

**MINUTES COUNCIL MEETING
CITY OF UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS, OHIO
FEBRUARY 17, 2015**

Mayor Infeld called the regular meeting to order at 7:37 p.m.

Roll Call:

Present: Ms. Nancy E. English
Mr. Mark Wiseman
Mrs. Adele Zucker
Mrs. Susan Pardee
Mr. Phillip Ertel
Mr. Steven Sims
Ms. Pamela Cameron

Also Present: Law Director Luke McConville
Finance Director Larry Heiser
Police Chief Steve Hammett
Fire Chief Douglas Zook
Service Director Jeffrey Pokorny
Clerk of Council Kelly M. Thomas

Pledge of Allegiance

Approval of Minutes from Council Meeting February 2, 2015

There were no additions or corrections to the Council Minutes of February 2, 2015.

MOTION BY MRS. PARDEE, SECONDED BY MRS. ZUCKER to approve the minutes of February 2, 2015 as presented. On roll call, all voted "aye."

Comments from Audience

Mr. William Fudge III, 3846 Grenville Road and Chair of the Technology Advisory Commission spoke about the research and work that went into the recommendation and policy for the purchase and use of iPads. Mr. Fudge thanked Council for considering the legislation.

Mayor Infeld thanked Mr. Fudge and Ms. English for their hard work and efforts.

Ms. English thanked Mr. Fudge and the Technology Advisory Committee for their hard work over the course of the past year. University Heights is fortunate to have professional people in our community who volunteer their time and expertise to aid Council on what type of hardware to purchase and create a policy of its use.

Mayor's Comments

Mayor Infeld provided the following comments and reminders:

- ❖ Dunkin Donuts held its grand opening on Saturday.
- ❖ Ohio EPA is looking for public input on dredging in the Cleveland Harbor. There will be a public hearing on February 24 at 6pm at the Metropark's Watershed Stewardship Center at West Creek, 2277 West Ridgewood Drive in Parma. Mayor Infeld added that the Ohio EPA is concerned because the Army Corp of Engineers has been given permission to dredge 400,075 cubic yards of material in the Cleveland Harbor and the Ohio EPA is concerned that this may result in a change in the current water quality conditions of Lake Erie and the Cuyahoga River; although it cannot violate Ohio water quality standards that protects human health and the environment. Mayor Infeld also explained how and why the river is dredged every year in making sure that the passage ways are sufficient for the large boats that use the rivers.

Agenda Items:

A. Swearing-In of Law Director Luke F. McConville

Mayor Infeld swore in Mr. McConville as the City Law Director.

Mr. McConville introduced his wife and three sons.

B. Ordinance No. 2015-03 Appointing Luke F. McConville as Law Director Effective February 17, 2015 and Declaring An Emergency

Mrs. Pardee spoke in terms of the process that Council used in selecting a Law Director. Mrs. Pardee stated she has known Mr. McConville since 2009 and that he has been her Campaign Finance Manager. When Mr. McConville submitted his resume for the Law Director position Mrs. Pardee immediately informed Council that Mr. McConville was her campaign treasurer and that if he were chosen for the position that would no longer be the case. At no time did any one indicate they had any reservations. When Mr. McConville was selected as one of the six interviews Mrs. Pardee reminded everyone that he was her campaign treasurer and therefore would not have anything to do with talking, asking questions or making comments about him as part of the process. The night of the final interviews and discussed the Law Director Mrs. Pardee stated she did not make any comments. Mayor Infeld was involved in all the interviews and was invited to give her views and comments after which Council talked and there was already a consensus before Mrs. Pardee said a word about her thoughts. Mrs. Pardee announced that Mr. McConville is no longer her campaign treasurer but looks forward to the beginning of a new relationship in working with him as the Law Director.

Council has asked that Ordinance 2015-03 run through the end of the calendar year 2015 because every two (2) years Council appoints their employees, the Clerk of Council and the Law Director. At this same time newly elected or re-elected Council members and that timeline begins again in 2016.

Mayor Infeld added that this will coincide with the re-appointment of all Administrative/Department Head Staff, which occurs when there is an election. The Department Heads are sworn in at the same time the Mayor and Members of Council are sworn in.

MOTION BY MRS. ZUCKER, SECONDED BY MS. ENGLISH to approve Ordinance No. 2015-03 Appointing Luke F. McConville as Law Director Effective February 17, 2015 and Declaring An Emergency. Roll Call on suspension of the rules, all voted "aye," except Mrs. Pardee who abstained. On roll call, all voted "aye," except Mrs. Pardee who abstained.

C. Ordinance 2015-04 Authorizing the Advance of Funds from the General Fund (101) to the Park Fund (206) (first reading)

Mr. Heiser stated that this Ordinance starts the process of working on the new Park by advancing \$100,000 until the bonding is in place around the summer of 2015.

Ordinance 2015-04 was placed on first reading.

D. Ordinance 2015-05 Amending Section 1474.10 of the Codified Ordinances - Point of Sale Inspections (first reading)

Mayor Infeld stated that this Ordinance will tighten up the City's Ordinances in the case of property transfers due to sheriff sales. Previously the City had no mechanism in place to make sure a point of sale inspection was completed. Ordinance 2015-05 will assure that a point of sale inspection is done and that in this case the duty doesn't fall on the seller but the buyer.

Mr. Tuck-Macalla noted that in reviewing hatch reports from the County Auditor he noticed that Sheriff home sales were going through and the only way point of sale inspections were being done was if the buyer volunteered for it. Currently the Building Department cannot enforce that these buyers obtain a point of sale because the current Ordinance only references the seller.

Mrs. Pardee asked what City he modeled this Ordinance after.

Mr. Tuck-Macalla responded that Shaker Heights.

Ms. English asked for clarification that the Ordinance would be adding a subsection to section and that the current section "a" would not be removed.

It was clarified that the language in Ordinance 2015-05 will be added to the current section 1474.10 (a).

Mayor Infeld noted that this Ordinance will only apply to homes that are transferred in a sheriff sale.

Ordinance 2015-05 was placed on first reading.

E. Motion Authorizing the Purchase of 2015 Ford Fusion S vehicle for Building Department

Mr. Heiser noted that the purchase of a vehicle for the Building Department is in the budget for 2015 and the quoted price is from the State bid listing.

Mrs. Cameron asked if the purchase will be replacing a current vehicle.

Mr. Tuck-Macalla replied that it will be replacing one of the older vehicles either the Durango or one of the pick-up trucks.

Mayor Infeld added that this is part of the normal capital plan to replace vehicles used by the Building Department at a rate of one (1) vehicle per year and that the City is limited to the vehicles listed on the State Purchase Program.

Mr. Sims asked if the city will be done with this scheduled plan of replacing a Building Department vehicle every year once the last replacement is done.

Mayor Infeld responded yes.

MOTION BY MR. ERTEL, SECONDED BY MS. ENGLISH authorizing the purchase of 2015 Ford Fusion S vehicle for Building Department. On roll call, all voted "aye."

F. Motion to Authorize Mayor to Enter into Agreement with Braun & Steidl Architects to Design and Manage Construction of the City of University Heights Community Park

Mr. Pokorny stated that the next step in developing the park is to do the detail design which will lead to taking bids and then to the construction of the park. The detail design involves many different services, such as; creating storm sewer construction designs, sanitary sewers, water services, landscaping, etc., it also includes landscape architects (paths, pavilions, landscaping, playground equipment, etc.). Once a design consultant is chosen to provide all those designs the City can go out for bids.

Mr. Pokorny added that in January the City put out a request for proposals (RFP's) to have consultants provide their proposals. Two (2) proposals were received; Braun & Steidl Architects and Knight & Stolar Inc. Mr. Pokorny noted that in both proposals a team concept was used, thus neither company would be the sole architect nor designer but would serve as the lead.

Braun & Steidl Architects proposed using Behnke as their Landscape Architecture, Stephen Hovancsek as their Survey and Design Consultant.

Knight & Stolar proposed using CBLH as their Design Group, Kirpenske for their engineering and Dempsey as their Surveyor.

Mr. Pokorny stated that both firms were reviewed, several questions were asked and then both firms were brought in for interviews. Following the interview process each firm was graded and concluded with the recommendation for Braun & Steidl. Mr. Pokorny noted that both firms are well qualified, but the responses from Braun & Steidl more closely followed the request for proposal. Mr. Pokorny explained the types of questions that the firms were asked during their interviews and recommended that Braun & Steidl be selected to Design and Manage Construction of the City of University Heights Community Park in the amount of \$132,353.00.

Mr. Sims noted that he liked Braun & Steidl because they are female owned but was disappointed that out of all the various areas of sub-support neither firm was able to suggest/recommend a minority owned business.

Mr. Pokorny replied that neither one provided that in their proposal other than female business enterprises.

Mr. Sims added that he didn't want the park project to start out in that manner. If Braun & Steidl is selected and as we get into the larger park project he thought it would be very important that as a City that the involvement of minority owned businesses is stressed because it is as important as any other involvement.

Mrs. Pardee noted her disappointment that only two firms bid because of all the landscape architects in surrounding counties even though a number of specific organizations were approached as well as the firm that took out a packet didn't bid.

Mr. Pokorny stated that he couldn't answer that but the City did its best to get the information out, via newspaper, City website and was posted by Builders Exchange.

Mrs. Pardee added that Knight & Stolar actually had the lower bid by \$303 so when you talk about quality of previous work and similarity to other work what is most important; manage the services, create the design. What did Knight & Stolar indicate they had done and who made up the panel for the interviews.

Mr. Pokorny replied they indicated they had done park design. The two firms were very equal in dollar amounts, but remember the dollar is an estimate based on engineering. The interviews were held with Mayor Infeld, Joe Ciuni, Eric Tuck-Macalla, Larry Heiser and himself.

Mr. Ciuni commented that both firms looked excellent on paper. The panel felt the team with Behnke was a stronger team because they done so many more parks.

Mr. Sims asked if when the City went out for proposals was there an estimate established for what the work should cost.

Mr. Ciuni replied that in the RFP that there is a total budget of \$1.8 million which includes engineering cost and architectural fees.

Mr. Pokorny stated that the City did not provide an exclusive architectural budget. As part of the request for proposal each proposer was provided the nearest estimate for the park and that was \$160,151.

Mr. Ertel noted that he too was initially disappointed that there were only two firms but in looking at Braun & Steidl in conjunction with Behnke they had a nice proposal packet. Mr. Ertel stated he was pleased overall and thought Braun & Steidl was a good selection.

Mr. Wiseman stated that he was struggling with this and stated – "I sat through the meeting with Braun & Steidl and I have no doubt that they wowed the interview committee probably because they sent the whole summer listening to and dealing with the City and understanding exactly everything the City was looking for. So, in that respect I think that they sort of/probably had a leg up on things. We had some chance to interact with Braun & Steidl as they were doing this, I myself was not so satisfied and the last thing that I remember is that the week before we voted/ or the meeting before we voted about the bond we asked a Braun & Steidl representative to come and address us and speak with us about the numbers in the park and the response that we received was had something to do with whether or not we were going to vote on the contract where they had already been paid. Which was a issue that I thought had nothing to do with the numbers in the bond and I was a little surprised that we had to vote on that, having them refuse to come in and address Council, and at least one of them lives probably a couple miles away - so I'm just struggling to understand how as this park goes forward if anybody on Council wants the architects to be, to interact with us, or to cooperate with us. That we're not going to get the same kind of response which I found to be not entirely appropriate for the body that was sort of overseeing this. And, that really my big concern now, that they are going to get this and anybody from Council who has (causes) with them is going to be met with the same kind of sort of attitude. I would like to think that the members of Council are going to have some meaningful dialogue discourse and/or input with the architect to/who coordinates this job and what keeps going around in my mind is that the fact that they refused to come here to talk to us before we voted on the bond."

Mayor Infeld responded that that was not her my recollection – what happened was there were questions over the summer about the contract that had been entered into with Braun & Steidl, that contract provided for a certain number of meetings with the community, a certain number of meetings where they would come to report to the Council, and again to the community and they had for filled everything in their contract and I believe it was Mr. Wiseman who wanted them to come in and talk about what they had submitted. It was not refusal on their part, the contract had ended. And so it was really up at that point a decision of the Council, the Law Director at that time asked the Council to ratify the contract, which the Council did not do, but they (Braun & Steidl) had performed the work and the work was supposed to be to develop a concept plan that is posted over there on the easel which is what they did. Besides just being a posting board on a easel the concept plan was also a written document that included the engineering cost and much more information. The engineering costs that were submitted as part of the proposal were sent to Council today by email after a question from Mrs. Pardee. Regarding the characterization that Mr. Wiseman attributed that Braun & Steidl refused; the contract was over and there was nothing to talk about at that point because the concept was already extant and had been delivered. They actually finished the contract and delivered what they said they would do. Mayor Infeld continued and stated "In this case, we have a situation where many firms were contacted and also contacted

us (City) for information in some cases some of their joined together into the two proposals that we got, which definitely narrowed the field from the original eight or so firms. And so what we have is proposals from two different firms that were frankly different.” Again, as Mr. Ciuni had said, there was one member of one of the teams who’s got extensive park development experience, this is a park. His park development experience is local and easily viewable and so that was basically the tipping point between two firms that were pretty similar, but one made a presentation that was much more of an emphasis on park development then the other presentation. And that was pretty much the difference. The costs were pretty much the same and so that was why the recommendation was made and why they are here before you (council) tonight, to explain how this decision was made.

Mrs. Cameron noted that she had recollections as well, and her recollection was that in February she was asked to participate in an ongoing update type of meeting with Braun & Steidl. At the meeting on or about February 11 she was advised of where they were in developing their plan or their concept idea for the park. And as part of that meeting she inquired with the representative as to the cost involved. The representative did not answer but the Mayor answered that there were no cost yet provided because they weren’t in the process of compiling all the data that they had received from our meetings, the meetings with our citizens, so that there were no cost. Then in May the project concept was presented, giving an idea of what the cost were, but then we were later told that in fact Braun & Steidl had provided a January 13 memo to the City to explain a general idea of what the cost were. Mrs. Cameron stated that information was not given to her at the February 11 meeting and in fact Council as a whole did not receive that information until May and then we’re expected to vote on their project in June. As it relates to who asked them to appear, it was not solely Mr. Wiseman who asked them to appear, but other members of Council asked them to appear as well and even suggested that they be paid and we talked with Finance Director about the cost involved with paying them to come and provide Council with more information about the cost involved in the project prior to us even considering the bond issue. So for these reasons Mrs. Cameron said she had some concerns that they would not be responsive to her since she was one of the people who expected to have them present. As a representative of the Recreation Committee I expected to have them present to detail to us and to Council what was involved with the project, and the scope of the project. And, as well I wanted to understand why the project itself went from a \$500,000 project to a \$1.7 million project and I simply wanted some information from the people who had conceptually provided us with this outline. Mrs. Cameron noted that for those reasons she was a little concerned and would like to have a copy of the Knight and Stolar information for review.

Mayor Infeld replied that she was concerned about this commentary, there is a proposal in front of the Council the method of obtaining this information has been explained, has been provided. Mayor Infeld acknowledged that she didn’t know what Council’s decision would be, but she reminded the Council that there was a public vote on paying for the construction of this park and the community voted to pay for the construction of this park. Mayor Infeld added that so far she heard in the commentary from a couple of members of Council that they were not happy with the process of the concept plan. Mayor Infeld commented that that is a completely different issue than what is before us tonight. Tonight is fulfilling the wishes of the community to construct a park, again we explained the process, we explained how the proposals were advertised. You have copies of the information that – anybody who pickup a proposal was asked to provide. You also have a explanation as to why the recommendation is what it is.

Discussions ensued on the early planning meetings that were previously held pertaining to the park and the recommendation for Braun & Steidl.

Mrs. Cameron stated she was asked to participate in an ongoing update type of meetings with Braun & Steidl. Mrs. Cameron stated that she tried to obtain their cost in relation to the project prior to the consideration of the bond issue and therefore had concerns of them being responsive to her because she merely wanted and explanation of what was involved in the project and it scope. Mrs. Cameron asked Mr. Pokorny to provide a copy of the Knight & Stolar information for review.

Mr. Pokorny noted that the proposal list that two (2) meetings are to be held by the consultant with Council. If the City would like to add additional meetings that this would be the time to add that if desired. There will also be several meetings with the public.

Mrs. Pardee asked what the timeline of work.

Mr. Pokorny stated that he hopes construction would begin by July. The timeline has to move quickly because the consultant would need to have the design completed and bid in order to start construction in July. The schedule is listed in the proposal.

Mrs. Pardee asked Mayor Infeld what would happen if Braun & Steidl were not approved when voted on tonight what would be the result, would the choice be RFP'd, open up for bids again, etc.

Mayor Infeld stated the recommendation was that the Baun & Steidl proposal was the better one, thus it would not be the Administration's desire to go with the vendor of the proposal didn't recommend. Mayor Infeld read and explained the proposed project schedule.

Mrs. Cameron asked if there were any legal requirements in terms of the bond and when the monies have to begin to be spent.

Mr. Ciuni said yes and that time period is stated within the bond document.

Mr. Ertel stated that this is a very important project for everyone and the council's concerns are warranted to make sure the project is done right and with the uncertainty the project can move forward.

MOTION BY MR. ERTEL, SECONDED BY MR. SIMS authorizing the Mayor to Enter into Agreement with Braun & Steidl Architects to Design and Manage Construction of the City of University Heights Community Park. On roll call, all voted "aye," except Mr. Wiseman and Mrs. Cameron who voted "nay." The motion passed with a 5 to 2 vote.

G. Motion to Authorize Mayor to go out for Bids for 2015 Road Resurfacing Program with the City of Shaker Heights

Mr. Ciuni stated that the City of Shaker Heights has agreed to allow University Heights to join them in receiving joint bids for the 2015 Road Resurfacing Program. Shaker Heights will pay for all the bidding and advertising cost. This year the combined bid with both cities will be about \$1.7 million so hopefully with this being a large project the bid numbers will be better. Shaker wants to open bids before the end of February.

Mayor Infeld provided the streets to be resurfaced as follows: Washington Blvd. (from Warrensville Center to East Carroll); Hillbrook Road (Warrensville Center to Fenwick – this will also include new curbs); Allison Road (including the Nordway Intersection); Westwood Road and the installation of new curbs on Silsby Road (from Warrensville Center to Miramar Blvd.).

Mr. Wiseman asked if the street resurfacing will include curbs going forward.

Mr. Ciuni yes if needed, but curbs should last 50 to 60 years.

Mrs. Pardee asked if there were plans for large patch work to be done.

Mr. Ciuni stated that it depends on the bids and budget.

MOTION BY MRS. PARDEE, SECONDED BY MS. ENGLISH authorizing the Mayor to go out for Bids for 2015 Road Resurfacing Program with the City of Shaker Heights Department. On roll call, all voted "aye."

H. Motion Authorizing the City to Accept Bids for the Replacement of three (3) Bay Doors on the Truck Garage and one (1) Bay Door on the Mechanics Garage

Mr. Pokorny reported that the doors on the truck garage have rusted from the inside to the point where the lower to panel no longer function. The mechanic bay door functions but would need to be replaced in a few months; the bottom panel on the mechanic bay wooden door is rotted also rotted are the side rails. Mr. Pokorny is recommending replacing all the doors at the same time in hope of getting a better price.

Mayor Infeld noted that this is part of the Administration's ongoing maintenance/upkeep of the buildings by making capital improvements when needed.

MOTION BY MR. SIMS, SECONDED BY MRS. ZUCKER authorizing the City to Accept Bids for the Replacement of three (3) Bay Doors on the Truck Garage and one (1) Bay Door on the Mechanics Garage. On roll call, all voted "aye."

I. Motion Authorizing the Mayor to sell 1986 Crane Carrier Rubbish Truck with a 1996 Glider Kit on Gov.deals or sell for scrap value if warranted

Mayor Infeld stated that it is the City's intention to sell the truck for more than the scrap value and if the bids don't rise to be high than the scrap value then it would be sold for scrap value.

Mr. Pokorny stated that the last rubbish truck 21-03 was similar in nature was listed on gov.deals but didn't receive an adequate bid it is worth approximately \$4,000 in scrap value. So the same process will be done with this 1986 Crane Carrier Rubbish Truck. Monies received from the sale of old vehicles goes back into the general fund.

MOTION BY MS. ENGLISH, SECONDED BY MR. ERTEL authorizing the Mayor to sell 1986 Crane Carrier Rubbish Truck with a 1996 Glider Kit on Gov.deals or sell for scrap value if warranted. On roll call, all voted "aye."

J. Motion Authorizing Payment of EDGE Contract Agreement invoice for \$10,847.25 for 2015

Police Chief Hammett stated that University Heights Police Department is part of the Regional EDGE Swat Intervention Team and this is the annual cost. The overall budget for EDGE is a little over \$120,000 and is divided by the five (5) participating agencies. Chief Hammett added that University Heights pays the smallest amount because we have the fewest members with a total of five (5) members of which three are patrol officers. The funds are used for training, equipment, etc. The teams train twice a month and in order to maintain certification members have to attend mandatory training from the National Tactical Officers Association.

Mr. Wiseman asked if there was a report listing the deployments.

Chief Hammett said he would check with the SWAT Team Commander.

Mr. Sims asked what agency is responsible for accounting for the funds, also if the total amount that collected in the aggregate is expended by the program every year. And, if needed would the entire team participate on a maneuver and not just our five members.

Chief Hammett replied South Euclid and that there was a carryover this year, where University Heights didn't spend all its funding. Chief Hammett added that our spending budget varies from year to year depending on what training is needed and how many officers need the training and/or gear. The entire SWAT Team would participate in a maneuver.

Mr. Heiser replied that the Mr. Jim Smith, City of South Euclid sends an accounting to each agency of where all the funds go.

MOTION BY MRS. PARDEE, SECONDED BY MR. SIMS authorizing the Payment of EDGE Contract Agreement invoice for \$10,847.25 for 2015. On roll call, all voted "aye."

K. Motion Authorizing the Purchase of five (5) Police Cars from State Purchase

Chief Hammett provided an overview of the Police Department inventory of vehicles and the choice in the make and model of vehicles used. Chief Hammett stated that three of the five cars will be replacements with the other two cars be added to the fleet as backup when other cars may be out of service.

Mr. Wiseman asked if with the purchase of these five cars is to maintain the current fleet of Police Department cars.

Mrs. Pardee asked if there were any problems with the Ford Interceptor cars and how long are they expected to last.

Chief Hammett responded that there have been minor problems but it was under warranty. The only other choice would be the Chevy Caprice Classic, those are more expensive and there have been issues with them. Unmarked cars last about 10 years, the department tries to keep the marked cars until they become a problem and that is about 4 to 5 years.

Mr. Wiseman commented in relation to a discussion that was held during a meeting last year as decals. Mr. Wiseman asked if there will be some uniformity, will there be decals or will there be the small decals which give the appearance of no decal.

Chief Hammett stated he’s trying to create some sense of uniformity. The cars are marked in conformance with the Ohio Revised Code. The more elaborate the markings are the harder they are to match up from year to year and it can get expensive.

Mr. Wiseman noted that having marked police cars aids as a teaching tool for children.

MOTION BY MR. SIMS, SECONDED BY MS. ENGLISH authorizing the purchase of five (5) Police Cars from State Purchase in the amount of \$136,197. On roll call, all voted “aye.”

L. Motion Authorizing the Mayor to enter into a contract with the Senior Transportation Connection to provide rides for senior citizens in University Heights

Ms. English stated that the Civic Information Committee met prior to this evening Council meeting and recommends that the contract with Senior Transportation Connection be approved for 2015 as presented. The contract is based on a per ride bases, reducing the number of rides from 80 to a total of 60 one-way rides; 50 individual rides and 10 grouped rides. The cost of the City shall be \$25 per individual ride and \$8.50 per group ride. The rider fee shall remain at \$3 per one-way trip. Ms. English added that over the course of 2015 the committee will look at ways to market the service especially the group trips. The committee will also investigate alternative modes of transportation for future transportation purposes.

MOTION BY MS. ENGLISH, SECONDED BY MR. ERTEL authorizing the Mayor to enter into a contract with the Senior Transportation Connection for the year 2015 as presented to provide rides for senior citizens. On roll call, all voted “aye,” except Mr. Sims, who “passed.”

M. Motion to Purchase nine (9) iPads, Keyboard Folio Cases, and AppleCare+ for use by City Council, Law Director and Clerk of Council

Ms. English stated as has been discussed in previous meeting the Civic Information Committee has recommended that Council convert to a electronic packets by using the iPad tablets to receive their packets and view the material at the Council meetings. A \$10,000 appropriation was made to the 2015 budget to purchase 16 iPads the committee recommends that software and warranty be purchased from Apple Inc. under the state purchasing programs for a total of \$5,021.55 to Apple Inc. as follows:

- 9 - iPad Air Tablets, 16GB,Wifi Only - Space Grey @ \$379.00 each.....\$ 3,411.00
- 9 - Keyboard Folio Cases by Logitech - Carbon Black @ \$99.95 each.....\$ 899.55
- 9 - AppleCare+ Warranties @\$79.00 each.....\$ 711.00

The Committee further recommends that software be purchased and downloaded from Apple iTunes Store for a total of \$89.91 as follows:

- 9 – iAnnotate software apps @ \$9.99per unit \$89.91
- 9 – dropbox (file hosting service) – free of charge. \$0.00

The total purchase price of \$5,111.46.

MOTION BY MS. ENGLISH, SECONDED BY MR. WISEMAN authorizing to purchase nine (9) iPads, Keyboard Folio Cases, and AppleCare+ for use by City Council, Law Director and Clerk of Council through the State Purchasing Program in the amount of \$5,021.55 and (9) iAnnotate software apps to be purchased and downloaded from the Apple iTunes Store in the amount of \$89.91 for a total sum of \$5,111.46. On roll call, all voted “aye.”

N. Resolution 2015-02 Adopting a policy for the use of Apple iPad Tablets issued by the City of University Heights to its elected officials and certain staff members (second reading)

Ms. English stated that Resolution 2015-02 was introduced for first reading at the February 2, 2015 Council meeting. The policy establishes provisions for the proper use of City issued iPad tablets.

MOTION BY MS. ENGLISH, SECONDED BY MRS. CAMERON for the passage of Resolution 2015-02 Adopting a policy for the use of Apple iPad Tablets issued by the City of University Heights to its elected officials and certain staff members. On roll call, all voted "aye."

Mr. Wiseman commented that this is a great idea and was glad that the Civic Information Committee along with the Technology Advisory Committee was able to make the recommendations. Mr. Wiseman clarified that the Council is not buying their selves computers. The iPads are more like electronic file cabinets to help Council deal with the information received for Council meetings. The iPads will make it easier to look back at other information and legislation and in the year 2015 anything a municipality can do to make things greener is a great idea. Mr. Wiseman added that he believes the City will recoup the investment in short time saving paper and time.

Mrs. Pardee thanked Ms. English and the Technology Advisory Committee for their hard work. Mrs. Pardee added that she was proud that there are citizens in the community that are willing to volunteer their time and help advise.

O. Motion to hold an executive session immediately following this regular meeting for the purpose of discussing personnel, legal and real estate matters.

Mayor Infeld remarked that there was a need to discuss a litigation matter in executive session with no additional actions being taken.

MOTION BY MRS. PARDEE, SECONDED BY MS. ENGLISH to hold an executive session for the purpose of discussing a litigation matter. On roll call, all voted "aye."

Directors' Reports

There were no director reports.

Mr. Sims noted that he wanted to meet with Building Commissioner Eric Tuck-Macalla to discuss and get a update on some of the items proposed related to the Building Department and the activates of the Building Department.

Standing Committee Reports:


Finance Committee: Chairwoman Susan Pardee reminded everyone that there will be a joint Finance Committee/Financial Advisory meeting on Thursday, February 26, 2015 at 7pm in Council Chambers.

There were no other standing committee reports.


Council entered executive session at 9:26pm

MOTION BY MRS. PARDEE, SECONDED BY MR. WISEMAN to adjourn the meeting. On roll call, all voted "aye."

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 9:39pm.



Susan K. Infeld, Mayor



Kelly M. Thomas, Clerk of Council