



**ZIONSVILLE TOWN COUNCIL
MEETING MINUTES
FOR
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 2023
AT 7:30 A.M. EST
ONSITE MEETING**

This meeting was conducted onsite and via Zoom.

The following Councilors participated in person:

Council Members Present: Jason Plunkett, President; Brad Burk, Vice-President; Alex Choi, Josh Garrett, Bryan Traylor, and Craig Melton

The following Council members participated electronically:

Josh Garrett

Absent: Joe Culp

Also Present: Adam Steuerwald, Town Council Attorney; Andy Pickell, Deputy Mayor; Tim Berry, Crowe; Lance Lantz, Director of Department of Public Works; Cindy Poore, Director of Finance & Records; Roger Kilmer, Senior Planner, Community & Economic Development; Amy Lacy, Municipal Relations Coordinator; and other Town Department Staff

OPENING

A. Call meeting to order

B. Pledge of Allegiance

C. Attendance

Plunkett Good morning. I will now call to order the Monday, September 18, 2023 Regular Town Council meeting. If you would please, stand and join me in the Pledge of Allegiance.

All Pledge of Allegiance.

Plunkett All right, up first on the agenda – actually, Amy, do we need to do a roll call since we have members online?

Lacy Yes, we do.

Plunkett Perfect.

Lacy Okay.

Plunkett If you would please, go ahead and do that.

Lacy Okay. President Plunkett?

Plunkett Here.

Lacy Vice President Burk?

Burk Here.

Lacy Councilor Choi?
[No response]

Is not present.

Councilor Culp?
[No response]

Okay, not present.

Councilor Garrett?

Garrett I'm here.

Lacy And Councilor Garrett is present via Zoom. Councilor Melton?

Melton Here.

Lacy Councilor Traylor?

Traylor Here.

Lacy Thank you.

Plunkett Thank you. All right, so because we have an online participant, our rules require individual votes so just a head's up for Council, we'll be going through roll call votes on everything.

APPROVAL OF THE MEMORANDUM OF THE AUGUST 21, 2023 BUDGET WORKSHOP

Plunkett Up first is the approval of the Memorandum of the August 21, 2023 Budget Workshop. A copy has been posted. Are there any questions from Councilors? I will make a motion to approve the Memorandum.

Burk Second.

Plunkett First by President Plunkett, second by Vice President Burk.

Lacy President Plunkett?

Plunkett Yes.

Lacy Vice President Burk?

Burk Yes.

Lacy Councilor Choi is not present.
Councilor Culp, not present.
Councilor Garrett?

Garrett Yes.

Lacy Councilor Melton?

Melton Yes.

Lacy Councilor Traylor?

Traylor Yes.

Lacy Thank you.

Plunkett Motion passes 5 in favor, 0 opposed.
At this point I would, Amy, do I just read Alex in since he's here now?

Lacy Yes.

Plunkett Note for record of the meeting that Alex is present?

Lacy Yes, for record of the meeting, Councilor Choi has arrived at the meeting.

APPROVAL OF THE MEMORANDUM OF THE SEPTEMBER 5, 2023 REGULAR MEETING

Plunkett All right. Up next is the Approval of the September 5, 2023 Regular Meeting. A copy has also been posted for this Memorandum as well. Are there any questions from Council? I'll make a motion to approve that as well.

Traylor Second.

Plunkett Second by Vice or by Councilor Traylor. Amy, if you would please?

Lacy Yes. President Plunkett?

Plunkett Yes.

Lacy Vice President Burk?

Burk Yes.

Lacy Councilor Choi?

Choi Yes.

Lacy Thank you.

Councilor Culp is not present.

Councilor Garrett?

Garrett Yes.

Lacy Councilor Melton?

Melton Yes.

Lacy Councilor Traylor?

Traylor Yes.

Lacy Thank you.

Plunkett Motion passes 6 in favor, 0 opposed.

APPROVAL OF THE SEPTEMBER 18, 2023 CLAIMS

Plunkett Up next is the Approval of the September 18, 2023 Claims. Are there any questions from Councilors? We have Cindy here if we have anything. I'll make a motion to approve claims.

Burk Second.

Plunkett Second by Vice President Burk.

Lacy President Plunkett?

Plunkett Yes.

Lacy Vice President Burk?

Burk Yes.

Lacy Councilor Choi?

Choi Yes.

Lacy Councilor Culp is not present.

Councilor Garrett?

Garrett Yes.

Lacy Councilor Melton?

Melton Yes.

Lacy Councilor Traylor?

Traylor Yes.

Lacy Thank you.

Plunkett Motion passes 6 in favor, 0 opposed.

REQUEST TO SPEAK

Plunkett Up next is a Request to Speak on Agenda Items. Amy, do we have any requests to speak?

Lacy No, we do not.

MAYOR/ADMINISTRATION UPDATE

Plunkett Up next would be Mayor/Administration Update and we did not receive an update there either.

TOWN COUNCIL UPDATE

Plunkett So moving on to Council Update. Are there any updates from Councilors?

OLD BUSINESS

**Consideration of the 2024 Budget for the Town of Zionsville Ordinance 2023-20
(Public Hearing)**

Plunkett All right, moving on to the first item of Old Business. This is a Consideration of the 2024 Budget for the Town of Zionsville. This is Ordinance 2023-20. This is a first reading and we have Deputy Mayor Pickell, Tim Berry from Crowe and then Councilor Garrett will also follow up with some of that when they're done.

Pickell Good morning.

Plunkett Good morning.

Pickell Good morning. Deputy Mayor Pickell. The 2024 budget process was started by providing the Council with a budget that contained all wants, needs. We went to the 08/21 budget workshop with everything on the budget for Council to look at and review as well as the Administration. Two rounds of cuts beyond that and this budget is what's in front of you.

A quick reflection – Personnel Needs: Fire – currently we have three Firefighters, three Firefighter #2s, one Administrative Training Captain in that budget. Police – we have two Patrolmen. DPW – we have one Inspector and one Street Technician. In Parks we have two Maintenance Technicians. In Human Resources we have one Administrator. In Finance we have an Account Asset Administrator. In Planning we have one Planner. In IT we have zero.

To go back, this salary also includes a 7% salary increase. It includes a 2% increase in the 401(a) match increasing from 3 to 5%. The first version of the budget reflected a \$12.3 million dollar deficit. We've been able to decrease the deficit by a half down to \$5.9 million dollars. The Town has healthy fund balances due to savings for capital projects. The focus has been to make sure that the deficit is not made up of recurring costs but one-time expenses and we've tried our best to try and meet that. Revenue totals include the estimated amount for receiving the excess levy appeal for the rural to urban and general levy appeal.

Some quick notes – there is. I'll save that point. Do you have any questions for me?

- Garrett Deputy Mayor Pickell, I appreciate all the hard work that everyone has put into this and we got that Friday night so we've been able to dive in on the weekend and I'll go through some points here in a bit. One question I have though, the request for an additional Finance resource. I was unable to see where that's placed because as I look at the 2024 budget request for the Finance Department, personal services is only going up about \$20,000 which I assume was in relation to the proposed 7% pay increase but I did not see that additional salary recognized somewhere. Is it somewhere else that I'm missing?
- Pickell Actually, and I'm going to invite Director of Finance, Jo Kiel, up to walk this with me but it's my understanding the employee was a part-time employee this year –
- Garrett That, that's HR. I'm talking about Finance.
- Pickell I'm sorry. Finance, thank you.
- Garrett No problem.
- Poore Cindy Poore, Director of Finance and Records. The reason for that, Josh, I dove into that after the workshop. We actually had a position in for the '23 and, Tim, correct me if I'm wrong – the '23 budget we were considering a procurement person and that didn't happen and so there was just a little bit of change since that was in the '23 budget for next year since that position didn't get filled. That's the reason why there's not much of a difference between the budgets from this year and next year.
- Garrett Okay. Thanks Cindy. That explains that.
- Poore You're welcome.
- Pickell Further questions?
- Traylor I'm just curious because I think at the last meeting, if I recall correctly, we brought the salary increase down, back down to 4% and now we're back up to 7. I'm just curious the thought process that –
- Pickell I can easily explain that. The revised budget from the 21st to the 5th to our meeting on the 5th came in with a 4% increase and a dropped 2% 401(a). I'll be honest – I missed that until the budget was presented. I even had a conversation with Tim Berry about this and we talked about the 4% but it did not register with me. So, I apologize. That's why the 7% is back because that was our intention the entire time. It through a busy, robust budget season, I did miss that. So I apologize.
- Burk It was and thanks for putting that back in. It was a pretty big chunk of, on the revenue though or the expense. Was that primarily balanced by just cutting back on new positions to balance to get that 3% back in? Was that your strategy to kind of?

Pickell Well, I mean, honestly, the first budget that we presented is what we need. It's honestly what we need as a Town. It's not reasonable to expect that we're going to get those things but that's actually what we need. This is what our department heads have requested. I trust their professional opinions. Our finance counsel has been excellent at trying to keep us with a realistic view of what we're trying to do. The employee cuts were a difficult choice and, in fact, I think it became a point where once everybody saw the need to draw back, every single department head stepped in to find that measure that we could get to to include the 7% raise and the 2% increase to keep us within that range of \$5.5 to 6 million dollars as we had talked earlier.

Garrett Deputy Mayor Pickell, I just want to talk semantics real quick because you mentioned employee cuts and I just want to make sure everyone watching realizes, you are talking about cutting future employees. There is no mention in any budget of cutting current employees.

Pickell No.

Garrett I know you know that. I just want to make sure everyone is, is on –

Pickell Yes sir. I appreciate that. Thank you Councilor.

Burk Thank you.

Plunkett I think the biggest question I have, Deputy Mayor Pickell, is do you believe this is a sustainable budget? Do you believe – is this – last time, in the last meeting we had a presentation, we were \$8 million and change over and we said is this a budget you would recommend we pass and you and Tim Berry both said no and that it wasn't sustainable. Do you guys anticipate that this is a sustainable budget moving forward?

Pickell I think there's probably, you know, if it came down to it, to be honest, the Police, I would've preferred to have four Police Officers hired because the plan that was brought to us to enact that actually seemed more than reasonable and actually helpful to not only staffing problems that we have but community policing on a normal basis with officers that are in and out in regular hours, it actually shortens the variance that the officers have so we have coverage every single day. That's something that I'm disappointed that we can't put in there but, the Police made no hesitation to say we can step back. They were in their 5-year plan and holding with two officers it would've been nice to advance that for a year but we understand that the limitations are there and that's what we're stuck with.

Also, in DPW, the Director removed almost every piece of new equipment that he needs. That's going to be helpful for him to continue to serve not only the new sections of Town but to maintain the level of service that we have all grown accustomed to receive. In fact, some of the machinery that he has would've actually lowered the number of bodies that have to be involved in leaf collecting and those things. That's a savings that's somewhat calculated in but it's not actually calculated in.

So, as far as sustainable now, I believe so. I think we could probably do some, some maneuvering if that's what you're looking for. If you're feeling like you need to offer some advice in different areas, we're absolutely willing to talk to you about that and work with the Council.

Melton With regards to the cut to salaries or not to salaries, excuse me – to the increase – the 7 down to the 4. We just aren't going to do it now because you didn't include that? I guess I misunderstood.

Traylor No, it was added back in.

Melton So you added it back up to the 7% again?

Traylor Correct.

Melton Okay. So, I just wanted to be clear on that because that was a major request that we put in to try and make the budget as close to balanced as possible. You know, after being on the Council the last few years, I feel like the Finance Department, obviously, really needs help and the Planning Department, we're going to be hit with all these things coming at us, all these developments, we've got the Bradley, we've got all these controversial things coming. We need to help those departments out for sure. We have Police and Fire – I think we, personally, have a great Police and Fire Department that is not fully staffed to where we want to be to meet other municipalities and to meet that local to match kind of the other municipalities or even across the country but I think that as we look at this budget, it's really important to me that we work within our budget but we also look to the departments that are going to be able to finance and plan the future for Zionsville and we've got Planning and Finance right here. Those two are like our most important, to me, because we've had such great public safety over the last few years, at least what I've witnessed here on the Council.

So, with respect to the salaries, I'm just kind of frustrated that we didn't get that included into this budget as we move forward but I know you're talking about equipment and other employees with DPW – those things, those pieces of equipment can be brought to us later throughout the year for requests, right? Is that something they can do outside of – I mean, if we need a piece of equipment, you're not saying that we can't give them a piece of equipment at all. We're just asking them to come back throughout the year. Is that –

Pickell Not, not at all. My point was to direct that this equipment isn't like really a want, you know, it's something that we need. It's something that we need to maintain the high level that our residents expect in this community.

Melton I just don't want it to come across that we can't get it –

Pickell No sir.

Melton Our goal is to get to the balanced budget –

Pickell Absolutely.

Melton As close as we can and then coming back throughout the year for things that we really need. The only thing that we're going to miss out on, I believe, is the savings on the sale if we were to order that equipment now or having that ordered now. So I just want to make sure that it's clear that if we need equipment, we're going to do what we need to get that equipment to DPW and I stand behind that just like we did in the past when we asked for everybody to trim their budgets and come to us and let us know if you have and need throughout the year as well and I think that's more important because it comes to the forefront as like hey, we're buying this new vac truck or whatever that item is then the public knows that it's coming and we see it, we hear you and we're going to serve you to that highest level of service that we can.

Traylor Just to clear up a little bit of maybe confusion here – I think the goal of the Administration is presenting a holistic budget for next year, not something like in the past we have left things out and but, quite frankly, the items I'd be the first one to say I'm kind of pleasantly surprised, but this has been, so far, the smoothest budget process we've been through so far but I think with that the goal is to present a holistic budget not something we have to come back and ask for additional appropriations for later because, quite frankly, if that's the plan, we're –

Melton Over budget.

Traylor We're over budget. We're way over, significantly more over budget than what we see here.

Pickell And to be clear – I trust Director Lantz implicitly that if he pulled that out of his budget, he was going to survive. So, I'm just making a point that we have these things in the budget not because they are just superfluous wants, they are needs that we have to have in this community.

Melton I appreciate it. Thank you.

Pickell Yes.

Choi There are the things that, for example, that Chief VanGorder asked for as far as putting together four Firefighters per apparatus and in looking at the communities around us – Carmel, Fishers, Lebanon, Noblesville, Westfield, Whitestown – what we've discovered is, are things like it varies from community to community whether it's three per apparatus or four per apparatus and sometimes they have a mixture of both. I'd like to, I'd like for those instances when we want to meet community standards or the standards set by the State Firefighters Associations, those kind of things, whether it deals with safety on the Fire side or on the Police side, we want to eventually reach. I think, what we tried to do this year may have been too aggressive and if we can get to four Firefighters per apparatus over a period of time instead of trying to get there all at once that may be something that we plan for as we go down the road. Same on the Police Department, if we can get to a certain (inaudible) that we step it instead of trying to do everything all in one year. That was a challenge for us on the Firefighter side the time (inaudible). Firefighters to get to that four. There are a number of communities, including us, that would like to meet the standards set forth. As we look at this, we shouldn't

just look at what we're impacting in 2024 but what we have as a goal for three years, four years, five years down the road to try to get to what the hierarchy of what Chief VanGorder wanted in one year may have been difficult but I don't think it's out of reach say several years from now and then we also would, obviously, as we've all talked about in the past, we've got the three Firefighters that are coming off the grant and in a couple years –

Garrett Six.

Choi That we will have to figure out how to (inaudible)

Pickell And that's six.

Choi Oh, sorry – six.

Pickell Right, right . And that, and that, that is certainly weighing on our minds as well because that will be, unless we prepare for it's going to be a shock to the system that, well, we have to prepare for that. So, and I, and I feel like the Fire Department has done a great job of setting themselves up, planning for the future. They are now in the, in serious mode of, of planning a future of the Fire Department and what that leadership looks like and growing the department within. So, while I understand completely that three Firefighters and a new Captain is a big lift, the Chief has also, we have in conversations, he's also understanding of where we are at on this budget. He is as realistic as anybody else in our departments to understanding what we have to work with so.

Garrett President Plunkett, if you would and the Councilors allow me – I've really dug into this budget. I would like to go through some, some thoughts I have via a presentation that may help guide some of this conversation. Would that be acceptable?

Plunkett Yes, sounds good. Joe, do you have whatever Alex needs or Josh?

Garrett I got it.

Plunkett Good.

Garrett Yes, I got it but you guys should be seeing 2024 Budget Discussion up there. Just a little background – President Plunkett tasked Councilor Choi and I for diving into the budget. I agree a lot with what Deputy Mayor Pickell has said in terms of, I think what has been presented to us are needs and wants. I know our department heads, I don't think they're asking for frivolous things but at the same token, we as every other community, as every other household has to live within our means. If you sort of think through these budget iterations and I just want to put this up so everyone is seeing here – Deputy Mayor talked about the initial budget, the \$12 million dollar deficit. You will see in the second round we got there were cuts. There were cuts of about oh, you know, \$1.2 million dollars. There was also additional revenue found which really helped bring down that deficit. Some additional revenues sources that were identified and we're now on this third round here. There was further revenue found. From what I could tell, this was some additional CCI income and \$90,000 was more in the Parks and you

can see that, that expenses were cut of further \$100 and – I’m sorry – \$1.5 million dollars.

We are still at a \$6 million dollar deficit. I put a quote up here from Deputy Mayor Pickell mentioning that we have unappropriated balances of, of almost \$70 million dollars. That’s a bit of a – and I, he was not doing this intentionally but that’s a bit of a statement that, that doesn’t sort of ring true because if you look at if we passed this current balance – or sorry, this current budget, our ending balance would be around \$23.9 million dollars. So if we were starting with \$68 million and we had \$6 million dollar deficit, you’d think we’d be ending with \$62 million dollars but a lot of those dollars are already identified and will be used and so, in my opinion, this is not a sustainable budget. I wanted to show just some, and these are numbers from Crowe, of how much our budgets have grown here in the last few years. So you can see that our revenue is up roughly 14%. Per this budget, our expenses are up relative to 2022 of almost 49%. Capital outlays are up over 250%. You can see individual departments there that are up very large percentages. We are certainly a growing Town. There, there’s additional needs but revenues are not keeping up with this and so I just wanted to point this out that, that even though these are needs, these expenses are growing very, very quickly and many of these are what I would consider sustained expenses which contribute to a consistent budget deficit. This also assumes and Deputy Mayor Pickell did mention this that, that we are going to win the property tax appeal of roughly \$850,000. I think that is a bit of a dangerous assumption based on feedback that I have gotten, not about our specific appeal but just appeals in general and if we don’t, that further puts this budget into deficit.

So, just for comparison and, again, I, another budget through Westfield just came through last week. I just sort of wanted to show Westfield’s proposing a \$35 million dollar budget, we’re proposing here a \$50 million dollar budget. You can see the spend per resident is 128% higher than what Westfield is proposing and our population number here includes both the Urban and Rural Service Districts and, as we know, some of our departments, mainly Police and Roads, don’t even service those Rural Service Districts where Westfield doesn’t have that distinction. So, we are a high touch community. It’s nothing wrong with high services but we have to have the revenue to support that and I don’t think we do.

Deputy Mayor Pickell went over the Administration highlights that were given to us. This is the employee raise that was 7% from the 4% we saw last time and he explained that. The 2% increase in the 401(b) match the employees are being requested. There is some money that is being cut from some areas and just being moved to other areas and there’s nothing wrong with that but it’s just something that, that I noticed as we were looking through that.

What I have had to do – I don’t have the Crowe budgeting system. All I had were PDFs that sent to us on a Friday night. So I basically had to recreate the budget on my own Excel spreadsheets which that was a fun exercise so this has been and bit of and long project over the weekend. This is what I am proposing. This is what I think the Council should propose going forward. I think that we should cut this budget further, a full cut by about \$3 million dollars. I’m going to go through some of those cuts as to where I’m recommending there. Most of those cuts are

going to be around recurring expenses, not one-time expenses. We also have what's known as ARPA. This is federal dollars that were given to us. I am proposing that we move some of the budget items that are currently being proposed that are one-time expenses and move those into an ARPA spending plan and those, those would be in addition to other spending in ARPA that I'm going to go through here that are goals of, of all different constituents. They are stated goals of the Administration, they are goals of the departments and they are goals of the Council so that we can still maintain some of those high services. This proposed budget would actually create a surplus of around \$175,000. I suspect actually it will be a little bit more as we plug in some of the changes. So, for example, going back from, changing around employee salaries, I didn't know exactly what salaries were so if I've cut a position, I've estimated what that cut may be. I think I've tried to be conservative there but I've tried to create a surplus in anticipation of not gaining the full property tax appeal of that roughly \$850,000 and not forcing us as a group of Administration and Council to come back and potentially cut the budget further.

I want to go through this in one fell swoop and, for me, this is a sustainable budget not only for 2024 but going forward. So, how, how are we achieving that? I think we should reduce hiring. I started this at a hiring freeze quite frankly and brought myself back up through it, to these positions I'm recommending. I agree that ZPD needs to patrol folks. I have no new additional personnel for Fire. They had quite an uplift last year and as mentioned here earlier, there is that grant that is going to expire and we're going to have to make sure that we're able to fund that. DPW, I agreed with the two recommended folks, especially because those folks, to my understanding, are effectively expense neutral because they generate revenue and if we cut them we will cut the revenue and it's effectively a wash – just expenses are lower, revenue is lower. One individual, one Parks person, especially because that person is going to be reimbursed by the CDC at 75% of the total cost. The Finance person who Cindy explained was already built into the budget and the HR person who was explained, we actually approved that a few meetings ago and so that was really just someone that was moving from part time to full time.

While I appreciate the Administration's enthusiasm for the employees, I think that's something that we share, I do not see a way that we can give a 7% raise as well as a 2% increase in retirement. It is just not fiscally responsible to do that and I hate to say that. A 4% raise is still almost a million-dollar cost to do so but the extra 3% is another \$728,000 that I just don't see that we can afford and I'll talk a little bit later about how that might work but I also very much agree with something Councilor Traylor has said over and over again is implementing a merit-based raise. It's just odd to me that we just give everyone the same raise when you're certainly, in any organization, are going to have some laggard, some superstars, why aren't we awarding those more and having those others catch up? I'm not saying that's something we'd have to tie to the budget but I just think it's something that really makes a lot of sense to me as I've thought through raises. I did fight though to match and agree with the Administration's request to increase the retirement contribution. I think that's something that even though that's going to cost us \$419,000 a year additional, is important to setting our employees up when they retire 10, 20 years, maybe two years from now, who knows? But I do think that's something that if we can get employees money into their retirement

pre-tax, I think that is money well spent and is still representative between a 4% increase, the 2% retirement match and longevity pay – that is still an overall roughly 7% increase in total compensation for employees which is pretty healthy I think.

I think we should implement a travel freeze for 2024. There's a lot of travel spend in there, travel and training, and I'm going to talk a little bit about how departments may still be able to achieve some of this stuff. Expenses are hard to go through at individual line items and understand what is being asked, especially if I'm not in those budget workshops the Administration was having. It's not a complaint, it's just a fact. So what I have done is that if a department has asked for an increase in a line item of their budget, I have capped that at 4%. So if they've asked for no increase, I've granted that. If they ask for a 10% increase, I've given them a 4% increase but nothing more than that because I just, it's just not feasible to go through line item by line item. I have, though, put exceptions. You can see here things that are, I would say, outside of the control of, of the Administration or department. Things like insurance, utilities, fuel, even though there are actually savings. Police actually has their fuel budget going down but I have allowed those just to make sure we aren't unnecessarily harming departments or even employees when it's something that just really can't be helped.

I really eliminated any contingency dollars that I've seen in there. Things, if there's cost overruns, I want departments to live within their means and I've also further reduced capital projects, although that's a bit of a, it's not like it's necessarily a reduction in some cases and in some cases it has actually moved over to ARPA.

A few other recommendations I just sort of thought through – again, I want to make sure we are prepared if that property tax appeal does not happen, that we are not in a further bind. I want to make sure that our revenues in 2024 can start catching up to these recurring expenses so the following year there's momentum to perhaps start chipping away at some of those needs that Deputy Mayor Pickell mentioned. I've, we've already talked about the grant expiration coming and being prepared for that and in the past we have had supplemental distributions on LIT, on public safety LIT. I would not plan on that but that may happen and that may be something if that does happen we're able to add back in some of these cuts, perhaps add in a few employees mid-year if we see those distributions come in so that, again, we're adding recurring revenue for, for recurring positions.

Some other ideas I've thought through, again, we don't have to implement these right away necessarily but potentially moving to a single legal representative for the Town Council and the Administration. Looking at our insurance policy and seeing if we can perhaps somewhat self-insure to reduce that, you know, potentially further reducing hiring if we wanted to shift some monies around for other priorities and I even think I would support going back into the red from a budget standpoint if we added about \$500,000 from both the LRS and MVH Funds. Those are funds that can only be used for road repair. That cash just sitting in a, in a balance sheet really doesn't help us any and so adding that back in truly as a one-time cost. Next year if we're unable to afford it we would just do a little bit less road maintenance. So, I think that is something that's feasible.

I talked about ARPA. We did spend a little bit of money in ARPA. If you remember, a couple years ago we implemented a one-time bonus to employees in partnership with the Administration. So we've got about \$5.6 million dollars here and my understanding is that these funds are now a lot more flexible in how we can use them versus when they were first proposed, however, we have to at least have a contract signed for the funds by the end of 2024. So, again, my recommendation is let's just go ahead and get these funds spent in 2024 even though they don't necessarily have to be spent until 2026 and I'll talk through here in a minute how that works.

So, if I sort of look at what I'm cutting by department, there's three columns you can see here. The first column are cuts that I'm making in terms of dollar amounts and I have a spreadsheet that we don't necessarily have to go through right now, but with all the details of this. So, for example, the Communications budget cut, most of that is reducing the salary increase from 7% back down to 4%. In addition though, you can see I'm adding back in on the ARPA budget. So if you look at DPW streets, for example, well, I've cut \$1.13 million dollars from their budget but I am giving grants through the ARPA budget of \$1.525 million dollars including some of the equipment that we had talked about earlier that Deputy Mayor Pickell was disappointed that perhaps didn't make this budget. So, I'm trying to find ways to make the cuts as minimally impactful as possible. Most of the cuts you're seeing on the left are going to be recurring, whether it's employees I'm recommending that we don't hire or whether it is the raises that I recommend going back down from 7% to 4%. And then on the far right you see what I have called as ARPA flexible spend. What I've done is taken about \$250,000 of ARPA spending and broken it up by department and allowing them to look at the details of the cuts that I've put and add back in via ARPA some of those expenses. So, for example, in Fire I've made some cuts but I'm giving them \$87,500 that if they wanted to use that for something that I've cut, they're able to do that. I mentioned earlier having and travel and training freeze. If that's an important part to a department, they can use those ARPA flexible spending and be able to put that travel and training back in or really use it for anything else that, that I have, may have cut. So you can see I really cut just about every single department here but I've tried to add that money, those monies back in, in various ways.

So, thinking about highlights where I think we should be spending the ARPA money. I also should note that the ARPA spending plan is not part of this budget. So, what we'll do is we will pass a budget, then if the Council and Administration wants to move forward with an ARPA spending plan that is actually a different process that we have to go through. What I'm recommending is we give \$200,000 to Z'Works. That is an organization we have supported every year to the tune of \$60,000. However, in giving them this money, my anticipation is they don't come back for more. So, this is their grant, if you will, to see if this is a viable organization. I think it is, but assuming it is, they could be self-sustaining after this grant and it effectively removes a in perpetuity grant that, that the Town perhaps may choose to make to this organization. Same thing for the Chamber of Commerce – \$200,000 but I've given them an extra \$10,000. They have been vocal about their concern about the lack of a downtown bathroom. I would like them through a grant here of \$10,000 to figure out how

should we fix that? And I'm not asking them to fund it, I'm just asking them to come back with ideas. Whether it is temporary bathrooms that they may have, whether it is part of a private partner, private-public partnership that may happen whether it is allowing businesses to be paid to use their bathrooms for the public, whatever that may be, I'd like them to go through and figure that out and come back to this, to the Town with that recommendation. \$100,000 for the summer concert series, same with Z'Works, same with Chamber of Commerce. We've given them \$25,000 a year. This is enough for the next four years and allow them to bring back their sponsorships that they've lost over the last four years since COVID and, again, be sustainable.

I've got a lot of improvements for Parks which I think both Council and Administration will support. So we, I know that Jarod had cut the Elm Street Green/Lions Park connector. I'm proposing putting that back in. We took down the land so I think we should certainly activate it for the public, \$60,000 for the Lincoln Park refresh, \$250,000 for a Turkey Foot bridge improvement that was something that was feedback from Councilor Burk and then \$415,000 for trail studies and engineering. Basically, lots of different trails have been requested along Oak Street. I know President Plunkett has some requests there. Michigan Road, I've heard a lot about that. I know Councilor Burk has heard a lot about that. Royal Run has some requests. I know that Mr. Lantz has spent a lot of time in putting together how that engineering would cost and how to do that. It doesn't necessarily pay for the trails themselves but it gets us effectively to shovel ready whether there's additional grants or future budgets that may want to put these in place. It really gets us pretty far down the road.

I've also, and so these are things, for example, that may have come out of the budget as requested. So I've got \$150,000 for a transportation plan. That was in the budget, now it's out of the budget so the budget is now \$150,000 less of a deficit but we're still getting that. \$150,000 for a Comprehensive Plan, \$65,000 for street sweeping and I've put in over \$600,000 in maintenance and repairs. So, I've taken the maintenance and repairs out of the budgets, put them into ARPA but I don't, I didn't want to cut maintenance and repairs because it's the spend a dollar for maintenance today versus spend \$2 if you defer it tomorrow. So, that's spread around many different organizations – Police, Fire, DPW, who need maintenance. That could be building maintenance, equipment maintenance, vehicle maintenance and there's some other one-time spending in there as well.

So, if this is something that seems appealing, my recommendation is that we take these, this spreadsheet I have that I know is not perfect and clean it up within the Crowe system with this revised payroll with the proposed cuts, the shifting to ARPA, certainly get Administration feedback, department feedback. What I also want to say is I'm not saying that this budget should be exactly how I dictate it. I think there may be changes that may want to be made within departments – either the Administration or a department itself. I'm certainly fine with a like-for-like trade. So, for example, if there is a capital project that I have identified but there is a different capital project that would want to be prioritized and they're the same dollar amount, I have no problem shifting those around. What I will not accept or I don't think the Council should accept is saying well, I don't want this capital project but I want to hire two people. You're trading a one-time, one-time cost for a recurring cost. That's not the case but certainly you can trade around

recurring costs too. You know, if we want to find money for two Firefighters, I'm willing to look but we've got to take out the same dollar amounts in recurring costs in order to support that.

So, once that's finalized I think we'd have an updated final version that I think is balanced, is sustainable and I think we would approve that then at the, at the next meeting so we'd have a busy next couple of weeks and then we would have to go through the process of approving that ARPA spending plan because if we don't, we've cut a lot from this budget and if we don't backfill with the ARPA those things are not happening. The equipment, for example, that Mr. Lantz may want that I put in the ARPA, if we don't pass the ARPA he will not get that equipment unless he comes back for an additional appropriation and we're back to where we started which is a deficit budget. So, that, that is where my head is at right now from, from the budget and I would certainly welcome feedback from my other Councilors because it is our budget not my budget.

Burk Josh, I just want to thank you for all the hard work you've put in over the weekend. This was very, very, very informative. I know we've had some conversation but it's very enlightening to see it all put together so I appreciate that. I have one question that I think is, just to make sure you have enough money in there – is that, that Comp Plan had he pulled it out to \$150,000, I just want to make sure that's enough to get it done because that's a critical component and I know it's future Mayor Stehr's number one priority is to get the, to get a Comp Plan in place to help guide his Administration over the next four years.

Garrett You know that – it's a good question, Brad. That number came to me from the original budget workshop presentation we had. I believe Mr. Dale presented that and so my understanding is that is the dollar amount required for that.

Burk It seems a little small but I'll trust, trust the pros but I would like to have a triple check that one just to make sure there's enough money. \$150,000 just doesn't sound like enough to do a full Comp Plan but let's make sure.

Choi Thanks Josh. Thank you very much for this. One of the things that, and this is outside of the discussion around the budget, but, again, as to future planning. We have the supplemental distributions that occur in roughly about April of each year that amounts to anywhere from – I'm going to look towards Mr. Berry, anywhere from like a little less than a million dollars to close to \$2 million dollars every year that we don't have a plan around how that gets distributed to the different departments, how that gets built into a budget. Do we want it as a philosophical standpoint this is for future Council to determine whether it goes into the single spend ask or if it gets somehow baked into recurring budgets. Those are, that's one of the questions that I think we need to think through as we look at the budget and otherwise it does continue to build up the reserve funds for each and that's kind of what the intent of it has been over the years is to, it feeds into the reserve, reserve, fund reserves so that it can be spent on capital projects. But just to kind of think through, you know, as you all stay on for future Councils what, what is that money earmarked for and the problem with it is it's so highly variable from year to year that I don't know that you can just say hey, let's fund Firefighter X with this. I don't think that's possible but to have a spending

philosophy around what that supplemental distribution is is probably going to be helpful for you all.

Plunkett I would echo a lot of these sentiments. Councilor Garrett, I appreciate your work on this. Councilor Choi, obviously, you've been working on this too. I mean I think this is, here we are, right? This is where over the next couple of weeks the rubber meets the road. I mean we've got and balanced budget that is sustainable, proposed or, or at least considered here and, obviously, there might be some other areas that Council wants to work through over the next couple of weeks to see what, to see what we can do, if we can do anything, for different departments that may have been cut but, I mean, we've got a, you know, \$7, \$6, \$6.5 million dollar difference here, right? So, I think now we've just got a couple of weeks to pare this down and make sure we get an appropriate budget, a sustainable budget. I think a lot of these things, like Councilor Choi mentioned, as it relates to some of these supplemental distributions, I think it's important for the, for the incoming Administration to have a plan with that as well. Some of the stuff that we approve in the budget I think is certainly specific to operations and making sure that we can sustain the core functions of the Town. Some of this stuff, I think can be considered for future Administrations and Councils as well so. Are there any questions from Councilors for Deputy Mayor Pickell or for we have Tim Berry from Crowe here as well, Cindy Poore is here, Councilor Garrett is still online.

Traylor Not actually. I really don't have a question. Councilor Garrett hit on a lot of what I was going to speak on. I had six bullet points here but what I do want to make clear is my support for the recommendations that Councilor Garrett put forward that way. I think it'd be good for the Administration to know that whether we support what was presented or not because if we're unified in that then it gives a little bit more of a direction for the Administration rather than it just be one Councilor's opinion.

Plunkett Yes, that's a good point. I mean, to be clear, I'm certainly supportive of the majority of what was, I would like to have some Firefighters – I'll be honest there but I'm sensitive to the fact that we've got to find that money but, I mean, beyond that, I was really pleased when Councilor Garrett started going through this and talking about ARPA money. There really hasn't been a plan for ARPA and being able to use that money for one-time expenses to help with trails that we hear about from people, to help with the bridge at, at Turkey Foot. There's just a lot of really, really good opportunities there for the ARPA spending and, obviously, those are one-time expenses that will, that will balance the budget so, I would agree with Councilor Traylor and that I'm certainly supportive of this method and this direction right here for sure so – I know, we don't necessarily have to take a vote on that because that's not what we're voting on. What we are voting on is something completely different here.

Melton I have one question about this from Josh Garrett's proposal to something that we're going to be talking about here on the New Business line item of, you know, as we potentially talk about increasing the Urban Service District and one of those services that we provide to the Urban Service District is that policing and I guess I just wonder if as we look at the next line items and this budget and

we're talking about cutting a Police Officer, Josh, is that, is that something that you considered in your proposal?

Garrett It is and if you remember, the Administration and Chief Spears as they went through the budget iteration to present to us today also recommended going from four to two. I mean certainly they would like to have four, I would like to have four, much like I agree with President Plunkett, I'd like to have additional Firefighters but I went based on their comfort level of two and the assumption of those in the Urban Service District as well. That was a good question Craig.

Melton Thank you.

Burk I've got a couple of comments. I fully agree that now's the time to leverage some of those ARPA dollars to appropriate and cover some one-time expenses that are in the budget that wouldn't be covered otherwise so I think that's a very smart move by this Council. I do have a question though about reserves because in terms of just looking for, for revenue before we talked about ARPA, I thought there might be an opportunity for us to tap some of those potential reserves without going too far in an unsafe position. When we were at our last meeting, Tim Berry from Crowe mentioned – I wrote this down and I'd like Tim to confirm this, but he thought by end of year we would have a potential reserve estimated balance of \$29 million dollars. And if that's true, I also asked him a follow-up question which was what, in his professional opinion, what was kind of an appropriate amount that a municipality should have in reserves and essentially it was up to 40% which is kind of the gold standard. And so if we have a \$50 million dollar future balance, budget, thinking that even if you had 50% in reserves that would be holding onto \$25 million dollars. In fact, if we're potentially projecting \$29 million dollars, it sounds like there could be a few million dollars at play that would still be available to us out of reserves that would still be responsible enough to hold onto 50% of our revenue and maybe there's a little bit of extra money that could be found for something like a couple extra Firefighters. I just want to make sure there's not and revenue stream here that I'm missing based on the previous presentation.

Garrett Well, remember, if you're paying down reserves with something like salaries, you're creating a sustained deficit. So my recommendation is if you want to add further spending, you add one-time spending things like if we're engineering for trails, we've still got to fund the trails. If you need to buy a fire truck, but even that create sustaining because you've got to buy it every so many years. So just, just be careful you start (inaudible) those reserves –

Burk Yes, I –

Garrett To things like salaries.

Burk I fully agree with you, yes, so it wouldn't be for that. So if there were something else in this budget that got cut but there were reserves that we could spend that wouldn't put us in any risk whatsoever, in fact, we're still in a very conservative place, I think, in terms of these dollar amounts so I just want to make sure there's not some money there that we're not, we're overlooking because that is a very healthy reserve but I would like Tim to comment on that.

Plunkett I mean that's certainly a good, that's certainly a good point to make but I would also point out that over the last 21 years we've gone from 10,531 people to 31,702. I would assume that the reserves that Tim talks about are for more established communities that have, have a more consistent budget or more consistent revenue stream and expense stream. I mean we're, we're in and unique spot, I think, with this Town where, in my opinion, it's never been more important to have healthy reserves because of the growth that we're experiencing and people still want to be here and they're still coming and we're still building and we're still developing and we've gotta, we've gotta make sure – that, that's why, that's why it's so important to make sure we have a sustainable budget and why it's so important, in my opinion, to have reserves in the event that you need to use them for expenses that we're not prepared for. I mean, I don't know what the next 5 to 10 years looks like but, you know –

Burk I don't, I don't you –

Plunkett (Inaudible) growth.

Burk Yes, well taken. I don't want you to just make the assumption that that I'm saying we should do this. I'm just asking if there are dollars there for us to weigh over the next two or three weeks as we're trying to finance this because if it's not there, it's not a move we should make according to Tim then that's off the table but if it is, it's something to consider.

Choi I think to Josh's point on some of these issues, we moved a lot of this over to ARPA funds and so the reserve is healthier because of that kind of shifting as well. Otherwise, we would be further spending down what we have in the fund balances. That aside, the other comment that I'd like to make is, is my support for – and I have to think through this a little more and talk to the organizations involved but at first blush the support for giving one-time single distribution one more time for organizations like Z'Works and Chamber of Commerce and the summer concert series – not that I don't see value in what they do. I see incredible value but more and more as other organizations find out that we are supporting individual organizations there's going to be a little bit of grumbling now but further grumbling down the road of why not us as well, why don't we get a \$50,000 a year contribution from Town Council or the Administration? So, those kind of conversations I think are difficult to have as, to me, they support organizations that continue to grow and so Josh's proposal that we give them a one-time grant for, to support them several years and that gives them the off ramp to no longer to depend on us I think is a good policy to have as well and maybe one of the things that we might want to think about going forward is to take some of the savings out of the – so between Z'Works and the Chamber and to some degree the summer concert series, it's over \$100,000 a year. We may want to think about shifting that into the Community Foundation grant process so that it could support other organizations, not that we should lose that in how we support community organizations like Z'Works and Chamber, but that we distribute that to other organizations that are, are supporting our community as well.

Traylor We have that in place now. I mean, the process –

- Choi No, I know we have it in place. I'm saying further fund it –
- Traylor Yes –
- Choi Increase the funding for it.
- Traylor Okay, gotcha.
- Burk I would still like Tim to address my comments.
- Berry Tim Berry, financial advisor to the Town with Crowe. Councilor, what I think is most appropriate is to take the recommended changes from Councilor Plunkett or Councilor Garrett, put those into the model and look at that and exactly where we're going to end up. You know, yes, you currently have a balance in your ARPA fund of \$5.6 million dollars so there still will be dollars available to utilize from ARPA for next year that will still need to be identified for projects, contracts entered into by December 31 of next year, so there is some opportunity there. Let's look at what those fund balances will be where we anticipate they will be at the end of next year and then make some analysis as to what is the appropriate level of, of reserve balances looking forward.
- Burk Thank you.
- Plunkett Tim, do you just off the, obviously, you haven't seen the spreadsheet that Josh mentions but off of the, off the cuff here listening to some of the things he's saying, do you have any concerns with sustainability with his, with his changes and modifications?
- Berry Based on what I've heard, no. Obviously, I've not seen them. I was a little preoccupied this weekend and unavailable for a whole lot of discussion Friday. I apologize for that. I received a couple of calls from Council members and emails. My son was married on Saturday, actually here in Zionsville. So, well –
- Plunkett Congratulations.
- Berry Technically I guess, maybe not Zionsville but it has a Zionsville address let's put it that way. So, but, so I was a little preoccupied this weekend celebrating that and didn't have an opportunity to respond to some of the requests. I do apologize for that but do believe that it is important to have good, strong balances and reserves. I will say that I, too, am concerned about the additional levy growth request from DLGF and whether you would be able to receive all of that so it is important to understand that and then not pass a budget now and have to come back and make additional cuts later. I think that's important to set the Town up appropriately there.
- Choi Would it be advisable then as far as the levy appeal goes then, I know in the process of what we're doing, you have to build in the full levy appeal as –
- Berry Correct –

- Choi As a revenue stream but then to take that out until and bake it into a 2025 budget – no, not take it out of the budget –
- Berry No I understand what you're saying but no, I would not do that –
- Choi Okay.
- Berry Or suggest that because that would give the opportunity for them to state that yes, in fact, you do not need that additional value.
- Choi I got it. Okay.
- Plunkett So, Tim, just for purposes of clarification and maybe even for public input – today what we are approving or voting to approve or introduce on first reading I should say would be the Form 3 which is the maximum budget estimate, correct? This is not the Administration's budget or what Council is proposing. This is the maximum allowable budget and then over the next two weeks we'll dial in on the specifics of the budget.
- Berry Which you actually voted to approve at your last meeting as it was intro, in the introduced version was that Form 3 which was the max, yes. That is correct.
- Plunkett Okay, but we didn't hold a public hearing.
- Berry That's correct. Today is the public hearing on that.
- Plunkett So today will be the public hearing?
- Berry Yes, right. And then I was just kind of going through the whole process –
- Plunkett Yes.
- Berry And then the final adoption would be available on October 2nd.
- Plunkett Okay. So then basically I just need to open the public hearing, take comment, we don't necessarily need to take any action on this right now –
- Berry Correct.
- Plunkett So there's no vote and then, again, over the next couple weeks we would finalize this on hopefully October 2nd, right?
- Berry That is correct.
- Plunkett So that could be – okay.
- Berry And then, and, again, for both yours but also the public's understanding, it is important because the additional levy request is due to DLGF by October the 19th so that allows us the appropriate time to prepare the narrative, present that information to DLGF in a timely manner to qualify for both should the Council

approve the rural to urban as well as the additional levy request for excess growth

–

Plunkett Okay.

Berry In your assessed value over the last three years.

Plunkett Okay. So are there any questions for Tim, Josh or Mr. Pickell?

Garrett I am, and I know, I just have presented this and I will send this, in fact, I've already sent this to Cindy so that we can share this or she can share to both Council and department heads. I am curious if there's any feedback from the Administration or not at this time. We certainly want to work together to get this done and I think this gives us a framework and the flexibility to satisfy different priorities.

Pickell What, I guess what I would say is that I appreciate the work that you've put into this. I'm not sure how long it took you but it seems that you've done some work. I am a little concerned. The Administration has made a point to not enter into any new agreements or any new agreements to leave the new Administration open and I wonder if we are putting a constraint on a new Council by using, as I agree you need to use all these ARPA funds, and I don't necessarily on its face disagree with your plan but I do have a concern that we are not necessarily holding a new Council to this but I think we are obligating the Council whether it's to these projects that we agree are priorities but then again, there's going to be a new majority on the Council. It may be three of these members here on that new Council and that would be the way it is. My point is, I hate to put our wants and needs on a brand-new Council without full contact and understanding that point – if that makes sense to you.

Garrett I mean I understand. I tried to take into effect what potentially the future Administrations have been saying in their campaigning. My understanding, again, with the ARPA funding plan is, and I appreciate the Administration's prudence in handing it over to the next Administration and next Council. That can always be amended. What I'm also hoping to do together here is to create a budget that allows perhaps some flexibility as they go through their next budget year so that would be the 2025 budget in 2024 where they will then be able to get that say. It's a funny process, right? Mayor Styron pointed this out in her first budget year that she inherited Tim Haak's budget and Mayor Stehr will be inheriting Mayor Styron's budget. It's not perfect but I do think if you look through it most of what is being driven by is departmental needs which I don't know that that would necessarily change with the new Administration and new budget and by what I think is community needs, especially around parks and pathways but it's certainly something to consider.

Pickell Like I said, I don't on its face disagree with what you're saying. We'll definitely look at everything that you've put together and consider all of it. I just wanted to bring that point that it does concern me that, that we might be doing that and I'd want to tread lightly if it's perceived that way.

Choi I think one thing to remember as far as whether this is spent out of the fund balances that we have currently or whether it's spent out of ARPA, it's, it is money that is available and if we get to a point, I mean, this is not the way that I would want to do it and, correct me if I'm wrong, anybody – Mr. Berry or, or you – is that, it is a pool of money, whether it comes out of ARPA or it comes out of our fund balances, that if it's decided that okay, let's not build this into ARPA, then there's no problem with coming back because it would've naturally come out of the fund balances in the first place to come back and ask for an appropriation to cover the cost later on next year if that's the way that shifting needs to be done. Am I thinking this through this right Councilor Garrett?

Garrett Yes, you are and I think one of the things to think through too is the ARPA rules are, it has to be under contract in 2024 –

Choi Right –

Garrett The new Councilors having been one myself at one point will be drinking from the firehose. If they don't get in front of that quickly, it starts putting a big burden on the department heads to get those under contract as well. So, I think it's a reasonable plan. I mean, I'm certainly welcome to hear from those that are, Mayor Elect Stehr or anyone else if that's appropriate at some point if they want to reach out, but I do think this will be well received by those that are running today.

Plunkett And we could also, the reality is, because of the timeline of the ARPA money, we could also amend the ARPA plan between now and 12/31 of this year –

Garrett 100% –

Plunkett And we could release those funds for those capital expenses, or at least it's a, then the plan's been declared and then the department heads can go out for those capital outlays and for the trucks and the equipment and the things that we would put in there anyway so. And then to your point, Councilor Choi, you wouldn't necessarily need to take money from one pocket and put it in the other, we could just make sure that's covered for 1/1 of '24. –

Choi Yes and I was just trying to make the point of whether it's our fund balances or the ARPA money –

Plunkett Right –

Choi It is a pool of money to spend so –

Plunkett And that ARPA is still considered part of that fund balance.

Choi Right.

Plunkett I mean, so the reality is it is going to be spent down so.

Choi Yes.

Plunkett Yes. Okay. Is there anything else from Council? All right, so this is, obviously has been mentioned last time. We've already gone through the first step of this so this is a public hearing. I have proof of publication in Gateway of public notice of public hearing. At this point I'll open the public hearing. Are there any members from the public who would like to speak? Then I'll close the public hearing. Thank you very much. So, again, no action needs to take place here.

Consideration of a Resolution Regarding the Appropriation of Additional Funds (READI Grant) Resolution 2023-16 (Public Hearing Held August 21, 2023)

Plunkett We'll move on to item B of Old Business is a Consideration of a Resolution Regarding the Appropriation of Additional Funds. This is the READI Grant and this is Resolution 2023-16. We've got Cindy Poore, Director of Finance and Records and Lance Lantz, DPW Director here available if needed. Are there any questions or anything from Councilors or – you may not have to come up Lance, who knows?

Garrett I have a quick question. I know there was some discussion last time about how this could be spent. Mr. Lantz, I know the state has talked about a second READI Grant potential and the Styron Administration went through with this Council to get this first grant approved. If we didn't pass this grant now is there any implication that you would see about a potential second grant application for further funds?

Lantz Sorry, I was distracted. Someone left their phone up here so if you're missing that there it is. I think it's very safe to say that if we fail to capitalize on this opportunity in round one that we probably won't even be allowed at the table to discuss round two.

Garrett Okay, thank you. That was my fear.

Traylor So, my big concern was the flexibility within these funds. Can you spell out for us exactly what we can spend this on and if we approve this, what latitude the Administration would have to alter that?

Lantz Absolutely. If you will accept an enumeration as opposed to a spelling. We're going to go with some numbers talks here. Yes, so, what is the \$1.9 million that the Town was awarded? It is all engineering and design costs for transportation, pedestrian projects, all in support of the economic development to be gained by the development of the Gateway Area. Let's talk specific numbers here: There are six elements and these were probably 90% my number estimates. Corrie Sharp, when she joined the team, helped flesh out or, or finalize a few of these numbers but there are six components to this and the first one is a road realignment and intersection improvement. That is the realignment of what is now Main Street as you leave the bridge north of Bub's to swing that westward and align it with First Street. This, as far as transportation projects go, this goes back to at least 2015. I mean, 15 years ago, 2007-ish when we were taking hard looks at what's the best solution for not just vehicular access but also pedestrian movement through the downtown area.

So, the first component for the realignment of the road and intersection improvement at Sycamore and First is \$397,500. Also necessary in support of a new intersection location, we have some changes necessary along the existing First Street corridor – that Dairy Queen block, if you will. The estimate for engineering expense there is \$297,500. Back in 2012, we constructed a pathway from U.S. 421/Michigan Road to Lions Park parking lot. There were a lot of challenges in that last portion of the pathway to get on over to the sidewalk system at Elm Street so we have some decent preliminary engineering already completed but the third element of the engineering expenses is \$49,000 to complete the design for the pathway extension and bring that appropriately and properly the rest of the way along Sycamore Street. The Lion or the biggest chunk of the total amount is \$517,500 and that is for utility coordination and potential burial along the First Street corridor and in the areas where the transmission lines go over land there at the old Citgo site.

So those first four elements are purely transportation and pedestrian projects. Those are the numbers that I generated to justify this \$1.9. The remaining two items that were included in the, in the total amount are in regard to the plaza grounds and that is the preferred ZGA, I guess land use, if you will, showed a plaza there where the Citgo site is, it has remained dormant. That includes also a, we called an urban pathway section. Think Monon or not the Monon but think of the cultural trail downtown, right? This is an experiential pedestrian way to get, walk down to the Bub's area and south of the Village of Zionsville. So, there were two components to round out our total of six items. The first was called plaza ground surface and that was design – what is, what is the ground going to look like? That's nothing vertical. That was \$150,000 and then the final amount, amount – I'm sorry – cross that out. The plaza ground surface was \$227,500 and the final element was what's called plaza grounds amenities \$150,000. That's for conceptual designs of what those vertical elements may be – is it a fountain, is it a statue, is it what, what have you. If you add all of those numbers up that I just gave you, it comes to \$1.639 million dollars. Because of the way this grant ultimately played out, the CIRDA group, which you joined – you had Mayor Fadness here. I think that group originally submitted a holistic grant application totaling around \$50 million dollars. When the funds were finally allocated from the state or distributed or awarded, that group got \$20 million dollars. So that group led by the Fishers consortium went back to its partners and said all right, this is what you asked for now we're going to get this. So, this is kind of a how would you spend \$1.9 million dollars. If you add those numbers up to the \$1.639 million, it does include about a 15% contingency to allow for fluctuations in road design elements, intersection treatments, we'll be looking at robust pedestrian signals in that congested downtown area. So those are the six elements that make up the \$1.9. It is my recommendation that you approve this additional appropriation primarily so we can get working on this longstanding and off tackled but yet not acted upon traffic issue downtown.

Traylor Thank you.

Plunkett Lance, I've got a question – the, based on what you just said, \$277,000, \$377,000, sorry, that's for this, for this plaza and this has been probably the one thing that's irritated me the most about this project is this plaza area, this park area in the middle, it's difficult for me to understand how we're going to improve

traffic flow and put a park in between two roads and increase the traffic signals and allow people to go right through it, to walk right through there and do whatever they're going to do. My question is the, if the new Administration comes in and says they don't want that there can that be modified? Is this Gateway project set in stone from the early rough drafts we saw two years ago?

Lantz Well the Zionsville Gateway Plan was adopted by both the Town Council and the Plan Commission as an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan. Now within that plan there is some flexibility absolutely but what remains consistent across all plans as well as all past efforts, is the transportation element, the realignment of the roads and the improvement of the intersections. So, to your question – I understand there is yet some nebulous nature to what this plaza ultimately looks at. We, whatever we do with an intersection improvement it's going to have a robust pedestrian component to it so people will have a high comfort level moving across these busier roads in the downtown area. We know we're going to get lots of pedestrians as our events increase downtown. So, I guess if the plaza is a sticking point and, frankly, we have worked with our, our design or our selected designer and engineer and they stand waiting in the wings ready to execute a design contract for the roadway elements should you approve all of this or a portion thereof but we have not even had discussions yet with a design team that would be focused more on a landscape architect element. If there's any or enough discomfort in the plaza area and what it ultimately looks like, I believe you have the flexibility to approve less than the amount advertised. So, if you wanted to specifically hold off – actually, keep in mind it is my recommendation that we get to work on all of these elements under the entirety of the grant amount but if the plaza is a sticking point with this Council, I would recommend that you in your motion you could frame it specific to those first four elements, approve a lesser amount of \$1.5 million and leave that \$400,000 for the next Administration and/or the next Council to consider in their appropriation once a little bit more direction is achieved through the transportation projects.

Plunkett Well, I mean, to be clear, I hope I'm wrong. I hope I'm wrong. I just don't see, you know, this is, in my opinion, one of those careful what we wish for. We're going to realign the roads in the effort to improve traffic flow and then encourage people to walk across the roads and hang out and watch traffic fly by. So I hope I'm wrong. I hope it's different.

Melton I just want to point out – I have one question. So real quick – the four main were realign Main and First Street, second was First Street needed some adjustments further up, third is utility coordination – what was the fourth?

Lantz Finalizing the pathway from Lions Park over to the sidewalk system along Elm Street.

Melton So I just want to point out that we're spending \$377, 000 potentially on a plaza, nothing vertical, right? Just the plan?

Lantz No, that totality, the total amount of the two elements would include the vertical, consideration of vertical elements to be determined. Is that a pavilion, is it a fountain? I don't know.

- Melton So there is, there is construction, there is vertical in that?
- Lantz This is all design. No.
- Plunkett It's all design. This is engineering and design.
- Melton So that's what I'm saying – so there's nothing vertical being created. It's all design.
- Lantz Nothing there, no. Nothing is built as a result of this.
- Melton So we're spending \$377,000 on that and then we go back to Vice President Burk's thought on the plan for the Comprehensive Plan of the Town is \$150,000. These numbers are just kind of skewed in my mind that we're looking at a plan for this plaza for \$377,000 and then we're looking at \$150,000 for the Comprehensive Plan for the entire Town of Zionsville. I don't know if our priorities are a little skewed on that or if the – I'm just confused on that. I think I publicly just wanted to have the public understand that we talked about the Comprehensive Plan for \$150,000 is that enough and then we come down here to these two priorities of the six for this grant which is money that we can receive but it's just, to me it blows my mind that we're spending \$377,000 on a plan and I think to the Deputy Mayor's point, this is the current Administration's model that we've followed for this and it's great that the current Administration was able to gain this READI Grant money with the help of the Council and the staff, of course, but I just, I'm kind of looking at those numbers and there's nothing being built for almost \$400,000 necessarily with that second 5 and 6. So I like your recommendation that maybe this gets approved in a way that allows more input for that plaza area as we move forward. So I just wanted to hear that out loud –
- Lantz Sure.
- Melton And I appreciate your giving us all these talking points on these six line items.
- Lantz Well a Comprehensive, a Comprehensive Plan doesn't entail the level of detail that this goes into. This is survey, this is actually designing construction plans so it's not just a conceptual design, it's taking those conceptual designs that are identified in the ZGA study and actually bringing them to a point where you could hire a contractor to do it so it's a much more involved process than just a planning exercise.
- Melton And I think will play off of the old Comprehensive Plan too so you have something to start off of, right – when it comes to the new Comprehensive Plan?
- Lantz Sure.
- Melton So and, I respect that. I understand that. I just, again, I think with the plaza to President Plunkett's idea about people walking through a busier intersection, I think we do need to plan it properly, you know, spend the right amount whatever that is but I'm excited for the Gateway. I just, again, I was just kind of looking at those numbers and wondering how that's going to pan out with just planning on

both things so but I appreciate all this breakdown. It makes it easier for us to kind of move forward and that's all my comments.

Garrett So I would just, from my perspective, I would recommend that we approve the full amount just from the optics of Mr. Lantz pointed out we did go through the process, regardless of what you feel of the Gateway, we went through the process and approved the general design based on the Planning Commission recommendation. We asked for the READI Grant based on that design and received it. I don't see any harm in going forward with the design as requested. If the future Administration, future Councils in seeing the details of that design decides this is not for us there's no obligation to then build it. Holding back the design I just feels give you an incomplete view of what that may look like and to President Plunkett's point, if we look at it and say gee, this is terrible for pedestrians, well, let's not build it, right? We're not obligating ourselves to put dirt, put, put shovels in the ground, we're just getting the money that we've asked for and if we ask for more money I think they may question us – like, well you asked for money last time and you didn't spend it all, why should we give it to you? So I'm just worried the precedent this sets and I don't feel it's obligating us to anything that the next Administration may not want to do.

Lantz I did hear the comment from the first meeting when this was introduced on the engagement of our next Administration and immediately thereafter I reached out to our – I almost said President elect – for now it's just Mayor elect, maybe someday, John, and quickly met with him, reviewed the transportation elements and the steps we had taken so far, reviewed them toward the Gateway, so as my commitment to him that he is now engaged in this process through the remainder of this year as an interested party. Certainly you don't want to just pull a, flip a switch on January 1 but he will be from here on out part of the design development process.

Traylor And he did reach out with an endorsement of approving this so. All of my questions from last meeting have been answered so if you're ready for a motion I'll make one.

Plunkett Yes, we did hold a public hearing on August 21st for this so there's no need for a public hearing. Are there any other questions for Lance or anyone else? Otherwise, I would entertain a motion.

Traylor I make a motion to approve.

Plunkett First by Councilor Traylor.

Burk Second.

Plunkett Second by Vice President Burk. Amy, if you would please do a roll call?

Lacy Yes. President Plunkett?

Plunkett Yes.

Lacy Vice President Burk?

Burk Yes.

Lacy Councilor Choi?

Choi Yes.

Lacy Councilor Culp is not present.
Councilor Garrett?

Garrett Yes.

Lacy Councilor Melton?

Melton Yes.

Lacy Councilor Traylor?

Traylor Yes.

Plunkett Motion passes 6 in favor, 0 opposed.

Lantz Thank you very much.

Plunkett Thank you.

NEW BUSINESS

Consideration of a Resolution Regarding the Appropriation of Additional Fund (Hussey-Mayfield Memorial Library) Resolution 2023-17 (Public Hearing)

Plunkett Up next, first item of New Business is a Consideration of a Resolution Regarding the Appropriation of Additional Funds. This is for the Hussey-Mayfield Memorial Library, Resolution 2023-17 and we have Kristin Shelley, Executive Director of the Hussey-Mayfield Memorial Public Library here to present.

Shelley Good morning Council members. Taking this opportunity to introduce myself. I am literally the brand-new Executive Director of the Hussey-Mayfield Memorial Public Library, been on the job just over a month. So, while I'm new to Indiana libraries, I have decades and that's decades with an "S" experience in both Michigan and Ohio libraries, but I will say each one of them funds differently and each one of them expects different things for budgets.

So, here today to ask for additional appropriations for the continuation of the construction of the new Whitestown branch and while the Board and the construction company and the staff have been incredible stewards of the public's money, we do have, and they've been fiscally responsible throughout the process of building the second branch – costs have increased astronomically from when we first went for the \$9 million dollar bond for the construction. As I said, our

team has been fiscally responsible and we will be able to finish the building with money that we have on hand we just need to come to all of you, our fiscal body, per the state law and ask for permission to be able to spend the money that we have. And just to confirm, we are not requesting any additional funds, we are not asking for a tax rate increase and we are not asking for any money from the Town. These are all funds that we have on hand. Our request simply, as I said, is to use what we have available to cover some extra expenses the library has encountered during the construction process. I don't think anybody could have anticipated how much construction costs have gone up and what inflation has done with pretty much everything.

Specifically, the library has funds available in three different areas that need to be reallocated – \$257,312 from a supplemental local income tax distribution, \$100,000 from the library improvement reserve fund and \$350,000 from the rainy day fund which is a total additional appropriation of \$707,312. I do believe in your packet there was the certified copy of additional appropriations which has more details about these funds. And throughout the past few months, the library team has completed an extensive review of our finances to find ways to cover these increased construction costs. The funding sources worksheet in your packet provides a detailed summary of how our team has redirected funds to address additional construction costs. Specifically, \$591,619 in estimated savings from the delay in the opening of the new branch. That also comes with construction projects – delays, delays, delays. \$100,000 from the undesignated gift fund and \$50,000 that we received from the Library Foundation. The last three areas highlighted on that sheet – I hope your sheets are highlighted – mine is highlighted, are portions we need your approval to use and, again, that's the \$250,312 from the supplemental local income tax distribution, \$100,000 from the library improvement reserve fund, \$350,000 from our rainy day fund for, again, a total of \$707,312 and then also included in your packet is a very colorful pie chart that shows all these numbers for you guys. Again, kudos to the library team, to the Library Board of Trustees, to the construction company, to the architects for managing this process within our current available funds. So, I simply ask that you consider approving the resolution.

Plunkett Thank you, Kristin. Welcome, by the way.

Shelley Thank, thank you.

Plunkett Welcome. To be clear for Council, this is not, as Kristin mentioned, these are three funds that are currently under the library's taxing unit, taxing name. This is not money that comes from the Town. This is money, we've had to do this in the past, where we just have to approve it and then they can go spend it. So, are there any questions for Kristin?

Burk I know we don't manage that budget to your point but, I mean, it is a tough spot for you to have to tap into these dollars to have to finish the project. You really don't have a choice, you have to finish the project. So I know this, these are tough decisions. I just hope that all the funds that you're having to tap into, I mean, this is going to take away a lot of dollars that you were counting on for potential other needs at the library and, I mean, I'll obviously support this is what you're recommending but I am, but not being a member of your Board, I would

be concerned that some of these dollar balances are going to be kind of tight for a while if you have other needs at both branches.

Shelley Thank you and rest assured we have not drained those three funds.

Burk That's good news.

Plunkett All right, any other questions for Kristin? This is a public hearing and I have proof of publication of the notice of the public hearing. At this point I will open the public hearing. If there are any members from the public who would like to comment. Having none I will close the public hearing. Any additional discussions or questions? Otherwise, I would entertain a motion.

Melton I would like to make a motion to approve Resolution 2023-17.

Plunkett First by Councilor Melton.

Choi Second.

Plunkett Second by Councilor Choi. Amy, if you would, go down a roll call please?

Lacy Yes. President Plunkett?

Plunkett Yes.

Lacy Vice President Burk?

Burk Yes.

Lacy Councilor Choi?

Choi Yes.

Lacy Councilor Culp is not present.

Councilor Garrett?

Garrett Yes and I actually have to leave so this will be my last vote and you can stop doing roll calls but I am a yes.

Lacy Okay.

Plunkett Thank you.

Lacy Thank you. Councilor Melton?

Melton Yes.

Lacy Councilor Traylor?

Traylor Yes.

Plunkett Motion passes 6 in favor, 0 opposed. Thank you very much.

Shelley Thank you.

Plunkett I think for purposes of the meeting and public record, Councilor Garrett has left the meeting so I'm assuming we can go to just normal votes at this point, is that correct?

Steuerwald I'd recommend you still do the –

Plunkett Still do a roll call?

Steuerwald Still do the roll call.

Consideration of an Ordinance Amending the Town of Zionsville Zoning Ordinance (Appaloosa Crossing) Ordinance 2023-17

Plunkett Okay, very good. Up next is a Consideration of an Ordinance Amending the Town of Zionsville Zoning Ordinance. This is for Appaloosa Crossing, Ordinance 2023-17. We have Roger Kilmer, Senior Planner, Community & Economic Development and Matt Price, attorney from Dentons to present.

Kilmer Good morning members of the Council. Roger Kilmer, Senior Planner with the Town. The Ordinance provided before you for consideration is a rezoning request of 2.811 acres located in the Appaloosa Crossing development. I have on the screen for orientation purposes we're talking about this area that is outlined in black. It is known as Outlots J and K, all of Block B of Appaloosa Crossing and a portion of Appaloosa Drive. Appaloosa Drive is the drive that runs back behind, behind these lots. The request is to rezone the property from Rural Professional Business District to the Rural General Business District and remaining within the Rural Michigan Road Overlay. The 2014 Zionsville Comprehensive Plan Amendment recommends a mixed-use development for the area. The rezoning request is consistent with the future land use recommendation. At its August 21, 2023 meeting, the Plan Commission voted to forward a favorable recommendation to the Town Council by a unanimous vote of 7-0 of the rezoning request with commitments for the property owner that future development on the subject site would be limited to a maximum height of the main roof line or parapet at 40 feet and that exterior lighting would automatically be dimmed by 50% at 10 p.m. This is just a quick overview of what the Plan Commission acted upon. I'll turn it over to the petitioner to provide details.

Price Good morning Mr. President and members of the Council. Matt Price here on behalf of Harris FLP. Mr. Kilmer's summary was very succinct and captured the essence of the proposal. Just to give maybe a brief overview of the history of this property, originally this was designed for a power center type commercial development with a little over two-thirds of the total acreage devoted to general business uses. In fact, the anchor tenant originally was proposed to be a Kroger and so what's happened over the years is it's been modified, really modernized and updated to reflect current development patterns, the needs of the community and really where the marketplace is.

And so in connection with that, in 2020, Mr. Harris added the parcel that you see immediately south of the area outlined in black so this area, this area right here, right there. It's approximately 1.35 acres and that area was not part of the original Appaloosa Crossing development. It was added, it has and water feature located on it now and that area provides additional buffering from the residential use to the south. Originally, the concept was behind the development is that the PB zoning was located on the southern portion of the project to buffer between the residential uses on the east and the south. What's happened over time, as you know, is that we've added the residential uses to the east providing a nice transition between residential uses and we've added the acreage to the south providing a buffering from the residential properties to the south. We anticipate that the development will be very much like the mixed-use building that you see north, that's at the very north end of the aerial that you see there today that has the Verde, the dentist office, the bakery. It'd be very similar types of uses located in this development as well. We anticipate a brunch spot, perhaps a chiropractor, those type of, of mixed-uses in the, in the new building. Mr. Harris and I are available to answer any questions that you have and appreciate very much your time this morning. Thank you.

Plunkett Are there any questions from Councilors?

Burk Matt, you're rezoning from Rural Professional and I know you talked about the original intent of this project back in the day with Kroger and everything. Would that have qualified under Rural Professional? What's a good example of what would be a Rural Professional development?

Price It's the classic type of use would be a medical office use, professional service type uses would be in the Professional Business. Part of what we're responding to, I think, is a change in office demand since COVID certainly. One of the other things that we found is that the mixed-use building much like what's done at the north end of the project, does incorporate some office-like uses so we do have, for example, a dentist office in that building. We would anticipate similar types of medical-related uses to be compatible with this building as well.

Burk But really opens it up for more of a bit of a retail maybe perhaps food eatery?

Price You've, you've hit right on it. What it permits primarily for us is the food service and, for example, we're looking at and brunch-type spot there today that's not available at the northern building. This would provide that opportunity here.

Burk And is, the potential Culver's that I've heard that's going in, is that in this particular location or that's the lot above that? This is not for the Culver's, right? This would be for a duplicate of where we see Verde.

Price Right. So that parcel immediate, immediately north of the area outlined in black is the, is the proposed Culver's which has received its final Plan Commission approval as of August 21.

Burk But that's not at all to do with this particular project?

- Price It's not, no. That, that parcel is today zoned General Business already.
- Burk So when you talk about the lighting issue, I mean, in talking to residents in the area I think a lot of people are excited about Culver's but people just don't like the lighting in there and I feel like there's already been some accommodation with that Culver's lighting and so I feel like, and I have to go up at night, I guess more to the building with Verde – I don't feel like there's not an egregious lighting already at that building I don't think. Have you had complaints about that particular lighting? I know BP got a lot of attention last year.
- Price Yes. I think primarily the focus has been on the BP convenience store. What you, what you referenced with regard to Culver's is true. There have been accommodations where Culver's agreed not to have, for example, blue lighting on the building around the cornice or top level of the building. I think that was in response to some of the concerns about the BP and, which, I think, had to do more with the color palette and intensity of that lighting and so there's been an accommodation on the Culver's voluntarily by the Culver's Restaurant operator and then on this building, as Mr. Kilmer mentioned, we've agreed to and, a dimmer that would be enacted automatically at, by 10 p.m.
- Burk Is that same dimmer on the other property that's already on the north end or no?
- Price It is not. It is not.
- Burk Okay. And then just clarify on the map that you, you're showing us – you got the south border in the black that's outlined. Just south of that there is and small acreage that looks like it has and retention pond. You were pointing out, that's obviously not part of this you were just pointing out that that's additional buffer that was purchased later that's there?
- Price Correct.
- Burk I was recently just at this property in the neighborhood south of there. There's not a lot of trees and it sounded like maybe, I don't know if there's any accommodation to this but not just that the buffer is there for the pond because you're looking at, I don't know, a pretty decent chunk of acreage but is there any plan to on that south side there put a, full canopy of some kind of protection of trees or something else that I'm not hearing about because that also takes away a lot of that distraction and light.
- Price Yes, no, that's a very excellent point. Yes, at the development plan stage – so when this project comes through for a development plan, one of the features of that will be landscaping along the south and eastern perimeter. That is a requirement of, of Zionsville's Zoning Ordinance. One of the things that we've done really on each one of the parcels as they've come through for development plan is we've obtained some relief with regard to landscaping between the parking lot and the frontage of the property and relocated those plantings more strategically to areas between residential areas and our parking lot and I anticipate that's what would be done here too so and enhanced landscaping along the southern and eastern perimeter.

- Burk I think it would go a long way –
- Price Yes.
- Burk To accommodating folks. It's pretty thin in some of the other places out there so, you know, again, I think a lot of it is just lighting and noise. I don't think it's necessarily the accessibility to have additional shopping opportunity. I think people enjoy that. I think it really is just lighting and sound.
- Melton I was following along on, for the Culver's during the Plan Commission. I just want to say the Plan Commission asked a lot of great questions surrounding signage and lighting regarding that so I'm really happy to see that interaction but – was there a fountain? So I think we had comments on a fountain in one of those retention ponds is it the, is it the one furthest to the south here or it is the one in back? Just curious.
- Price Yes, having a water feature along Michigan Road is a requirement of the zoning commitments for the project that really have been in place since 2008 and so there will be a fountain installed in the southern detention pond –
- Melton Okay.
- Price As part of that.
- Melton Great.
- Burk The pond I was just referencing?
- Price Yes.
- Burk I mean it may be beautification but I'm not so sure about noise.
- Price Well, I mean, the thought yes, the thought was beautification and to keep the pond aerated, reduce algae growth and provide a decorative feature there.
- Plunkett Any other questions for Mr. Price? I would point out, I certainly appreciate a lot of these questions, a lot of these things come up at the Plan Commission level and I certainly appreciate the work of the Plan Commission which is comprised of four appointments by the Mayor and three by the Council and for that to come through unanimous 7, 7 in favor, 0 opposed, I think it's important that the public understands we put a lot of weight in what the Plan Commission does. Any questions for Mr. Price? Otherwise, I would entertain a motion. I would make a motion to approve Ordinance 2023-17.
- Traylor Second.
- Plunkett Second by Councilor Traylor. Amy, if we're required to, would you please move forward with the roll call vote?
- Lacy Yes. President Plunkett?

Zionsville Town Council
September 18, 2023

Plunkett Yes.

Lacy Vice President Burk?

Burk Yes.

Lacy Councilor Choi?

Choi Yes.

Lacy Councilor Culp is not present.
Councilor Garrett is not present.
Councilor Melton?

Melton Yes.

Lacy Councilor Traylor?

Traylor Yes.

Plunkett Thank you very much. Motion passes 5 in favor, 0 opposed.

Price Thank you Mr. President.

Introduction of a Resolution Regarding a Fiscal Plan for Reclassifying Certain Areas within the Consolidated Town of Zionsville from the Rural Service District to the Urban Service District **Resolution 2023-19**

Plunkett All right, moving along. Introduction – up next on the agenda is Introduction of a Resolution Regarding a Fiscal Plan for Reclassifying Certain Areas Within the Consolidated Town of Zionsville from the Rural Service District to the Urban Service District. This is Resolution 2023-19 and we have Deputy Mayor Pickell and Tim Berry to present or maybe just Tim Berry. Sorry.

Berry Thank you. Tim Berry with Crowe. We worked with the Town, the affected departments, the Department of DPW as well as the Police Department as well as general costs associated with the administration of the Town in implementing the Rural to Urban configuration changes for Devonshire, Chelsea and Holliday Farms.

Plunkett Were there any questions from Councilors regarding this introduction? I do know that this has been something that we have discussed with even the prior Deputy Mayor and this Council has mentioned wanting to wrap this up and bring in these areas into the Urban Service District. There is a little bit of, and I know some of the next item will be a little bit more actionable perhaps but in our reorganization there is a requirement as developments become completed at certain levels they are required to be brought in assuming they have contiguous utilities and we're providing service to them. So, this really, in my opinion, is just checking a box

and doing something that probably should've been done two, three, four or five years ago in some of these cases potentially so.

Berry Certainly with the Holliday Farm –

Plunkett Yes –

Berry Piece, yes.

Plunkett Yes. Any questions for Tim? Having none, I will make a motion to approve Resolution 2023-19.

Choi Second.

Plunkett Second by Councilor Choi. Amy, if you would please roll call vote?

Lacy Yes. President Plunkett?

Plunkett Yes.

Lacy Vice President Burk?

Burk Yes.

Lacy Councilor Choi?

Choi Yes.

Lacy Councilor Culp is not present.

Councilor Garrett is not present.

Councilor Melton?

Melton Yes.

Lacy Councilor Traylor?

Traylor Yes.

Plunkett Thank you very much. Motion passes 5 in favor, 0 opposed.

Consideration of an Ordinance Reclassifying Certain Areas within the Consolidated Town of Zionsville from the Rural Service District to the Urban Service District **Ordinance 2023-18 (First Reading)**

Plunkett Up next is the Consideration of an Ordinance Reclassifying Certain Areas Within the Consolidated Town of Zionsville from Rural Service to Urban Service. So, as you'll recall, we just went through the fiscal plan for this particular proposal. This will require two readings. This is a first reading but this would be the

Ordinance to actually bring these developments into the Urban Service District.
Are there any questions from Councilors?

Traylor I'd made a motion to introduce.

Plunkett We have a first by Councilor Traylor.

Choi Second.

Plunkett Second by Councilor Choi. Amy, if you would please roll call vote?

Lacy Yes. President Plunkett?

Plunkett Yes.

Lacy Vice President Burk?

Burk Yes.

Lacy Councilor Choi?

Choi Yes.

Lacy Councilor Culp is not present.

Councilor Garrett is not present.

Councilor Melton?

Melton Yes.

Lacy Councilor Traylor?

Traylor Yes.

Plunkett Thank you very much. Motion passes 5 in favor, 0 opposed.

**Consideration of an Ordinance Amending the 2023 Salary Ordinance Ordinance
2023-19 (First Reading)**

Plunkett Moving along, we have a Consideration of an Ordinance Amending the 2023 Salary Ordinance. This is 2023-19. This is also a first reading and we have HR Director, Jo Kiel, here to present or Cindy Poore.

Traylor Looks like a 1, 2, 3 not it.

Poore This change is to allow for the salary for the new person that we're wanting to hire, the Accounting and Asset Administrator.

Zionsville Town Council
September 18, 2023

Plunkett You said, I'm sorry, what was that last part for Accounting and – what was that?

Poore Accounting and Asset Administrator.

Plunkett Okay. Thank you.

Poore Yes.

Plunkett Are there any questions for Cindy? Again, this is a first reading. If there are no questions for Cindy, I'll make a motion to introduce Ordinance 2023-19 on first reading.

Melton Second.

Plunkett A second by Councilor Melton. Amy, if you would please, roll call vote?

Lacy Yes. President Plunkett?

Plunkett Yes.

Lacy Vice President Burk?

Burk Yes.

Lacy Councilor Choi?

Choi Yes.

Lacy Councilor Culp is not present.
Councilor Garrett is not present.
Councilor Melton?

Melton Yes.

Lacy Councilor Traylor?

Traylor Yes.

Plunkett Thank you very much. Motion passes 5 in favor, 0 opposed. Thank you Cindy.

Poore Thank you.

OTHER MATTERS

Plunkett Up next would be Other Matters. Are there any other matters from Council?

Melton Just one comment – I just wanted to recognize Molly Whitehead who is a partner with Zionsville here. The Indiana Chamber of Commerce has named the Boone County community, Community of the Year by NextEra Energy Resources. I just wanted to give a shout out to Molly for her great work and the County for continuing to grow in such leaps and bounds so. Thank you.

ADJOURN

Plunkett Very good. Anything else? I will make a motion to adjourn.

Burk Second.

Plunkett Second by Vice President Burk. Amy, if you would please, roll call that too.

Lacy Yes. President Plunkett?

Plunkett Yes.

Lacy Vice President Burk?

Burk Yes.

Lacy Councilor Choi?

Choi Yes.

Lacy Councilor Culp is not present.

Councilor Garrett is not present.

Councilor Melton?

Melton Yes.

Lacy Councilor Traylor?

Traylor Yes.

Plunkett Thank you very much. Motion passes 5 in favor, 0 opposed. I certainly want to thank everybody for hanging with us. Sometimes these meetings get long. Appreciate everybody's help.

The next regular Town Council meeting is scheduled for Monday, October 2, 2023 at 7 p.m. in the Zionsville Town Hall Council Chambers. Public notice will be posted in compliance with the Indiana Open Door Law. Thank you.

Zionsville Town Council
September 18, 2023

Respectfully Submitted,

Amelia Anne Lacy, Municipal Relations Coordinator
Town of Zionsville