

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: J. Hewitt, H. Manning, J. Garski

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: None.

VILLAGE BOARD MEMEBERS PRESENT: S. Havn, G. Feest

Staff: M. Pierce, J. Klappauf, B. Kane, L. Martin, V. Matter, F. Torres, H. Peltz, T. Zarzecki, T. Peterson, R. Richardson

1. Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m. by H. Manning.

2. Public Comment

None.

3. Minutes

a. December 20, 2012

J. Hewitt moved and J. Garski seconded to approve the December 20, 2012 minutes. Motion carried (3-0).

b. January 16, 2013

J. Hewitt moved and J. Garski seconded to approve the December 20, 2012 minutes. Motion carried (3-0).

4. 2011 Audit Update

D. Maccoux, auditor, stated that the draft of the 2011 is slated to be completed on March 1, 2013. He stated that draft would be subject to review by the Village. He stated that the 2012 audit would be started once Rotroff and Jeanson were able to get in to complete the books for 2012. He stated that the quicker they can get done, the quicker the audit can be done. He added that everyone in the Village has been cooperative. D. Maccoux presented a PowerPoint overview of the items that were discovered by the audit firm during their fieldwork (presentation is attached). He spoke of the challenges with the current software and the implementation of the new software. He also spoke of various Village controls such as contract approval and budget amendments.

5. Village Board Budget Amendments – New Requests

a. Parks

B. Kane explained that this amendment was in follow up to the Board action of moving forward with implementing a contract for the mowing of the Parks. He explained that the Parks would be going from five seasonal employees to one or two. He explained that those seasonal workers would be doing garbage pick up, bathroom maintenance, and other miscenanelous tasks while Lakeshore would be doing the mowing. He stated that funds need to be moved from Parks Labor Regular Part Time to Contractural.

J. Garski moved and J. Hewitt seconded to approve the budget amendment for Parks 2013 budget. Motion passed (3-0).

b. TID #1

L. Martin explained that the TEA Grant project costs were higher than anticipated. He asked that the revenue line item for account # 26-48-4811-3020 be amended to \$155,000 and the expense line item for account #26-60-6000-5800 be amended to \$270,000 to accommodate the total TEA Grant project cost of \$305,000.

J. Hewitt moved and H. Manning seconded to approve the amendment for the revenue line item. Motion carried (3-0).

J. Hewitt moved and J. Garski seconded to approve the amendment for the expense line item. Motion carried (3-0).

c. General Legal (2012)

V. Matter explained that the Finance Department updated the General Legal budget amendment for 2012. The ending balance was \$113,000.

V. Rudychev explained that the FLL Committee needs to approve this amendment prior to the Board.

J. Garski moved to approve the General Legal budget amendment for 2012 and J. Hewitt seconded. Motion carried (3-0).

6. 2013 Court Contract

V. Rudychev explained that in the Committee's packets were the new court contracts for both the Court Clerk and Deputy Court Clerk. She stated that the contracts had been drafted by M. Phegley, Municipal Judge, and reviewed by C. Geary, Village Attorney. She stated that although the attorney found no issues with the contract language, he did have some angst about calling the employees "contract" employees. She added that the Court Clerk owns her own accounting business and the attorney had less issue with calling her a contract employee than the Deputy Court Clerk. She explained that neither employee had issue with being a contract employee when the Village's Attorney contacted them, but the Village Attorney saw potential liability for the Village down the road. She added that the Village's Attorney wished to know whether or not to perform a test to see if the two employees meet the letter of the law as being able to be classified as contract employees. She stated that if the attorney were to discover that they did not meet the letter of the law as being classified as contract employees that the Village would be responsible for providing benefits to the employees as outlined in the Village's Personnel Manual.

H. Manning asked the preference of the Interim Administrator in moving this forward.

T. Zarzecki stated he wished to do a bit more research on the topic.

J. Garski proposed that the contract be laid over.

J. Hewitt moved and H. Manning seconded to lay over the 2013 Court Contract. Motion carried (3-0).

7. Graef Signal Design Contract (Final Signal Design & Construction Inspection/Administration) Seda North America, Inc. – International Drive Signalization TEA Grant

L. Martin explained that this was the contract for the last phase of the signal design. He stated that the CDA and Village Board had approved the first part of the contract. He explained that the TEA Grant has been awarded to the Village and was on the next Board agenda for acceptance of the award. He stated that the money for the Graef contract was budgeted in TID #1 in an amount not to exceed \$25,000.

J. Garski moved and J. Hewitt seconded to approve the Graef Signal Design Contract in an amount not to exceed \$25,000. Motion carried (3-0).

8. 2013 Paving Program – 23rd Street Reconstruction: Recommendation to Award of Contract

B. Sasse explained that bids for the reconstruction of 23rd Street were received as part of the 2013 Paving Program. He stated that the Public Works Committee had reviewed the bids at their February meeting and had recommended that the contract be awarded to the lowest qualified bidder, Willkomm Excavating & Grading, Inc. He added that they bid at a price of \$193,522.95. He explained that this is within the budgeted amount for the 2013 Paving Program.

J. Garski moved and J. Hewitt seconded to recommend the Village Board award the 2013 Paving Program – 23rd Street Reconstruction contract to the lowest qualified bidder, Willkomm Excavating & Grading, Inc. at a bid price of \$193,522.95. Motion carried (3-0).

9. South Shore Fire Department Station #10 Sprinkler System Bid

It was requested to address agenda item #10 as agenda item #9.

M. Pierce explained that Station #10, the joint station with Caledonia, has had sprinkler issues for sometime. He stated that Chief Rouder of Caledonia was also present to help address any questions. He stated that R. Rouder has taken the lead on this project.

R. Rouder explained that M. Janiuk had looked over the bid documents and had suggested that they be reviewed by legal counsel. He stated that after the review, they would wish to proceed with publishing the bid documents.

M. Pierce explained that the bid documents were prepared by the consultant who does the plan reviews for the department.

R. Rouder stated that they were looking for permission to have an attorney review it and to send it out for bid after that review.

J. Garski moved and J. Hewitt seconded to approve the sending of the bid documents for Station #10 Sprinkler System Bid to the Attorney for review and then out for bid. Motion carried (3-0).

10. Financial Software Project

It was requested to address item #13 as item #10.

V. Rudychev explained that the consensus of the Software Selection Committee was to go with Springbrook as the vendor of choice. She stated that she did not agree with the final outcome of the Committee and felt that after her research BS&A was a much better vendor. She stated that the earliest the Springbrook software would be available to the Village was January 2014. She cautioned that conversion during year end would be difficult and suggested that that timeline could be and most likely would be pushed back. She added that she is here to present the opinion of the majority and welcomed any input from Committee members present.

T. Peterson stated that he felt the user interface on Springbrook was better and that was the reason for his choice. Some comments were made about possibly giving more time to review the two vendors. H. Manning stated that opportunities have been out there and were not used.

J. Hewitt asked if the auditors had any input on the two companies. V. Matter stated that they are familiar with Springbrook and have a client who uses the software, but are not familiar with BS&A

R. Richardson stated that from an IT standpoint, both companies use SQL database and the build out is approximately the same. He added that one vendor is more concerned about work stations, but that concern has been addressed by the IT staff.

J. Hewitt moved and J. Garski seconded to recommend Springbrook as the financial software vendor to the Village Board. Motion carried (3-0).

11. South Shore Fire Department Ambulance Purchase

J. Keiser explained that the Fire Department is looking for permission to start the ambulance bid process. He stated that the bid package would be for a new ambulance, but that they would also look into used models to speed up the process, and that they would look into doing a remount of their 2005 onto a van chassis.

J. Hewitt stated that he had advocated for a new ambulance two years ago. He added that the current equipment has a lot of problems. M. Pierce stated that the ambulances have had four break downs in 2013 so far. He stated that Med 9 which is a 2005 is currently in the shop. He added that the life expectancy of an ambulance is 10 years. He stated that most departments in the State do not have as old of equipment as South Shore.

J. Hewitt stated that it was time to buy a new ambulance, and then possibly look at a remount.

J. Garski stated that this department is run by two municipalities, yet one only pays 18%. He added that he did not buy the fact that a remount on our ambulance would not work. He added that the issues with the current ambulances are power train and if the ambulance was remounted, it would have a brand new power train. H. Manning agreed that the remount would fix the power train issue. He added that had the remount been done last year, we would already have new power trains. He asked that the department keep alternatives open.

J. Keiser stated they would entertain all options.

J. Hewitt asked how many units are in the shape that they can be remounted. J. Keiser answered the two 2005's. J. Hewitt asked how long it would take to get the bids back. J. Keiser stated that between sixty and seventy days from the time the bids go out to the time they come back before FLL Committee.

G. Feest requested that every ambulance be given a fair shake as to whether to replace it or remount it. He stated that the Fire Department needs to start with the 1998 and work through the whole fleet. G. Feest advocated for information for the Committee and the Board. J. Keiser stated that they would try to provide as much information as they could. The consensus was to have the bids go out and have the Fire Department bring the bids back to the Committee.

12. Interim Fire Chief Compensation

G. Feest explained that the Personnel Committee had drafted a package for the Interim Fire Chief compensation. He stated that the most honest way is to pay the difference between the salary Chief Bouma would have made and M. Pierce's current salary retroactive to the day that M. Pierce took the job.

H. Manning asked if the numbers were correct. H. Peltz stated that the numbers were correct, just a typo in the dates.

H. Manning moved and J. Hewitt seconded to recommend the Interim Fire Chief Compensation package. Motion carried (3-0).

13. Financial Updates

No Financial Updates were provided for the meeting and there was a consensus to lay this item over until the next meeting.

14. Review Various Licenses

J. Hewitt moved and J. Garski seconded to approve the new operators licenses. Motion carried (3-0).

J. Hewitt moved and J. Garski seconded to approve the massage license. Motion carried (3-0).

15. Adjourn

J. Hewitt moved and H. Manning seconded. Motion carried (3-0). Meeting was adjourned at 12:07 PM.