaller region.

Councilor Schocke responded that I don't know if I agree with that, because the way I look at it is like why shouldn't Joe the plumber have just as much access as Joe the former Senator.

Councilor Sheeman added, I just want to bring up the scenario. Councilor Schocke, you keep talking about that you shouldn't be able to leave here and make a pile of money. So, after my terms of service here is done and I have a neighbor that's having an issue with something with the building commission and she comes over to me and says hey, you were on the Town Council, can you help me out. So, I come with my neighbor to a hearing or something just to help her out. I'm not asking for any money. I'm not making a pile of money. I'm just a good neighbor and you're gonna tell me that's not allowed.

Councilor Schocke said maybe we can change the definition of include for compensation. I would be fine with that as you should be able to solve the problem. I'm just saying, if you're in a volunteer your time, I agree with you, I think you should you should be able to make a phone call and do whatever you need to do.

Councilor Smith commented that I don't really see the need for this and I'm not comfortable with it. It doesn't seem right to me.

Councilor Schocke asked Councilor Smith if she could provide more detail on that so what's uncomfortable about it, what don't you like about it, what could be better.

Councilor Smith said I just don't like it. I feel like I have the right to hire someone to represent me and I don't want someone dictating to me on who I can hire or can't hire to represent me because they were formerly on the Council or whatever. It just doesn't feel legal to me. In my opinion, it should go back to the people and let them vote on it, because we represent the people and not our personal opinion. I prefer to go back to the people and get their input.

Councilor Schocke said he's not trying to be disrespectful but exploring the reasons why you don't like it. It's not targeted any anyone specifically, it's actually broad to include any former elected official and so that would include me and include you and everybody on this town council. I would like you guys want to tweak it. Just so everyone knows, next week I'm going to be on a family vacation in Canada, I plan on participating with my iPad remotely but that's probably not the best time to shepherd a piece of legislation that I want passed. Maybe we don't put it on the agenda for the next meeting, maybe I tweak some things based on some of the feedback I'm hearing tonight, anything that might cause you to change your mind. Since I'm not going to be here on the 13th, probably the 27th would be my target. I can bring it back for further discussion on the 20th study session, if you like, so we can discuss it again before we do anything.

Discussion: Consideration of Ordinance No. 1764-1760- F: The Building and Inspection Commissioner had requested and the Council via consensus agreed to modify Section 8, Building and Inspection Department, subsection C Associate Employees and Staff by increasing the Incumbent Rate of the Inspection Clerk to \$19.47.

Building Commissioner Ken Mika began by saying he was here a couple of study sessions ago when this topic was brought up. I brought this up as Mark Herak had a

couple of positions open. One was a Chancery Bursar Clerk which has a salary of \$19.47 per hour. The long and short of it is, I have an employee in my office that's been with me almost five years now who's a valued employee and she currently is only making \$16.59 per hour. When I started looking at this in general, most similar positions in other departments start at the \$19 per hour range so there's quite a discrepancy and, quite honestly, she probably, in some cases has more responsibilities than some of these other positions. We presented this a couple of study sessions ago, in theory the general consensus was to proceed but doing so would require an additional appropriation. The additional would be approximately \$3,930.39, which at your May 23rd meeting, at which you authorized the Clerk-Treasurer to advertise for that additional appropriation.

The Clerk-Treasurer reminded the Council that the increase in pay is contingent upon the passage of the additional appropriation. If the additional appropriation doesn't pass, the Council cannot consider Ordinance No. 1764-1760-F.

Ken said he failed to mention that when she found this position was open she strongly considered going over to Mark just based on the dollar amount, even though she would prefer staying with me. She brings quite a bit of experience.

Councilor Sheeman asked to see a copy of both job descriptions so he could compare the two jobs to actually know what their duties are. The Clerk-Treasurer reminded Councilor Sheeman that not only was the job posted internally but externally as well. Councilor Sheeman said his position hasn't changed from several weeks ago, I don't think we should be doing this in the middle of the budget year. If there's something that needs to be adjusted we should do it during the budget process.

Councilor Schocke reminded Councilor Sheeman that the Council did the same thing for the police department at the May 23, 2022 meeting.

Councilor Sheeman responded that the jobs are totally different. He also wanted to know if there's anyone else in a town that's affected by this, besides one person so there's a little bit more research and I like to do into this before I make a decision.

Councilor Schocke asked Councilor Sheeman as to what more research he needed to do.

Councilor Sheeman responded, I just told you. I want to see the job descriptions and I want to look at the rest of the salary code and see if it affects anybody else.

Councilor Schocke asked the Council President if it was going to be placed on the agenda.

The Clerk-Treasurer asked if he might interject. Based upon the comments by Councilor Sheeman and since it is an ordinance and you need unanimous consent to pass on first reading and I got a feeling, and I can't speak for Councilor Sheeman but I don't think Councilor Sheeman will vote in favor to consider on first reading, so it could just be

introduced at the next meeting and then at the following meeting take a vote for adoption.

The several items on the agenda were brought up by the Clerk-Treasurer which are basically housekeeping.

Discussion: Modifying Ordinance No. 1764-1760-E (1):

Section 6

(A) That this ordinance shall become effective and shall remain in full force and effect from and after the date of its passage and adoption, subject to any express provisions of this ordinance, in all other instances not sooner than June 12, 2022, and except to any express effective dates herein described to the contrary and until its repeal or amendment by subsequent enactment;

(B) That the Clerk-Treasurer shall have authority to implement the provisions of this ordinance pursuant to the authority expressly set forth in IC 36-5-6-6 (a) (3) & (4).

(C) That the provisions eliminating the position of 4th Class and modifying the starting position of for Class3, Class 2 and Class 1 rate of pay based upon the level of LAW ENFORCEMENT CERTIFICATION AND EXPERIENCE CERTIFIED

This Ordinance was originally passed at the Council's May 23, 2022 meeting. After passage, the Accounts Payable Supervisor asked the Clerk-Treasurer if he would approach the Council to amend, making the changes effective at the start of the next pay period rather than becoming effective in the middle of the pay period. The effective date of June 12, 2023 was added, reading effective from and after June 12, 2022, which is the start of the next pay period. The Clerk-Treasurer already spoke with the Chief of Police and he's fine with changing the effective date to June 12, 2022.

Councilor Sheeman said that the changes were simply technical and he had no issues with.

Discussion: Modifying Works Board Order 2022-14: Owing that this is a federal grant, the following documents should have been included in the original Works Board Order.

1. Proposal Letter from Nies Engineering of May 16, 2022 and accepted by Public Works Director, Mark Knesek
2. Table 1 listing the streets that were part of the Grant Application #11400
3. A signed Clause (Addendum) and Affidavit Addendum to be added to Contract for Services as required by Indiana SEA 590, effective July 1, 2011 by a Principal of Nies.
4. A signed Affidavit of Nies Engineering with the Town of Highland, Lake County, Indiana regarding hire of unauthorized aliens. This affidavit must be notarized.
5. Table 2 for the 2022 Nies Engineering Personnel Hourly Rates
6. Standard Conditions for Professional Engineering Services

The Clerk-Treasurer explained that Works Board Order 2022-14 pertained to a federal grant (Community Crossing Grant) and Federal Grants require certain criteria be included in any formal documents and the Clerk-Treasurer failed to include. Those documents which are listed above are now included in the modified Works Board Order

2022-14.

Discussion: Town of Highland Board of Works No. 2022-15. A joint resolution of the Board of Works and the Water Works Board of Directors Awarding a bid to Gatlin Plumbing & Heating, Inc. for the River Drive Water Main replacement and street improvement project in the total amount of \$825,000, as the lowest responsive and responsible bid.

This is joint resolution between the Board of Works and the Water Works Board of Directors and requires formal action by the Council.

Discussion: Town of Highland Board of Works No. 2022-16. A joint resolution of the Board of Works and the Water Works Board of Directors Accepting and Approving a proposal from Nies Engineering, Inc. for Professional Engineering Services during construction for the River Drive water main replacement and street improvement project in the total amount not to exceed \$61,500.

This is a joint resolution between the Board of Works and the Water Works Board of Directors and requires formal action by the Council.

Discussion: Town of Highland Appropriation Enactment No. 2022-13. An Enactment Appropriating Additional Monies in Excess of the Annual Budget From Monies Received as a Grant from the State or Federal Government, pursuant to I.C. 6-1.1-18-7.5, I.C. 36-5-3-5 et seq.

The Clerk-Treasurer explained that unlike the normal additional appropriation process where the Town is required to advertise in the local newspaper the date and time of the public hearing, with state or federal grants, since the money is already received into the system, the money still needs to be appropriated but the Town is not required to advertise a public hearing in the newspaper but simply have an appropriation enactment adopted by the Council. The Council still has to approve. If the Council wants to adopt on the same night of introduction it would require a unanimous consent of the Council.

DISCUSSION: ACTION TO APPROVE PAY FOR EMPLOYEE WHO IS TEMPORARILY REPLACING ANOTHER EMPLOYEE AT A HIGHER GRADE-ACTION TO APPROVE PAY FOR EMPLOYEE WHO IS TEMPORARILY REPLACING ANOTHER EMPLOYEE AT A HIGHER GRADE LEVEL, AFTER THIRTY FULL DAYS IN THE POSITION, PURSUANT TO SECTION § 4.01 OF THE COMPENSATION AND BENEFITS ORDINANCE. THE CLERK-TREASURER IS REPORTING HE HAD ASSIGNED CHAD KINLEY TO *ACTING DEPUTY CLERK TREASURER*.

THE CLERK TREASURER MADE THE ASSIGNMENT EFFECTIVE MAY 7, 2022 AND MR. KINLEY HELD THE POSITION FROM THAT UNTIL A FULL TIME DEPUTY CLERK HAS BEEN APPOINTED. CHAD KINLEY WILL BE CONSTRUED AS ELIGIBLE FOR THE PAY OF ACTING DEPUTY CLERK EFFECTIVE JUNE 7, 2022, PROVIDED IT IS APPROVED BY THE COUNCIL.

Discussion: Authorizing the proper officer to publish legal notice of a public hearing:

Public Hearing to consider additional appropriations in the amount of \$40,000 in the Municipal Cumulative Street Fund.

This was at the request of the Public Works Director for the Sidewalk Replacement Program.

Councilor Sheeman asked to bring something up that wasn't on the agenda. It seems this weekend, we had a lot of angry residents who had their garage sales taken down from the public right away. I understand the ordinance I really do. But not enforcing that for a long time and then all of a sudden starting to pull them off, I think, even though it's legal, even though the ordinance is in existence, I think we need to think about something when people have a garage sale. I know, not everybody just lives in the corner and a lot of people live in the middle of a block. How much traffic, do you have on my little block so a lot of people like to put their signs on telephone poles or some people like to put them on a busy corner, because they say this way and then people drive and know there's a garage sale. I know there was quite a few residents that seemed to be upset about it over the weekend that I saw on social media that their signs were removed from the right of way. I mean it is a code but on the other hand is there something we could do to the ordinance make an exception for garage sales. Maybe it's a one day thing. it's got to be removed by certain time or whatever, I mean I just think we put a damper on the whole garage sale thing by our residents.

Ken Mika responded that yes, there were a lot of complaints over the weekend about garage sale signs being removed from the right of ways but that is what the ordinance prohibits from being placed in the public right away. The signs need to be placed on the property in which the sale is being held. Things are starting to get out of hand. We had one garage sale, in particular, there were 35 to 40 signs put up for one garage sale. We started seeing A frame type signs that are made out of plywood that are being placed on public sidewalks, on corners, signs being put on telephone poles. The whole reason behind it is to limit the number of garage sale signs. If you don't limit, then everybody else would be able to put up a temporary sign like a business for roofing or we buy houses. Anything that's in the right away gets picked up and either held for a little while and then gets taken to the dump. When it comes to the garage sales we are somewhat lenient but when we start having 35 signs or some people end up wanting to have a garage sale literally every week during the summer, that then become a business.

Councilor Schocke commented I remember as a kid, I grew up on a corner and it seemed like a lot of people would use our corner to advertise their garage sale signs. And because they lived on the block, you know my parents didn't really care and unless we had to mow or something we move it temporarily put it back. Nobody ever asked my parents if they could and his parents were pretty easy going and really didn't care. If someone did knock on their door and asked, my Dad would say go ahead.

Ken said they only touch signs that are in the public right away, which is between the street and the public sidewalk right. Not everyone who lives on a corner wants a garage sale sign on their property. I don't even know if we could fix that problem because we

can't have an ordinance saying yeah you could put it on the corner because you're kind of infringing on the corner property owners rights. I mean if you have the permission from the property owner that's one thing but you can't just allow a garage sale sign on every corner. Most communities have pretty much the same thing we have now some enforce them more than others.

Councilor Sheeman mentioned this before and again this week, I saw on social media somebody took down their metal shed and just piled all the metal shed on the right of way with a sign that says, come and get it. I don't know that we want that kind of stuff being done in Highland where people are just hoping somebody will come and pick up their junk.

Ken Mika responded, people leave it in front of their house, posting that they just placed cabinets in front of their house. I don't know how to curb that I mean. If we see it out on the street as I've said before we're usually proactive about getting with the property owner and advising them of the fact they can be cited for a nuisance violation if that stuff isn't gone within 24 hours.

Councilor Sheeman I don't know but just seems to be getting more and more where I see people putting their stuff out in front of their house, wanting to get rid of it, hoping people will come by and take it. I don't know if we want our town to be that way. It just doesn't give a good appearance to the Town.

Councilor Zemen reiterated the Town's policy of only placing your garbage (cans) out the Monday before pick-up on Tuesday. Its okay to place your garbage in your garage or in your back yard but not in front of your house in hopes that someone will take it. As he drives around town, on almost every block you can see residents putting garbage on the curb on in the parkway.

Ken said Code Enforcement is driving around and if they residents putting garbage in the public right of way, we stop and tell them they have 24 hours to either take the garbage to the Public Works Facility or into their garage or back yard. He questioned how do you counter social media (which he is not on) when someone post, come and get it.

Councilor Schocke said that when he cleans out his garage, I'll put on my own personal page and my friends will say, I want that old snowblower that doesn't start or I want that. I mean, I remember I replaced a water heater probably 10 years ago in my house. We took out the old water heater, put it on the curb it was there for like a whole 10 minutes before a scrapper took it because it's metal you know and same thing with an old metal desk I remember.

Councilor Sheeman said he understood the scenario but how do you predict that someone will pick it up or how long will it remain at the curb. Probably gone is an assumption. How do you predict that something is going to be there for half hour rather than all day and all night.

Councilor Schocke said, I'm just saying my experience and everything I put out usually goes away pretty quickly.

Councilor Schocke asked to bring up another item that Councilor Sheeman brought up at a previous meeting and that is a sponsorship banner or banners like potentially on stage for sponsors. What's the price point do we think we should set for that or should that be set by the Council Community Events. But ultimately everything the Council of Community Events has to be approved by this body. I know that my law firm would potentially be interested in sponsoring a banner, but I don't know what a fair rate to charge. What is a right price and fair size of a banner as I don't want to be looked at as a guy that somehow got special treatment to put up his company's business banner.

Councilor Sheeman suggested 1 big banner across the stage for the sponsors of the bands. Whoever gives the top amount gets you know, a bigger logo and then the others are sized accordingly. Whoever gives the biggest donation, you put their name bigger and guys that give smaller donations, you make smaller.

Councilor Schocke asked if businesses who had their own banners could use them. He brought this up because we're running out of time, as my thought is some business have them. His firm has one that they use that fits across a table when they are sponsoring an event or something. I realize we should we should have done this months ago if we were going to do it but do we want to try and make something out of it now, or do we want to just say next year. I know I could probably get at least a couple of businesses to get on board for this year. We need to determine a fair price. Is it \$5,000 or \$1,000 or \$500. I don't know if we could do this, but what if we had like a big projection screen on the back and have a protector with a power point displaying the sponsors.

IT Director Ed Dabrowski said the problem with a screen and projector is you have to assemble and take down each night. You are dependent upon weather conditions and if you chose to leave it up rather than take it down each night, you'll have to have security in the park.

Councilor Sheeman suggest that the lag time between the bands set up and take down, have someone announce who the sponsors of the bands or a public announcement thanking our sponsors and make sure they visit the various vendors.

Councilor Zemen asked the Clerk-Treasurer how the Park Department handled their sponsors for the Park's 75th Anniversary Festival. The Clerk-Treasurer responded in the negative.

Councilor Schocke said he hoped that the conversation tonight would generate sponsors but we need to be able to quote these businesses a price now so you can determine the level of interest.

Councilor Zemen thought a price of \$1,000 per sponsor for all 5 days. If we had five or six businesses each contributing \$1,000 each, I wouldn't mind the sign stayed up all five days.

Councilor Schocke added that the banner being up for all 5 days would a great marketing tool as for five days and people are always looking up at the stage and seeing the banner with the sponsors name on it. But the question is what's the price point. I mean, are we talking 500 bucks for like one band, are we talking 500 bucks for an hour I mean I don't know what the right price is. We need to figure out sooner rather than later.

Councilor Sheeman asked the Clerk-Treasurer the total cost of the bands and the Clerk-Treasurer responded \$32,000.

IT Director Ed Dabrowski said he knows the owner of the sound company the Park Department uses for the movie in the park and he uses a large inflatable screen. That might be able to be used on the side of the Gazebo, constantly projecting the sponsors. He added, its not inexpensive.

Councilor Schocke said he can start immediately make telephone calls for sponsors but the question is, what price do I quote them. Do we start at \$1,000? He's going on vacation next week, so that doesn't give us not a lot of time to get sponsors and get the banner made. He said he would reach out to Dave Turoci from Baxter Printing.

Councilor Black reminded the Council that the CEC is planning on having a fall festival sometime in August.

Councilor Sheeman said a banner can be made in a day or 2. You will need to make sure it's made out of vinyl and have wholes for gromets.

Councilor Schocke asked Larry Kondrat if Calumet Testing would be interested in a sponsorship. Larry answered in the affirmative. Mr. Kondrat suggested the price point be around \$500. Councilor Schocke liked the idea of a banner going across the entire stage versus being at the entrances because having on it on stage and your watching the bands, the banner is sending a subliminal message which is great for a business buying a sponsorship.

Councilor's Schocke and Zemen are going to co-chair the banner idea, calling potential sponsors.

The Clerk-Treasurer asked to be recognized saying it's not my place but I, I feel that the Park Department was unfairly criticized this past weekend. You know they're not a fully staffed with their summer help and they are in the process of taking out mulch from the playground. You have to remove the old mulch before you and put in the new. They are in the process of putting the new mulch in. I understand that some of the parents were upset that their kids are playing basically in dirt and one of the social media sites said that no other community has had to deal with this. The parents have to be patient as they

are placing the new mulch down but had to remove the old mulch first. In addition, with all this rain, they are trying to keep up with the grass cutting.

Councilor Schocke said he tried to respond to the complaints on social media but it wasn't fun as he himself was attacked. He was trying to make that point that we were short staffed as not all the summer help is on board. He and the Park Board, along with Alex and Trever spent 3 hours last week visiting all of the parks with suggestions on what maintenance was needed.

• **Plenary Business Meeting of Monday June 13, 2022 Likely matters**

- Minutes of the Meeting of Monday, May 23, 2022.
- Administration of the Oath of Office for Police Candidate Tyler J. Knotts
- Consideration of Proposed Additional Appropriations
- Salary Ordinance No. 1764-1760-F
- Modifying Salary Ordinance No. 1764-1760-E (1)
- Instructing the proper officer to advertise (sidewalk replacement)
- Order of the Works Board No. 2022-15
- Order of the Works Board No. 2022-16
- Town of Highland Appropriation Transfer Resolution No. 2022-13
- Action to approve pay for employee who is temporarily replacing another
- Accounts payable vouchers Docket
- Payroll Docket for the payday of _May 20, 2022 in the amount **\$299,832.09**
Payroll Docket for the payday of June 3, 2022 in the amount of **\$238,533.86**²⁵⁰

Meeting adjourned at 7:45

Mark Herak
Clerk-Treasurer