

MINUTES OF THE WORK SESSION  
CITY COUNCIL OF CREST HILL  
WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS  
July 11, 2022

The July 11, 2022 City Council work session was called to order by Mayor Raymond R. Soliman at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers, 1610 Plainfield Road Crest Hill, Will County, Illinois.

The following Council members were present: Mayor Raymond Soliman, City Clerk Christine Vershay-Hall, City Treasurer Glen Conklin, Alderman Scott Dyke, Alderman John Vershay, Alderwoman Claudia Gazal, Alderman Darrell Jefferson, Alderperson Tina Oberlin, Alderman Mark Cipiti, Alderman Joe Kubal.

Also present were: Administrator Jim Marino, City Engineer Ron Wiedeman, Finance Director Lisa Banovetz, Economic Developer Tony Budzikowski

Absent were: Alderman Nate Albert, Director of Public Works Mark Siefert, Assistant Public Works Director Blaine Kline, Interim Planner Maura Rigoni, Police Chief Ed Clark, City Attorney Mike Stiff, IT Director Tim Stinnett

**TOPIC: Discuss Council Room Dais Redesign**

Mayor Soliman presented the Discussion on the Council Room Dais Redesign per the memo dated July 11, 2022. City Administrator Marino informed the Council that this was discussed at the June 27, 2022 work session. The architect provided renderings based on what was discussed. We are looking for direction on the paint color and finishes for the dais. Mr. Prybys said that based on comments by the Council, the center of the wall behind the dais would be a different color than the rest of the wall. Some of the renderings show a lighter color carpet than what was originally in place, and the wall would be more of a grey-white paint. The side walls would then be a blue color and accented with some framed photos. Scheme two would use more of the blues, rather than the grey colors. He passed out color samples for the Council to view. Discussion followed on the color options that were presented. Alderwoman Gazal suggested that we start with the carpet color. She felt that we should stay with the same color carpet, because the light color will show more dirt. Alderperson Oberlin also commented that she agrees with using the darker carpet with lighter colors on the walls. Mr. Prybys did not have the carpet samples with him tonight. He also felt that the existing color on the walls is too dark. Alderwoman Gazal suggested staying with the same color scheme as we have in the rest of the building. Administrator Marino asked if the Council wanted to stay with the same carpet color as we previously had. Members of the Council felt that we should stay with the same color, with lighter color walls and make the wall behind the dais a focal point of the room. Mr. Thompson explained that the first renderings show the rear wall with a different color to accent the City logo. Utilizing the different paint colors would be around \$180,000.00. The cost for a different accent material or wood in the center would be \$206,000.00. Alderman Cipiti asked what the price of \$144,000.00 that was discussed at the last work session included. Mr. Thompson explained that was to reuse the existing dais, fix the paneling adjust the height of the dais and add the wings. Alderman Dyke questioned the rendering with the pillars on each side of the logo. Alderperson Oberlin thought that we had decided to add to the design feature at a later date with funds being available. Discussion followed on the color selection. Mr. Thompson explained that they are looking for some direction from the Council on wall color, and carpet color so that they can come back with another rendering.

Alderwoman Gazal and Alderman Dyke liked the bump out on either side of the logo. Alderperson Oberlin would like to see paint and carpet approved now with any additions at a later date. Mayor Soliman likes the wood behind the dais, it looks 1<sup>st</sup> class and more professional.

The Council chose the solid painted wall as shown on page 9, with a bump out on each side of the center logo as depicted on page 14. Mr. Thompson and Mr. Prybys will be back in 2 weeks with the color samples for the paint, carpet, and wood for the dais.

**TOPIC: Discussion and Staff Direction on Outdoor Advertising (Community Digital Displays)**

Mayor Soliman presented the Discussion and Staff Direction on Outdoor Advertising (Community Digital Displays) per the memo dated August 8, 2022. Engineer Wiedeman commented that these are similar to the signs that are being used in other communities. Mr. Przybylski from Community Digital Display which is an advertising company gave a presentation on the background of the company and where they currently have signage located. Information that can be displayed on the digital platform includes, local business advertising, City messages, the ability to provide live/emergency messaging and the time and temperature. Mr. Przybylski explained that they handle every aspect of the sign construction with no cost on behalf of the City. He went over the various sign company organizations they belong to. Mr. Przybylski explained how the signage works and that it is IDOT regulated. If a location on Weber Road or Theodore Street is chosen for the signage, we would have to get a permit from IDOT. We would not need their approval for Caton Farm Road. Each impression runs 24/7 is 10 seconds long per advertisement. The City could put announcements on the board, such as dates and times of Council meetings. The Police Department can tap into the sign for amber alerts or emergency messages. There are various designs that can be done. The digital faces only last 10 years. Every year the company cleans out the area and will plant new vegetation when needed. They also work closely with the area Chamber of Commerce's to get referrals and also work with the non-profits. The company would need to know the proposed locations to determine the height needed for the sign. Also, it would be better to place signs near stop lights. A few locations suggested were Theodore Street, Caton Farm Road, Kubinski Drive and Weber Road. Mr. Przybylski felt the best location would be somewhere along Weber Road. The alternative sites would be on Theodore Street and Gaylord Road or Caton Farm Road and Kubinski Drive. Mayor Soliman questioned the intersection of Rte. 30 and Larkin Avenue. Mr. Przybylski explained that you could not put a sign at this location due to it being part of the scenic byway. The existing signs along there have been grandfathered in. Alderwoman Gazal asked if it is better to have them located at a traffic light. It was. They are most affective where there is a lot of traffic. The Mayor questioned the traffic light at the entrance to Hillcrest. Engineer Wiedeman explained it has to be a minimum of 660' feet from the scenic byway. The sign company will handle all the survey work. Discussion followed on potential sites for the sign placement. Engineer Wiedeman informed the Council that they went over the various location that the sign can be placed. The best location would be at Weber Road and City Center Blvd. Another potential location could be Caton Farm Road at Kubinski Drive. Also, Renwick Road at Rte. 53. Prior to approval of the sign and placement we will have to amend our sign code.

Alderman Vershay asked if we place a sign at the City Center entrance, would it be 2-sided. Mr. Przybylski explained that is would be 2-sided and can have different advertising on each side. We can do up to 30 advertisements in a day. You can program it for a certain block of time to accommodate City messages. Alderman Cipiti asked if there are any

potential sites on Rte. 53. You can't place an advertising sign there as it is a scenic byway. Alderperson Oberlin questioned the City having a slot and how this would work. You would have the ability to designate a certain slot, or time of day when you want a city message to appear. The City would also be able to contact the company and Community Digital would change the advertising as requested. Watchfire is the off sight company that monitors these signs and does repair work usually within 24hrs. Engineer Wiedeman has worked with Watchfire before, and they are a good company. Alderperson Oberlin asked to verify that these signs will not cost the city any money. The City will have an advertising slot. Community Digital would like a 20-year agreement. The company solicits for advertising on these signs. All electrical is underground. Alderwoman Gazal questioned the height of the existing sign in Romeville to the north of us. Mr. Przybylski explained that there had been an existing sign in this spot, and they utilized that location. Per the lease agreement there are certain restrictions. Alderman Vershay asked if there are certain restrictions we have on the size and height of the sign. Engineer Wiedeman said that we will have to review the ordinance. Mayor Soliman asked if there are any restriction on what is advertised. They don't advertise anything that is prohibited in the zoning ordinance. It must be clean advertising and they cannot have any motion or flashing lights on the signs, as this would cause a distraction to drivers. Alderman Cipiti liked the idea of the sign by the City Center. He asked if we could do some further research at Larkin and Rte. 30. He does not care for the sign location at Theodore and Gaylord. He felt it should be in a more commercial area. Discussion followed on the traffic flow along Weber Road and the size of the signage. Alderman Vershay asked if this sign could be considered a road hazard as it could distract drivers. Mr. Przybylski explained that there have been detailed traffic studies done on this type of signage. IDOT would not allow the signs if there was a problem. The signs are controlled by a computer and the brightness of the lighting can be adjusted. The signs also help promote business and could increase the sales tax for the City. Alderwoman Gazal asked if any of the Municipalities have received funding for these signs. They have not.

Mayor Soliman asked for an informal vote on Discussion and Staff Direction on Outdoor Advertising (Community Digital Displays). All members present were in agreement. Alderwoman Gazal asked if the Council would have input into the design of the sign. They would.

**TOPIC: Discussion and Selection of City Welcome Sign Concept**

Mayor Soliman presented Discussion and Selection of City Welcome Sign Concept per the memo dated August 8, 2022.

Engineer Wiedeman commented that there was a request to bring back the sign concepts. There are a few sites that have been removed from the list. Option 1B was the Council's choice. The cost estimate has been updated. Engineer Wiedeman went over the size of the Public Works sign.

Alderperson Oberlin explained that she doesn't remember the Public Works signage coming before the Council for approval. Several other members also stated that they were unaware of the sign purchase for Public Works. The sign was purchased 6 to 8 months ago and was put in place 2 weeks ago. Engineer Wiedeman explained that this is the type of stone that we were thinking about and is depicted in concept 2. It is 6' at the base and 5' tall. Engineer Wiedeman went over the costs related to the sign for a total of \$9,100.00. The signs in the concepts that were discussed by the Council (1B) are 15' wide and 8' tall and cost around \$16,500.00 per sign. We can adjust the size of the sign. The cost for

concept 2 which was the stone has gone up 2 and ½ times. Alderperson Oberlin commented that we should go with a stone sign, since it will last longer, and it will continue with the theme from Public Works. Engineer Wiedeman felt that we should go with concept B-1 for the primary signs and concept 2 for the secondary signs. We could use the stone for the base of the primary signs. Alderwoman Oberlin still felt that the stone sign would last longer. Alderman Kubal said that with the proposed message signs coming in we may not need all of these signs. Engineer Wiedeman said that we will have to get easement agreements for several of the locations. Discussion followed on easements. Engineer Wiedeman is asking what direction and what concept the Council would like to go with. Alderwoman Gaza likes the concept with the stone sign. These signs have been budgeted for over several years. We have budgeted \$143,000.00 to get the easements, design plans and then to bid out what we need to. The main signs would be \$16,500.00 each for the sign only. Engineer Wiedeman went over the proposed locations of the main signs. The cost for the secondary signs, all stone would be \$227,500.00. It would be \$249,200.00 if we chose all metal signs. Mayor Soliman commented that any signs placed at City owned buildings would include the address on them. Engineer Wiedeman said that we can do the secondary signs similar to what has been placed at the Public Works Building. Mayor Soliman informed the Council that a previous Police Chief had suggested honoring our Officers that were lost in the line of duty with a stone placed by the new building stating "James Nink, Tim Simenson Law Enforcement Center." Alderperson Oberlin is not against this, but that is why we have the Police Memorial as part of the garden. What happens if we lost another Officer in the line of duty in the future. Mayor Soliman felt that the name could be added in both places. As far as the cost of the secondary signs, could we save on the cost by installing them ourselves. The Council was not in favor of this. Administrator Marino will check into the cost saving if we do the installation in house. Engineer Wiedeman asked to confirm that we are going with concept 2 for the primary signs and a sign similar to the one at the Public Works facility for the secondary locations. What design is the Council looking at for the City owned properties.

Mayor Soliman asked for an informal vote on Concept 2 for the five primary locations. Five members of the Council chose Concept 2. Alderman Vershay and Kubal chose concept 1B.

Mayor Soliman asked for an informal vote on Secondary Signs similar to the existing stone sign at Public Works. Council agrees.

Mayor Soliman announced that there were two letters left on the dais for the Council. The County will be addressing this continuing issue for the Caton Farm Road bridge proposal on Thursday. The Mayor and Engineer attended a meeting a month ago with the City's that would be involved in this proposed project. It would be expensive for the City to take part in what they are proposing to do. Engineer Wiedeman gave a presentation on the meeting that they attended. The phase 1 study cannot be completed as no one wants to sponsor the bridge. The County has approached the FHWA. There was a grant that they used to do the phase 1 study. The FHWA turned the study into a PEL. It shelves the project. If someone wants to come in at a later date to continue with the bridge project, it saves the information that they can access. The Mayor informed the Council that the total cost of the project is \$600 million dollars. Engineer Weideman said our portion would be \$140 million dollars. Lockport would like phase 1 finished due to the improvements shown in the study. The response that was made to Will County is that we cannot afford this project. This should be a State or Federal project, not the local communities. Alderperson Oberlin said that many years when this was discussed, someone had suggested cul-de-sacking Gaylord Road

because it would cause too much traffic on the new bridge. You would be taking away a main artery through our city. Engineer Wiedeman explained that proposals show improvements that go all the way to the six corner intersection in the City. He felt that it should stop at Rte. 53., create a new intersection west of there to take you to Weber to Rte. 30. Discussion followed. Engineer Wiedeman felt that the bridge is a good idea, but not with us sponsoring it. The Mayor explained that the County and communities are not interested in sponsoring this project. Alderman Vershay asked where the bridge would be located. Discussion followed on the location which would be near Caton Farm Road. Alderman Vershay asked how close would this come to the treatment plant. Engineer Wiedeman said that it would go over the top of the plant. Alderwoman Gazal asked if the State representative have been contacted regarding this. Mayor Soliman explained that IDOT recently changed the rules in regard to funding. Someone has to take responsibility to sponsor the project to get federal funds. This project has been in discussion since the 1970's. Alderman Vershay asked if this would go over to Bruce Road. It would go to Gouger Road and Rte. 7.

Mayor Soliman asked if the Council had a problem with him affixing his signature to the response letter. They did not. The letter would be sent to Will County DOT.

#### **TOPIC: Adult Use Recreational Cannabis Discussion**

Mayor Soliman presented the Adult-Use Cannabis-Discussion per the memo dated July 11, 2022. Community & Economic Development Director Tony Budzikowski stated this was a topic that was brought up during discussions on the budget. We would need to do a text amendment for a special use to allow a dispensary and also create a license requirement. Local municipalities are only issuing 1 license and there are a limited number allowed per the State. When the dispensaries were first proposed there were issues with parking and traffic. This should be factored into the decision along with the potential location. Alderperson Oberlin commented that the store in Joliet always has cars in their parking lot. The license fee for most municipalities is \$400,000.00. Alderman Kubal asked for the Chiefs input. Chief Clark commented that a portion of the revenue could be set aside for traffic safety and impaired driving. Alderperson Oberlin felt that this revenue could be used to benefit the City, for example funding road work. Alderwoman Gazal said that as long as this would not be located near any schools, residential areas, or day care facilities. Director Budzikowski explained that we would take a look at the zoning map to identify where these facilities could be located. Alderwoman Gazal asked what type of revenue would the City get back. It would be 3 to 5% of the sales. Alderman Cipiti is in favor of this since it would bring in revenue for the city. Alderwoman Gaza asked how we go about getting a dispensary in the City. Director Budzikowski suggested meeting with one of the dispensaries to find out what the procedure was they had to go through. Alderman Jefferson commented that Cook County made \$600,000.00 revenue in a month's time. He would be in favor of having one in the City and would like the Chiefs comments taken into consideration. Alderman Vershay was not in favor of it. We will need extra Police presence at the site and often the extra revenue isn't worth the headaches they cause. Alderman Dyke had no issues with this. Mayor Soliman said initially everyone thought that the dispensaries were going to increase crime in the areas, but that has not been the case. He would like to see us move ahead with this.

#### **TOPIC: Discussion on Ordinance #1689**

Mayor Soliman presented Discussion on Ordinance #1689 per the memo dated July 11, 2022. Treasurer Conklin explained that some things that have happened in the past and he would like to revisit this ordinance. Six months ago the Finance Director discovered that

we had gone over budget on our Public Works facility. At the time we were dealing with the absence of the past director and had some one here in the interim. A call was made to the previous Finance Director and Administrator questioning these finances. The information that was discovered was not shared with the Council. Treasurer Conklin would like to segregate some duties, so that we don't run into this type of situation again.

Treasurer Conklin then cited section 2.26.01. the last sentence in that paragraph would be changes from Administrator to Treasurer. There is also discussion on going to monthly billing and he would like this subject tabled for consideration regarding staffing. Under section 2.26.030, he would like an additional section for a separate account for any projects over one million dollars and to be monitored, recorded with reports provided to the Council. He would also like an additional section to inform the Council, Treasurer, Administrator and Mayor if a project exceeds budget on any capital project. Also we need to make a correction on the website from 941% to just 941. This is spelled out in item "F" in the ordinance. Treasurer Conklin is seeking Council input and concurrence on these changes to ordinance #1689. Alderperson Oberlin was not in favor of the original ordinance but went along with it because the Treasurer agreed to it. She feels that the Treasurer should be in charge of the money and supports the changes. The Council should be aware of what is going on with these projects and kept informed. Alderman Vershay also feels that the Treasurer should be in charge of their office. Alderman Dyke agrees that the Treasurer should be in charge of their office. Alderman Kubal asked Administrator Marino if he was in favor of this change. He commented that he is not and that he just became aware of this request. Treasurer Conklin is not looking to take over, but to be open a pathway for communication. The Director of Finance reports to the Administrator and it appears in the past that this either did not happen or the information was not forwarded to the Council. Alderwoman Gazal commented there is a reason why people elected a Treasurer. She did not agree with the changes that were made to the ordinance in the past. The Treasurer should not have to be supervised and when the Council asks for information they should not have to wait for the Treasurer to get permission to give it to them. She understands that in the past the Treasurer relinquished the supervision of the Office to the Finance Director for the betterment of the City. But it is time to give some of those duties back to the Treasurer. Alderman Cipiti also supports the request of the Treasurer. Who would the Finance Department then answer to. Treasurer Conklin explained that they would still answer to the Finance Director. We have an employee who has a master's in HR, and he wants to make sure that the employees is not being utilized in a role that is not part of their job description. Alderman Jefferson supports the Treasurers request since it is his fiduciary duty as an elected official. Alderman Kubal explained that he doesn't have an understanding of who's responsible for what duties at this time and doesn't feel he can make a decision without further information. Alderman Kubal asked if the main change was for the Finance Director to report to the Treasurer rather than the Administrator. It was, along with a few other changes, such as making sure that pertinent information is given directly to the Council. For example, if a Council member wanted to ask questions on City finances, they could go directly to the Treasurer or Finance Director. Alderman Kubal felt that you could be confusing the line of communication and adding an element. Treasurer Conklin explained that in the past information went to the Administrator and was taken no further. That is what we are looking to eliminate. If there is any type of stalemate between the Treasurer and Administrator then it would come to the Council for their decision. Alderman Kubal felt that part of the past problem was that the prior Administrator and Finance Director were inexperienced. Alderman Kubal asked the Finance Director if she had a problem with the proposed change. Director Banovetz said that if she had a problem she could address it to the Treasure. She is not aware of how this worked with the previous staff. Alderman Vershay said that the Treasurer is elected and should be

responsible for all of the duties of that position. Alderperson Oberlin said that she remembers when this ordinance was changed. At that time she asked if it could be reversed and was told yes. She would like this on the next agenda to be amended. Treasurer Conklin would like to discuss the changes with the Administrator. He asked how they would like to set up accounts for capital projects over \$1 million dollars, so that they can be monitored by the Finance Director. Alderman Jefferson thought a million was too high. Discussion followed. The majority of the Council would like to start with a half a million and work from there. Treasurer Conklin explained that anytime we exceeded the budget, Council and necessary staff would be informed on Capital projects. The Mayor said that when this original ordinance was passed it was by a unanimous vote. He would like to see the City Attorney go over the amendment to the ordinance. Treasurer Conklin stated at the time the original ordinance was passed, he was also in favor of it. Alderwoman Gazal asked the Mayor for his opinion. The Mayor felt that the Attorney should look the ordinance amendment over. Alderman Cipiti asked if we are requesting that we revert back to what was in place before the ordinance was adopted. Alderperson Oberlin commented that this should be on the next agenda with no delay. Alderwoman Gazal asked if this will be up at the next meeting. The Mayor feels that the Attorney needs to review the request. The Treasurer felt that if there is no problem with the changes then it should be on the next agenda. Alderman Cipiti reminded the Council that the representative from IML indicated we should have the Attorney at work sessions and Council meeting to address any issues that may come up. The Treasurer explained that he would like to see the Attorney directed to codify this ordinance versus trying to find a problem with it. There was no problem with it being in place prior to, and there should be no problem to change it. The Treasurer said if there is a problem, he will contact someone he knows with a back ground in Municipal law. Alderman Vershay said we're not making changes, just giving authority back to the Treasurer. Alderperson Oberlin stated as a Council member, she requests that the amendment be drawn up and placed on the next regular agenda. The majority of the Council agreed. Administrator Marino asked who would be responsible to direct the Attorney to have this drawn up for the next Council meeting. Alderperson Oberlin asked that the Administrator contact the Attorney to amend the ordinance as requested by the Council.

**TOPIC: Assistant Administrator Position**

Mayor Soliman presented a request for the Assistant City Administrator Position per the memo dated July 11, 2021. Administrator Marino informed the Council that this was discussed earlier this year when the Council chose to eliminate the HR Director position. The majority of the work would be HR related. The Council received a memo encompassing the job duties. This position was discussed at the budget meetings. Once the position is created, then he would contact GOVHR to start the interview and hiring process. Alderwoman Gazal stated she asked for a comprehensive staffing plan several months ago and as of today has not received it. Also, when this position was first discussed it came in at \$97,000.00. This has now increased to \$110,000.00 up to \$125,000.00. Alderperson Oberlin asked what the previous Assistant Manager was paid, It was under \$100,000.00. Administrator Marino explained that this salary range is in comparison to other municipalities. Alderwoman Gazal would still like to see the staffing plan. Administrator Marino explained that this was presented during budget discussions. Alderwoman Gazal would also like to know why the clerical help was taken off the agenda. If we bring in an Assistant Administrator with HR experience, how is this going to be phrased since we eliminated the HR Director position. She is also concerned about the salary. The Administrator explained that this is what a similar position pays in other municipalities. A large part of the position relates to human resources, along with other responsibilities as well. Alderwoman Gazal questioned the salary. The Administrator explained that we

prorated the salary because the person wouldn't be here for an entire 12 months. Alderwoman Gazal asked if we even need a full time person at this time and what are the Administrators responsibilities. Administrator Marino said that he has a lot of duties. Our previous Administrators did not have an Assistant Administrators they handled everything on their own. Also, why are we stopping the Clerk from hiring additional staff and why are we giving staff HR duties when that's not their jobs. Alderman Cipiti thought that when this was originally brought up, the Council was told that the Administrator needed to look into additional staffing and how things are working. Has this been done. Administrator Marino has not done this. He is not sure the offices are understaffed because he has not had time to do an evaluation. If the Council wants more staff hired, he will do it, but it is his responsibility is to assess the needs, responsibilities and make the operations more efficient and reassigning job duties. At this time there are issues that he is having to deal with such as the City Center and Public Works facility. Because we don't have an HR person anymore, many of those responsibilities have fall in on him or other staff members. Part of what an Assistant Administrator would do an evaluation of what the current HR needs, and staffing needs are. Alderman Kubal thought that this had already been decided on. This person would take over the Administrator position if necessary in the future. Also, he sees where the Administrator is dealing with a number of things that are currently going on and we also need someone to step in when the Administrator goes on vacation. Discussion followed on who would take care of the daily operations of the City if the Administrator were out of the office. Members of the Council felt it was the Mayors responsibility. Alderperson Oberlin would like to know what HR items need to be done. Administrator Marino said that question is what HR items are not getting done because you don't have staff to do it. Some of the items are conducting Civil Service meetings, union contract negotiations with the Police and Sergeants. City wide training programs, and personnel initiatives and management improvements. Alderman Vershay questioned the Civil Service and the lists. They create the lists, and you hire from those. The Mayor explained that when Ms. Fulara was here she worked with Civil Service to assist them in creating the lists. The Mayor said that she had worked with Attorney Kelly and got everything set up. Alderwoman Gazal said that eventually we will need someone in HR. Do we have a need to hire someone in the Clerk's Office and Finance. She asked who is handling IMRF. It used to be Renee, but it is now a staff member, who also handles, payroll, monthly and quarterly reports. Can we ask the Attorney about hiring a part-time HR person. The Administrator indicated that you could ask the Attorney anything you want. Alderwoman Gazal stated that she would like us to figure out what our goals are going to be for the staffing plan. She thought that we had budgeted for an Assistant Administrator, a Clerk, Public Works, and Police. Discussion followed on the salary for the Assistant Administrator. We need to see what is in the future in regard to the budget. Also, we are going to be short another person in the Clerk's Office due to retirement. This person could leave here any day. Do we have anything in writing showing the retirement date. Clerk Vershay-Hall informed the Council that the employee only has to give a two week notice. Alderwoman Gazal feels that we are putting pressure on the staff and giving them extra duties. Treasurer Conklin is concerned over the some of the HR duties in the Finance Department, and the possibility of going to monthly billing. Alderwoman Gazal can't justify the salary for the Assistant Administrator. The Administrator explained that what dictates the salary is the market. This is a standard job description and salary for this position to get a qualified individual. This is similar to the position the Administrator previously held. Alderwoman Gazal would like to see the information to back up this position. Treasurer Conklin said that Ms. Fulara was the HR Director and acted as the Assistant Administrator in their absence. Discussion followed on the salary. Alderman



Kubal said that we need to find someone that has a background in government. Mayor Soliman felt that you are going to have to offer a candidate the market value of the position.

Mayor Soliman asked for an informal vote on the Assistant Administrator Position. Alderman Kubal and Alderman Dyke voted yes. Alderman Cipiti would like to see the hiring done in offices that are under staffed. Alderperson Oberlin was undecided. Alderwoman Gazal voted no, until she gets the information she requested. Alderman Jefferson agreed with Alderman Cipiti, he would like more information. Alderman Vershay voted no. Alderwoman Gazal suggested getting a staffing study done by the next work session so that we can discuss this further and make the best decision.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:** There were no public comments.

**MAYORS UPDATES:**

Mayor Soliman announced that the City received the certificate for achievement for fiscal reporting. He commended the City Staff for a job well done.

Mayor Soliman addressed the Council in regard to the incident that happened last night. There will be a hearing coming up this week or next week on it. The liquor license has been suspended and currently they can only serve food. The Mayor will keep the Council updated.

**COMMITTEE/LIAISON UPDATES:**

There were no committee/liaison updates.

**CITY ADMINISTRATOR UPDATES:**

The City Administrator had no further comments.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:16 p.m.

Approved this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2022

As presented \_\_\_\_\_

As amended \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
CHRISTINE VERSHAY-HALL, CITY CLERK

\_\_\_\_\_  
RAYMOND R. SOLIMAN, MAYOR