

CITY OF FAIRVIEW

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS MEETING MINUTES

October 6, 2016

Patti L Carroll, Mayor
Toney R Sutton, Vice-Mayor
Allen Bissell, Commissioner
Shannon L Crutcher, Commissioner
Stuart L Johnson, Commissioner
Scott Collins, City Manager
Tom Daugherty, CFO
Larry Cantrell, City Attorney
Brandy Johnson, City Recorder

Present: Carroll, Bissell, Crutcher

Others Present: Collins, Cantrell, Daugherty, Hall, Paisley, O'Neal, Fox

Absent: Johnson, Sutton

1. Call to order by Mayor Carroll at 7:00 p.m.

A. Prayer and Pledge led by Mayor Carroll.

2. Approval of the Agenda – Commissioner Crutcher made a motion for approval with Commissioner Bissell seconding. Commissioner Bissell requested the removal of items 10 A since Vice Mayor Sutton is absent tonight. Mayor Carroll asked City Manager Collins if he had anything to report, or if we should wait for Sutton to return. City Manager Collins stated that he could provide a brief update but nothing of substance. Carroll asked Bissell how to proceed and it was agreed to remove the item. All were in favor.

3. Citizen Comments (Limited to the first 5 citizens to sign in and a limit of 3 minutes each). NONE

4. Awards and/or Recognitions NONE

5. Public Announcements NONE

6. Staff Comments

A. CFO Daugherty announced that the approval of the FY 2017 Budget has been received from the State Comptroller's office. He stated that he e-mailed it today to all BOC members.

B. Codes Director Hall stated that Sharon Hall, Codes Clerk has been super busy with building permits. He also stated that he has had two meetings in the last five days regarding a new Subway coming to the City at the interstate opposite from Flying J. He stated the structure would be 9,000 square feet, and that Subway would only use 1,500 square feet so there was hope for more businesses. One of the buildings will be 4,500 square foot, and the others will be 1,500 each. He stated that he also had a conversation with a developer about the possibility of a 300 lot subdivision.

C. Chief O'Neal reminded everyone of the Touch-a-Truck event schedule for Tuesday, October 11 at Fairview High School from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. He stated he had received confirmation that the Sheriff's Department would also have their helicopter at this event if the weather cooperates. He also stated that there is a phone issue at the fire hall, and they are unable to receive calls at this time. Mayor Carroll stated that if anyone has an emergency to please call 911.

D. Keith Paisley, Parks/Streets Director reminded everyone of Fall Fun Day at Bowie Nature Park this Saturday from 10:00 to 3:00. Paisley also stated that the Friends of the Nature Park have placed a box at the Nature Center for torn or tattered American flags.

7. Approval of the Minutes (only needed if removed from consent agenda)

8. Consent Agenda Consisting of Items as Follows

- A. Approval of the Minutes from the September 15, 2016 Board of Commissioners Meeting
- B. Second and Final Reading of Bill #2016-25, Ordinance No. 940, An Ordinance for an Amendment to the City of Fairview, Tennessee, Budget for Fiscal Year 2015-2016 Budget (Reallocate for Salaries)
- C. Second and Final Reading of Bill #2016-26, Ordinance No. 941, An Ordinance for an Amendment to the City of Fairview, Tennessee, Budget for Fiscal Year 2015-2016 Budget (Debt Restructure Bond Refunding)

Commissioner Bissell made a motion for approval with Commissioner Crutcher seconding. All were in favor. City Attorney Cantrell asked to speak at this point, and reminded the BOC that with two members absent tonight, anything that is passed with require unanimous approval.

9. Old Business NONE

10. New Business

- A. Discuss and/or Take Action on Status and Timeline for IMPACT Study – Sutton – REMOVED
- B. Discuss and/or Take Action on Approval of Bid for Camera and Access System – Chief Smith – Chief Smith clarified that all members had received copies of the bids sheet. There were four received and two of those ranged from \$40,000 to \$30,000. The other two bids were close in price at around \$13,000.00. He stated that the \$40,000 bid consisted of changing everything in the entire building, and he stated that this is not necessary. Chief Smith stated that the cheapest bid was through EduTech, at \$13,173. This has two options for a camera and a separate data base for the interview room, as law enforcement does not do interviews any longer unless they are recorded. He stated that the \$30,000 bid has an over-the-top server, and we do not require all of the memory that is included in that bid. Chief Smith asked Sissy Taylor if he was missing anything so she stepped up to double check. She stated that there was one bid that did not meet the requirements, as they did not have an option for the interview room, and there was no license to be able to put a camera in the interview room. She also stated there was one bid that did not include a server. Chief Smith repeated that EduTech was the bid he was looking at. He stated this was not just surveillance equipment, but also card door readers, access cards, and the database to store the information to show who entered which door and when and what time. Mayor Carroll asked him which bid he was recommending, and he stated EduTech, with the option. She also asked for the cost again, and he stated it was \$13,173, with the option, and without the option it is \$12,463. Mayor Carroll asked if we had a motion, and Commissioner Bissell moved to approve, with Commissioner Crutcher seconding. Commissioner Bissell asked how we are paying for this equipment. Chief Smith stated with the Facilities Fund. Commissioner Bissell asked CFO Daugherty if this was cleared with him, and he stated that we are well ahead on Facilities Fund revenue this year, at 82.2% of expected revenue received at this time. Daugherty stated this is the most equitable place to go for the funds and stay out of General Fund dollars. He also stated that we have no way of missing this year's or next year's note in the Facilities Fund. Commissioner Bissell stated that was the only question he had. Mayor Carroll stated that her only concern is that this is not upkeep of the building, and asked City Attorney Cantrell if this was proper use of those funds, and he stated it is proper use of these funds if it is attached to, or becomes part of, the real property then it is upkeep of the facility. Mayor Carroll asked Mr. Collins if he had any thoughts on this, and he stated that he and CFO Daugherty went over this item earlier today and that there was no question that it was a qualifying expense under that line. Commissioner Crutcher asked Chief Smith if this actually gives him what he needs at this time, and he stated it does. Mr. Crutcher stated that he remembered in earlier discussions there was an issue with some software, or a server, and he asked if this would fix that issue, and Chief Smith stated that it would. He clarified that the cheaper bids would not use the Cloud system, but would have a specific server for video surveillance, so it is not that costly, and that this would take care of what is needed, and that his main concern is the interview room. Mayor Carroll stated that there has been a lack of forethought in the past when making purchases, and she asked how long this system would carry the city before the system would need improvements. Chief Smith stated that this bid comes

with six more options for licenses. Sissy Taylor stated that this gives the option of adding an additional five cameras, and multiple door cards. She stated that this bid also covers two more door cards to cover the outside door from the courtroom, and the outside door downstairs at the Police Department. She stated that this system will need to be updated, and that the old system was never updated in previous years, and that it will be possible to keep this system up to date. Mayor Carroll asked if there were any other questions; there were none. She called for a vote, and all approved.

- C. Review Suspension of City Ordinance 11-603, Discharge of Firearms, for the Westwood Elementary School PTO – Chief Smith – Chief Smith that when he chose to add this to the agenda, he could have chosen better language, and that we do not need to suspend anything. He stated this is discretionary on his part. He stated that the PTO from Westwood Elementary have gone out of their way to make this a safe environment, with a dirt berm with hay bales on top, and that Lieutenant Sutton went out and inspected the site and said it will do fine. They will have safety officers on the range; the shotguns are limited to 20 gauge, #9 shot, so it is a very small shot that will be used; it is private property, not city property; they will have insurance, and that is basically it. There are three separate weekends, two days each, that they will be discharging firearms in the city limits. Mayor Carroll asked if this was for an event, and Chief Smith stated it was a fundraiser for the PTO, and that this was more informational and there was no need to suspend any ordinance. Mayor Carroll asked if a vote needed to be taken, and City Attorney Cantrell stated that he had concerns regarding the type of the guns used, as it was easier to contain the projectiles from shotguns than from high powered rifles. Also, he was concerned whether it was on private property, as the county school system would need to be notified if it was on school property. Lastly, if some enterprise that is sponsoring this and is providing insurance, the city would need to be provided with a copy of the insurance certificate naming the City as an additional insured, and secondly this needs to be checked and verified with TML that our insurance would still cover the City in the event something happened, before it happens. He stated that the ordinance does need to be revised for two reasons. He stated that we might have an event such as this on City property at some time, and he could find no precedence for suspending ordinances. He stated that the BOC could adapt an ordinance, they can repeal the ordinance, they can amend the ordinance, but there is no provision for verbally repealing it, and that what he would like to do would not interfere with what Chief Smith is talking about. He stated that he would like to like to bring a revision of 11-603 back to the next meeting in two areas. Number one, the ordinance states a fine of \$250.00 for an offense, and it does not matter what he thinks, but that the State Supreme Court in the case of Chattanooga vs. Davis states that if you do not have a jury trial, you cannot have more than a \$50.00 fine, so that needs to be changed because our court would have no jurisdiction to levy any more than that. Secondly, he would like to break this down into requiring non-discharging of firearms in the city limits with a B provision that would state that the provisions of Section A would not apply if the event was approved by the BOC. That way, if a club was doing such an event, and it was on City property right now, you could not do it, and he stated that he would not want the City to be in a position to suspend something when there is no precedence for it, as this is dangerous. He stated it is not dangerous to amend the ordinance, and he would like to do that and put it in proper perspective and bring it back to the BOC. He also stated that he has no problem with what Chief Smith is proposing, but he just wants to be sure that TML is checked with on the insurance, and that the insurance certificate is filed with the City, as we require everything else. Mayor Carroll thanked him, and asked if there was a motion on the floor. Commissioner Crutcher stated that he was not sure what we are doing at this point. Mayor Carroll clarified that she meant for discussion. Chief Smith stated that when he first started this he thought we would have to suspend the ordinance, but with further research it has been found it is not required. City Attorney Cantrell stated to the BOC that they were not required to vote on this item. Chief Smith stated that this was the same location where there were turkey shoots held in the past. Commissioner Crutcher asked where the event would be held, and Chief Smith stated it was at the Lions Club (baseball field). Chief Smith stated that the Williamson County School system required them to have an umbrella of insurance for this event. Commissioner Crutcher stated that this was not a matter of suspending an ordinance, but just not enforcing the existing ordinance for this particular event. City Attorney Cantrell asked what the first two dates for the event are, and Chief Smith stated October 29th & 30th. Cantrell stated that there would be a meeting prior to this first event, and that the ordinance would be filed in proper format before that time, and that the BOC could go ahead and approve this event tonight, subject to the ordinance being introduced. Once the ordinance has been introduced, and this is not a zoning ordinance but a routing policing ordinance, and does not require a public hearing but does

require publication of the ordinance in the newspaper. He stated that he would have the ordinance to the recorder tomorrow, and it could be run with the next agenda, and that once it is considered on first reading, the BOC would be fine with their approval contingent upon that because then you fall into the legislation pending doctrine and the BOC will have the authority to do that. He stated that it would be pending before the first shooting event takes place. Commissioner Crutcher asked for clarification on the two items that would be changed in the existing ordinance. Cantrell stated that he would leave in the portion regarding non-discharging of firearms in the city limits, but the \$250 fine would be changed to \$50 because the State Supreme Court states this limit, and the BOC will be given the authority to have Section A not apply if someone applies to hold an event and it is approved by the BOC. He stated he finds no precedence for verbally suspending the ordinance, but this would give the BOC legal authority to suspend the ordinance. He stated he would get this to the BOC for first reading, and therefore have the doctrine of pending legislation before the first shooting event. Crutcher clarified with Cantrell & Chief Smith that the next meeting would be October 20th, well ahead of the first shooting event on October 29th. Cantrell stated that you would need two readings for the ordinance, but after first reading the doctrine of pending legislation would be in force. Crutcher asked what the motion legally needed to say, and Cantrell stated it should state that the BOC is going to approve what Chief Smith is asking for, subject to amending the ordinance. Crutcher moved to approve; Bissell seconded. Mayor Carroll asked City Manager Collins if he had anything to add; he did not. Mayor Carroll asked why the ordinance needed to be changed if this was not necessary. Cantrell stated it would not be necessary for this event because it is on private property, however, but in the event of a similar event on city property it would be necessary. Crutcher also added that the jurisdictional issue regarding the fine needed to be changed. Vote was taken, and all approved.

- D. Discuss and/or Take Action on Resolution 10-16, A Resolution Amending and Superseding Resolution 10-15 and Adopting a Policy for the City of Fairview, Tennessee, Regarding the Making Open to the Public, Televising, Recording and Posting for Viewing Meetings of the Board of Commissioners and/or Other Boards Representative of the City of Fairview Subject to the Provisions of the Tennessee Open Meetings Act, Codified at Tenn. Code Ann. 8-44-101 Et. Seq. – Collins – City Manager Collins stated that every meeting for boards including BOC, Zoning Board of Adjustments, Planning Commission, are all subject to the Open Meetings Act, and the City has every intention to follow through with the obligation of meeting those. This Resolution would provide that the City would record and televise meetings where there will be votes and action taken, such as BOC meetings, Zoning Board of Adjustment meetings, and Planning Commission meetings. However, it would not be necessary to record, televise, or re-broadcast other work sessions requested for the BOC or Planning Commission that are only informational or advisory and do not require votes or action taken. These work sessions would be open to the public, and advertised (standard advertisement) in every way subject to the Open Meetings Act. To clarify, he stated that all meetings of the BOC, Planning Commission, & Zoning Board of Adjustments that require votes and action taken would continue to be recorded, televised, and re-broadcast. Carroll asked if there was a motion for discussion and Commissioner Bissell made a motion to approve with Commissioner Crutcher seconding. Mayor Carroll asked what this would do to Park Board, Tree Board; where do they fall in? Collins stated that these are all advisory boards, and they would be open to the public and advertised just as any other meeting, however they would not be televised or re-broadcast but would otherwise be handled the same as any other public meeting regarding advertising and public notifications. Commissioner Crutcher stated that he had a conversation with City Manager Collins regarding this subject after a workshop and he stated that he believes recording and televising work sessions sometimes puts a “chilling effect” on the dialogue and free flow of ideas during work sessions. Crutcher also stated that one of his goals, and something he focused on during his campaign was for the City to be transparent, and he intends to continue with that goal, but at the same time, he believes that of course work sessions should be open to the public, however it would be nice to share ideas freely without feeling the political pressure than some do, and be worried that something said may sound silly, and that it would be broadcast, recorded, and possibly reused in the future. He stated that he believes it would be beneficial and that discussions sometimes become political banter instead of focusing on the issues and solutions for them by putting our heads together and working through problems because we are concerned about how things we say are perceived. He stated that if it was just limited to workshops and we don’t abuse the process by calling more workshops, than what we have ordinarily had in the past, then he is in favor. He stated he does not believe it is in any way restrictive, and does still allow the public to attend and listen, and it would allow freedom to

discuss issues and remove some of the politics. Collins stated that the BOC should be commended for the effort put into transparency, and that he was surprised at the effort, and the true effect that this has, and he believes this Resolution continues this. He stated that this would give the ability for the BOC and himself to have true work sessions, and that we want to be open and transparent to the public, but issues that are recorded, televised, and re-broadcast should be of substance and of matter to the public, and you still have the opportunity to work and fulfill your duties as Commissioners, and for us as staff to do that. He again commended the BOC on transparency and the effort to work within this to make those meetings more productive. Mayor Carroll asked if there was any further discussion. Commissioner Bissell asked how many meetings in a normal month this would impact. Collins stated BOC, Zoning Board & Planning Commission meetings would still operate the same, and that the other meetings would be open to the public. He stated that his hope is that there are a few more work sessions along the way. He stated that we are growing, and he wants to put as much in front of the BOC as quickly as he can, and he believes we will need the opportunity to sit down and work through issues. He stated he would expect a few more meetings to come along, we will go through the process of advertising them, but he and the staff have talked about moving forward and giving the BOC the tools needed to make decisions as a body, and he believes this will help in that process. He stated we would not overwork anyone or abuse the ability to use your time for meetings, but we would get to the “meat” of some work, and hopefully this will help to facilitate that. Mayor Carroll clarified that we would still advertise all meetings, that most workshops would be called from a BOC or Planning Commission meeting, so the public would have plenty of proper notification. Collins stated there is no question, as they do now within every parameter of the law. City Attorney Cantrell stated that he appreciated Collins e-mailing him a copy of this Resolution for his review and comments. He stated he did review it in great detail, and that Collins did a good job of putting his thoughts into the Resolution, and of organizing it. He stated that he had done his due diligence on this, this is a good resolution and he assures that this Resolution does not in any way violate the Open Records Act. He stated that the people that see the advertisements and want to attend the meetings will not be affected at all, and that most of the time they do not participate in these, as that is the nature of a workshop. He stated that he agreed with Commissioner Crutcher in that it would take some of the tension out, and will allow more free discussion between everyone if the cameras are not rolling. He reiterated that this Resolution would in no way violates the Open Meetings Act, and that legally it is a good Resolution. Mayor Carroll asked if there was any further discussion. Commissioner Bissell stated that he had taken a practical approach when evaluating this Resolution, and he may be off a little, but that the impact would be six to eight meetings per month that were previously done, that would not be done. He asked if that was a good “ball park” number. Collins stated that if he was including Tree Commission, Beer Board, that these would not be broadcast live; that they would be open but not televised and re-aired. Bissell stated that these meetings tended to run one to two hours on average, and there would be a tangible cost savings due to not compensating an employee to attend these meetings and operate the recording equipment. He estimated that this would be 3 days per month of compensation for an employee to broadcast/record those meetings, and when you calculate that on an annual basis, that would be equal to a month of salary for an employee, either with comp time or overtime. Mayor Carroll asked for other discussion; there was none. Vote was taken; all approved.

- E. Discuss and/or Take Action on Beer Board Seat Opening & Park Commission Seat Opening – Carroll – We just continue to have this on the agenda until these seats are filled. At this time, there are no applicants, so Mayor Carroll encouraged anyone who is interested to put in an application, and that we would like to have as many citizens involved as possible. Commissioner Crutcher asked if the gentleman who was appointed to the Park Commission seat was unable to fulfill this, and Mayor Carroll stated that he wanted to be sure filling the at-large seat was done correctly, and it was, but as time passed he decided that he had other things going on, but he stated that he would still love to have some input on the Veteran’s Park. At this time, it has opened that spot back up to the at-large seat. Mayor Carroll once again encouraged anyone interested to apply.

11. City Manager Items for Discussion

- A. Miscellaneous Updates – City Manager Collins stated that he had placed a bumper sticker at each member’s seat, and that he had taken the liberty to change where it stated “City of” to “Welcome To” and additionally added the City’s website. He stated this is not intended to be a rebranding of the City, but just a small inexpensive way to show that we can do some of those things without a lot of

cost. He stated that each sticker cost \$0.24. He stated that he did not want it to look as if a vehicle with this sticker was a city-owned vehicle, and these were just for their enjoyment. He did leave some of these on the table in the lobby. City Manager Collins stated that he was not looking for any action to be taken on the second item, but it was more detailed, and he did want to share some information. Collins stated that he met with Daugherty on Wednesday, and discussed and received information from him regarding some of the City's resources, and discussed some financial planning. He stated that one of the things that needs to be addressed is the City's fleet. He stated that each member should have in their packet, a listing of every vehicle owned by the City of Fairview, that he is aware of. He stated that part of his concern, and that he has two specific to this issue, the first of which is the use of private vehicles of City employees being used to do routine tasks on behalf of the City, such as doing inspections, going to the bank, making visits, or going to do other things that we need to do. There is an inherent risk to the City with employees using their personal vehicles for that; travel training is another. He stated that he did not believe, and rightfully so, that there is an appetite by the BOC to make direct new purchases for vehicles right now, so this presentation will give us a brief reallocation of some resources that will help us get some use of some things over time. The first page is all police department vehicles, and this is every vehicle owned or assigned currently to the police department. The second page outlines vehicles to all other departments, including the fire department, parks and streets, codes department and admin. He stated that we are currently advertising for a Codes Inspector, and there is not a vehicle available for that position at this time at City Hall. He stated the second thing we do not have at City Hall is vehicle that could routinely be used by some staff for basic travel back and forth throughout the City. He stated that he is looking to reallocate some of the City's resources without expending any more dollars than necessary, and he has looked at the list of vehicles and most of them are assigned to the police department. The 2014 Ford Interceptor patrol vehicles were purchased by the General Fund, and are owned by the General Fund. Also, there is a 2008 Dodge Durango that is owned by the General Fund, and assigned to the police department, but it could be reassigned anywhere in the City. This vehicle has been reassigned to City Hall, so that there will be a vehicle here that can be used for general purposes. Looking further down the list, Collins stated that he looked at the reassignment of vehicles that could be repurposed. The first vehicle that could be repurposed is a 2010 Ford Escape that was purchased by the Drug Fund. It is six years old, and has 36904 miles, and it can be reassigned to City Hall with some additional work to be done, which he stated he would explain. The second vehicle that could be moved to City Hall is the Dodge Durango, and there is no work required to do this. The next section he called to the attention of BOC members was a list of all seized vehicles. These are as follows: 2012 Nissan Frontier; 2008 Chevrolet Impala; 1999 Ford Explorer; 1996 Ford Explorer; 2004 Ford Taurus (inoperable); 1997 Ford Escort (inoperable); Nissan Versa, which was a hazardous disposable, as it was a rolling meth lab that should be removed from the fleet for safety purposes, and cannot be repurposed. The next vehicles are a 2000 GMC Yukon (full size); 2002 Pontiac; 2 scrap vehicles from the '70's; 2005 Ford F450 command vehicle that is out of service; 2004 Interceptor, that will likely be sold, as it was involved in an accident, and we will likely be refunded that amount through insurance. He stated that he is presenting this information and would like the BOC to consider the purchase of the 2010 Ford Escape by the General Fund from the Drug Fund. This vehicle has been fully depreciated by the City, as there is a 5 year depreciation, and that vehicle has been depreciated to zero value to the City, but it does still have some market value. He also stated that this is a legal purchase, and there are no legal issues. He stated that a 2006 Ford Expedition, also purchased from the Drug Fund, has been temporarily assigned to the park. He stated that under provisions of purchase from the Drug Fund, you can resell vehicles purchased by the Drug Fund to the General Fund, if you establish a fair market value. He stated he will be proposing a price to sell those to the General Fund in order to get use of them without having to purchase new vehicles. He stated it did not make sense to him to purchase more vehicles if we already have serviceable vehicles in our fleet that can be repurposed, and still work within the parameters of the law and save money at the same time. He stated again that he is not asking for a decision tonight, but that these items can be considered at the next meeting. Next he stated that the vehicles listed as seizures would be taken out of service, bring them in as surplus, and sell them. He stated that under the law if a vehicle is seized for drug purposes, it can be used for drug enforcement or drug information purposes for a limit of up to 5 years. If you get the vehicle and it is not put into use, the requirement is you must sell it. If you have it for any purpose of use for up to 5 years, at the termination of 5 years, you must sell it regardless of the application. Given where we are, he is asking the BOC that we surplus the seized

vehicles through GovDeals or some other approved sale. All of the proceeds from those sales will be remitted to the Drug Fund. These proceeds would not go into the General Fund. He stated that anything that is Drug Fund purchased to be auctioned, or seized to be auctioned, would go to the Drug Fund for Drug Fund purposes as clearly as is within the law, as would be expected. Any item listed that is in the General Fund that is proposed to sell would be sold in the same manner, and those dollars would be remitted to the General Fund. Those dollars could be used for the purchase of any vehicles that we would need, as long as the money allows and we are not using tax dollars to do that. We are effectively reusing the same tax dollar if we can sell these items and get them out of inventory. He stated that when we come to the next meeting and we have a list of vehicles to surplus and sell, this is how he arrived at that list, and he asked that the BOC look over the list in the next couple of weeks before the next meeting. He asked that the members look at page three. He stated that he has listed their the 2010 Ford Escape that he mentioned earlier and that it was purchased on July 7, 2010 for a price of \$20,759 and was purchased by the Drug Fund. He stated that the audited depreciated value of this vehicle on a 5 year depreciation is zero. He stated that to err on the side of caution, he depreciated it out on a 10 year straight line depreciation, and that value is \$8,304. He stated the estimated market value (NADA) on that vehicle with the condition it is in is \$8,575. He suggested that in order to get the future use of that vehicle, and be within the law, he will propose that the General Fund purchase that vehicle from the Drug Fund for \$8,575, with those funds to be remitted from the General Fund to the Drug Fund so that the funds are properly accounted for, and we can get future use of the vehicle without a new vehicle purchase. The second vehicle on this list is a 2010 Ford Expedition, and it is fully depreciated at 5 years for our purposes, but to err on the side of caution, he stated that he depreciated that vehicle out to 10 years on a straight line depreciation, and that value was \$2,461. He stated that the last page shows the NADA value for that vehicle, which is \$4,575. He stated that the issue with that valuation is that NADA only reduces the value of the vehicles they appraise to the XLT model, and in this case this vehicle one level below that model that is police service, and it's not available for retail. He stated that he took the average of the 10 year depreciated value, which is clearly fair, combined with the estimated market value of one vehicle model greater, and that suggested value is \$3,568. He stated at the next meeting he would be requesting that the General Fund purchase both of these vehicles from the Drug Fund for a total of \$12,143, which gets us clearly within the parameters of the law, and we can repurpose that Expedition to the park, and it will be legally & fairly used within the park, rightfully owned by the General Fund, and the 2010 Escape would be assigned as a pool vehicle to City Hall so it could be used in lieu of city employees using their personal vehicles for City business, which clearly for a variety of reasons, is really not in the best interest of the City or the employee. That's a lot of work to repurpose two vehicles, but I believe in the interest of the taxpayer dollar and trying not to make any new purchases, I believe this is a good way to go. He stated that the list also highlights the need to make some changes to our take home vehicle policy, which he will also have for the BOC at the next meeting. He stated that on the first page it shows the General Fund vehicles, particularly the 2014 Ford Interceptors are listed and they have the mileages out beside them for the accumulated mileages to date and they range from 49,000 miles up to 59,000 miles, with the least mileage on one of those vehicles at 27,000 miles. He stated this indicates that we are putting some miles on these vehicles in a short period of time. His suggestion was to park these as part of what has been a take home vehicle policy. He stated that knows that historically this has been done in lieu of benefits for some employees, but we are looking at the ability to offset some of that cost to the employee that still is a savings to the City. He stated that when he brings this back to the BOC, he will also bring back that for the purchase of these vehicles, we can make some compensation to the employees for what has been a benefit, which clearly has been deserved, but in an effort to preserve the fleet, and treat the taxpayer and the employee fairly I believe we have hit a middle ground that we can show to give us the ability to do that and save dollars long term. He stated that this is really informational, and probably more information than hoped for something this simple, but he wanted to let the BOC know that the staff is working hard to maximize our resources, and this is a simple effort in that. He stated he would have that information to the BOC for a vote at the next meeting. Mayor Carroll thanked Collins.

- B. **City Attorney Comments** – Mr. Cantrell stated that he had nothing further, but wanted to thank the BOC for their attention to the comments regarding the various and sundry legal issues.

12. Communications from the Mayor and Commissioners

- A. Commissioner Bissell – NONE

- B. Commissioner Crutcher – NONE
 - C. Mayor Carroll – Stated that we were missing a couple of Commissioners tonight, and that they both had some family-related things going on, and she apologized for their absence. Have a great evening.
- 13. Adjournment** –. Commissioner Bissell made a motion for adjournment with Commissioner Crutcher seconding. Meeting was adjourned at 7:51 p.m.

Susan Fox
Deputy City Recorder