

**CITY OF NEWARK
DELAWARE**

COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

August 5, 2019

Those present at 7:00 p.m.:

Presiding: Mayor Jerry Clifton
Deputy Mayor Stu Markham
District 1, James Horning
District 2, Sharon Hughes (arrived at 7:40 p.m.)
District 3, Jen Wallace
District 4, Chris Hamilton
District 5, Jason Lawhorn

Staff Members: City Manager Tom Coleman
City Secretary Renee Bensley
City Solicitor Paul Bilodeau
Assistant to the Manager Jeff Martindale
Chief Communications Officer Kevin Liedel
Chief Paul Tiernan, NPD
Deputy Chief Kevin Feeney, NPD
Captain Michael Van Campen, NPD
Clerk of the Court Terri Conover
Code Enforcement Manager Stephanie Petersen
Planner Mike Fortner
Planner Tom Fruehstorfer
Electric Director Bhadresh Patel
Finance Director David Del Grande
IT Infrastructure Manager James Reazor
IT Applications Manager Daina Montgomery
Parking Manager Marvin Howard
Parks and Recreation Director Joe Spadafino
Public Works and Water Resources Director Tim Filasky
Deputy Public Works and Water Resources Director Ethan Robinson

1. Mr. Clifton called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

2. **SILENT MEDITATION & PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Mr. Clifton asked for a moment of silence and the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. 1. **FINANCIAL STATEMENT:** None

4. 2. **SPECIAL DEPARTMENT REPORTS:**

A. Efficiency Smart Presentation and Direction to Staff – City Manager (30 minutes)

01:11

Mr. Coleman reminded all that when Council approved the forward progression of the Efficiency Smart Program it was with the understanding that the matter return to Council to discuss the final plan design. Mr. Coleman noted that Emily Green from DEMEC and Tom Coyle from Efficiency Smart were available to answer questions specific to the program that he and Mr. Del Grande may not be able to answer.

Mr. Del Grande reported the Efficiency Smart Program was created through DEMEC to help the nine communities within DEMEC's purview reach economic goals and efficiency while helping residents and commercial customers within the City by promoting the use of efficient products within the City to help save money on their electric bill.

Mr. Del Grande reported the cost of the three-year plan is paid by DEMEC and no fee is charged to any resident or commercial customer if they are a member of the program. It provides a tool to help the City's electric customers and little or no time is added to City staff's workload through this program.

The Residential Program includes the following programs:

- LED Markdown Program which is a partnership with several retailers to sell LED bulbs for 99 cents each. The business would not purchase the lights themselves but would receive them and the retailer would keep the 99 cents.
- PLUG Load Meter Loan Program would allow City residents to borrow a plug load meter to see how much electricity each of their appliances or other devices use. Shipping and return of the borrowed meter are provided free of charge. Use of the device allows the resident consumer to provide comparisons to averages and identifies ways for residents to conserve electric.
- Online Product Store (www.energysmart.org) would be included on the City's website and residents can save on products to help reduce home energy use. Products include advanced thermostats, LEDs and advanced power strips. Available rebates will be built into pricing requiring no additional application forms.
- Outreach and assistance would reach the City's vulnerable populations by partnering with local agencies to provide services to seniors and lower income residents to provide information as well as LEDs to help lower their electric bills. Outreach and assistance will also be used to assist in identifying high winter electric users to promote incentives or promotions to assist them with their usage and to users with high bills (launching Fall 2019). The program is designed to help residential customers engage directly with the Efficiency Smart customer support team to troubleshoot high electric bills due to higher than normal electric use; and to help these customers understand their energy use, diagnose the causes of the high use and provide potential solutions to help them lower their electric use.
- Rebates encourage the purchase of energy efficient products. The list could change from year to year as each product type has a limited quantity per customer per year to be rebated. Additions to the list currently offered by Efficiency Smart could be added by using Green Energy funds. In consideration of this, staff recommended using current offerings for one year prior to enhancing the program and staff would return to Council before further modifications.

There were numerous rebates available for a variety of products with increasing rebates offered for larger products. Some rebates required a form to be filled out to receive the rebate. The offer was limited to two thermostats per year and one per year for refrigerators and washers and dryers.

The Large Commercial and Industrial Program included the following programs:

- Account Management included a dedicated account manager to work with companies to introduce the program, walk them through the process and provide basic assistance.
- Qualified projects would also receive incentives for LED lights, compressed air, HVAC variable drives, etc.
- Technical Assistance included technical walk-throughs to identify potential projects, energy savings and cost benefits analysis, utility bill analysis, equipment-specific electrical usage metering, project scope and savings evaluation, and detailed analysis of AMI data to identify trends or peak demand triggers

Mr. Clifton opened the discussion to questions from the table.

Mr. Hamilton asked how many light bulbs a consumer would be able to purchase at a hardware store. Mr. Coyle reported the bulbs would be provided to smaller locally owned businesses unlike a Home Depot. The objective was to encourage traffic to that small business. The current incentive allowed the consumer to purchase 8 LED bulbs per visit to the store. Mr. Hamilton thought it was critical to check the identification to ensure the people purchasing the bulbs were Newark residents. He asked how the local stores would be educated to know that even though a piece of identification stated "Newark" that it may not be within City limits. Mr. Coyle stated identification is not checked during the purchase and noted the savings that is claimed against the LED bulbs is greatly reduced and they expect "cost spillovers" meaning they would expect that a non-resident to come into the City and purchase LED bulbs. The hope is to use businesses towards the center of town to limit some of those purchases. Mr. Del Grande suggested requiring the recipient of the light bulb to present a Newark electric bill. Mr. Coyle said the reason this is not done because it puts a lot of onus on the store owner and he noted they are trying to encourage a partnership and make it easier for the business, so they welcome the program. He noted they have had a similar program where Bowling Green State University is located, and this has not been an issue.

Mr. Hamilton asked if the rebate limit applied to one appliance or one refrigerator per year. Mr. Coyle said it would be one refrigerator per year per house.

Mr. Markham asked there was an example other than a hardware store that would use this program in the City. Mr. Coyle said they can be available anywhere from a bike shop to hardware stores and even grocery stores.

Mr. Markham asked if the information would be used from the smart meters to help identify the high winter electric bills. Mr. Del Grande said it would be a combination of both smart meter data and self-identification. Mr. Markham reminded all during the installation process of the Smart Meters there were residents that expressed concern about privacy issues and the City said they would never use that information. He cautioned about using the information for this process.

Mr. Markham asked if there was a “top percentage” of high users that would be addressed in terms of residential usage throughout the City and he asked how high electric use would be defined. Mr. Coyle said it would be set up through the utility office and would kick in following a phone call from a resident expressing concern about a high bill. The Newark website would be noted on the informational packet and have the phone number of the Efficiency Smart office addressing the concern. The resident would then call the number and they would be assisted by identifying what would cause their problem and then educate them on ways they could address the high bill through no cost or low-cost programs or using the available rebates.

Mr. Markham mentioned he had a geothermal heat pump and has LED bulbs as well, so he is well familiar with the efficiency processes. He said he did not understand the difference between a high winter electric identification program and a high bill service program. Mr. Coyle said the high winter electric bill program is just the proprietary software they use to divide up the utility data to help identify people. It did not have to be used and noted only approximately one-third of their communities utilized it. Therefore, it allowed the City to be proactive and reach out to people. They took the information and, for example, identified the top 50 people that seemed to use a lot of winter electric. The City could then respond if there was a specific reason why that could be. The City would then be able to do outreach to those high usage customers if desired. Efficiency Smart would not outreach to residents directly strictly because of privacy constraints.

Mr. Markham noted residents may choose to opt in who want to have the analysis done. He pointed out residents with fewer financial resources had the most opportunity for savings, but he was uncertain how those residents would be identified. Mr. Coyle noted there were different ways to identify people, which could include identifying agencies already in place that had reached out with offers of support. Those residents could then be offered the LEDs or the other incentives or rebates. He noted the importance of putting the discounted LEDs in neighborhood stores that may cater to residents. Even though the store may not be ideal, the location may be because it had traffic from a specific neighborhood.

Mr. Markham asked that the Newark Housing Authority be included on the list as well. He noted, regarding the rebate program, the list was paid for by the program not by Green Energy Funds from the City of Newark. He noted it would be nice if the small business program had an analysis, review and proposal if some of the residential properties with bigger issues could also have something like that available. Mr. Coyle noted in earlier meetings with Mr. Coleman and Mr. Del Grande this was discussed including landlord outreach for those who had multifamily or even single family. He noted in most communities, landlords owned a lot of different properties and there were some that had bigger issues than others. The thought was to have a plan to have them help their residents. Mr. Markham reminded him that most landlords in the City rented to student tenants and the college students in Newark were not necessarily poor.

Ms. Wallace concurred with Mr. Markham. She liked the partnership with local businesses and believed it was important to have the LED bulbs available in the core downtown area businesses. She suggested included Newark Natural Foods, which was in walking distance of some communities that could benefit from them. She echoed Mr. Markham’s request to include the Newark Housing Authority and other organizations that may assist with getting this program to residents who could benefit from it the most, including Catholic Charities. She asked when the complete program would be launched as she would like to share with her residents as soon as it is available. Mr. Coyle said the website was designed and ready to go. He noted several staff members had been hired locally to assist with the program and, when trained, would be the day to day contacts.

Mr. Horning thanked Energy Smart for their presentation. He said the metrics seemed to indicate it was a three-year program and he asked what steps would be taken should the program not take off during the three years. Mr. Coyle said there would be a ramp up period as it took close to a year for the word to get out and he noted most was by “word of mouth.” In the meantime, Energy Smart recorded the data monthly using an aggregated formula that did not include personal information due to FOIA

regulations. It would detail such things as residential purchases with the reporting based on a 30-day delay. DEMEC attended most meetings and Mr. Coyle noted he was in constant contact with DEMEC staff which would continue with the new account managers hired to be part of this program. The account managers would meet with the City on a regular basis and they were always looking for continuous improvement. For instance, heat pumps would be added next month after considering this during discussions with vendors.

Mr. Clifton said he was currently shopping for a hot water heater and asked what the difference would be between a heat pump hot water heater in comparison to a regular hot water heater. Mr. Coyle said a heat pump hot water heater was an electric hot water heater versus a natural gas hot water heater and a natural gas hot water was more efficient.

Mr. Clifton asked how the purchase process worked. Mr. Coyle said there was a product rebates website. There was a form that was available at a big box retailer as well. He stated the product was purchased where the consumer chose with the hope it would be from a local business. Energy Smart would work to educate the retailer to ensure they provided the purchaser with the necessary information to obtain a rebate. He also noted the consumer could contact Energy Smart ahead of time with product information details so Energy Smart could let the consumer know if the rebate was available for that particular product. Additionally, the form was online as well. Any product with the Energy Star designation was rebate eligible.

Mr. Clifton concurred with Mr. Hamilton in that the LED bulb program should be limited to City residents and thought they should be helped first. He understood the rebate program would cater to residents as they had to provide a Newark address to be eligible. He also agreed with outreach to ensure people that most need the assistance had the opportunity to participate in the programs including the over 55 community. Mr. Coyle added that outreach to all communities that may benefit from these programs was well underway including senior centers. Mr. Coyle confirmed that Energy Smart would assist with education with any local group upon a Council member's request.

The Chair opened the discussion to public comment.

Jim Nieg, Northgate Commons, said the State of Delaware has a program of a similar nature with additional incentives and he suggested Energy Smart may be able to incorporate some of the those into their program.

MOTION BY MS. WALLACE, SECONDED BY MR. MARKHAM: TO DIRECT THE CITY MANAGER TO START THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAM

MOTION PASSED. VOTE: 7 to 0.

Aye – Clifton, Hamilton, Horning, Hughes, Lawhorn, Markham, Wallace.

Nay – 0.

5. 2-B. DISCUSSION AND DIRECTION TO STAFF REGARDING CITY PRIORITIES – CITY MANAGER (90 MINUTES)

35:22

Mr. Lawhorn stated the reason he requested this item was to help him understand what staff was working on as there are so many projects and initiatives. He believed there was a lack of continuity between Council and staff with expectations such as timing, projects or actions. As a new member of Council, this would assist him in understanding the workload. He said there were many good ideas coming forward that have regularly shifted a lot of the priorities, making it difficult to focus on items in order of importance. He felt that prioritizing those items would aid with:

- Ensuring that the focus was on the items that required the most immediate attention;
- Identifying items that could be addressed at a later date due to limited resources; and
- Identifying if more resources were needed to complete the desired tasks.

He felt that the meeting would give the City the opportunity to see what staff was working on and help define the steps moving forward. He noted the list of 103 projects, which did not include day to day tasks, that staff detailed to City Council was indicative, in his opinion, that prioritization was necessary. He felt that this exercise provided a clear view that the City had more going on than it has resources. He noted the next step would be to have staff come back again after the discussion. He said after the meeting, staff would have a good idea of Council's position on the items specified in the list. He suggested creating a plan of the things that needed to be done and the timing they required. In terms of timing, he

felt a year was reasonable for the things that were determined to be worked on and items that needed resources. This would provide Council with an understanding of when those initiatives would be started and an approximation of when they should be completed. He suggested going through the list and identify initiatives that could be added. He noted any disagreements should be provided with how staff laid out the information (i.e. importance of the priorities of the items) and once that exercise was done, staff could return with the workplan.

Mr. Coleman pointed out that in the list he attempted to cut it off at what would be a clear line as far as a project or a “one off initiative” that happened annually versus something that was continuous. He noted that most of the information was provided by the Department Directors. He reported he missed at least one instance initially where an item was provided by two different department directors with two dramatically opinions of how important the topic was. For example, the rental permit audit with the Finance Department putting it as a critical item because it involved money and another department placing it not as high on the list. He said depending on who reported the information, there may be some variance in the critical operations and importance levels. He mentioned two items that were omitted that needed to be added to the list:

- Multi space parking meter conversion – critical to operations and of high importance.
- The sale of the 919 Rockmoss property, which the City still owned – low or medium importance.

Mr. Coleman said that he was less optimistic about how much of the discussion would happen at that time due to the level of complexity with a lot of the projects cross cutting different departments. He said it would be difficult to get a handle on what everyone was doing. There may be some projects of a high or low priority that required less discussion. He noted that some may like the concept but not the format; it was easier to modify than it was to create from scratch. He mentioned that Mr. Del Grande made a higher quality, more functional version of the list that previously went out. He recommended keeping it as a “living document” which could be updated moving forward based on feedback from Council on individual direction. He told all that he felt it was easiest to sort initiatives by departments using x’s and o’s. They could get a feel for how many projects a department was leading versus how many they were involved in and how thin they were currently stretched. He noted for example, Public Works used \$1 million threshold for Capital projects and less than that did not make the list, anything \$1 million or more did. Different departments may have used different thresholds. He said certain departments may have fewer projects but have higher operational demands. He gave the example of the Police, who had fewer projects but had more operational things going on. A lot of their projects were IT driven. He said the IT Division would have a lot of projects because a lot of their projects were for other people but were IT driven. They were leading the initiative or involved in it. He asked that these things be taken into consideration in the discussion.

Mr. Lawhorn did not have any disagreements on how priorities were ranked but had a few questions. He asked if the Council Chamber Technology Enhancements were the same as the replacement of the Livestream technology. Mr. Coleman thought that project was partially underway with the projector and the new recording systems. He believed the rest of it was the Communications room upstairs. Mr. Del Grande said the cameras were already mounted in the ceilings in the corner of Council Chamber. In the next week or the week after, they would be tested in tandem with the Livestream. He hoped in three to four weeks they would be running and operational.

Mr. Lawhorn considered Electronic Council Packets a low priority and not a high priority as listed in the memorandum. He noted also considered extra Council meetings a high priority. He thought low priority was something that they could postpone until a later date and high priority was more of an obligation. Currently, he did not have anything to add. He understood there was a lot of effort and time people were putting into boards and committees. Some people contractually must do so. He thought boards and committees could be a good development opportunity for others if staff could delegate to some of the other staff members to free up management time. He said in speaking with Mr. Coleman and perusing the list, there were a lot of people and time invested into attending board and committee meetings. He felt the next step was where the difficult decisions would occur with projects that may not be able to be addressed in a short-term timeframe.

Mr. Horning mentioned adding the revision of the Comprehensive Development Plan. He was uncertain if it was already included. He noted the Ethics Code Review and Update, which was mentioned by a resident in District 1. An audit was performed, he believed, in 2015 or 2016 and there were some concerns. It was recommended to revise the current Ethics Code to match the State’s Code of Ethics. He believed it has not gotten the attention it deserves since then. He recommended leaving it where it was in ranking but offline, he could work with the City Secretary on it to help move it forward, if it was within her priorities.

Regarding the White Clay Creek Pedestrian and Bicycle Bridge, Mr. Horning asked if the high priority classification was driven by funding timing in terms of grants that must be used within a certain time or because it was a critical need. Mr. Coleman noted it was determined as high priority because the City received a significant amount of grant money for this project and it must be returned if the project was not completed. He stated this was a “point of no return” kind of project. Mr. Horning stated he was not questioning the project but if the project prioritization was driven due to the funding. Mr. Coleman confirmed that was the case.

Ms. Wallace thanked Mr. Lawhorn for recommending this. She thought this was helpful and that she was aware of most of the projects. Most of them were CIP and others she was involved in directing Council. She expressed her appreciation to Mr. Del Grande for creating a high-quality form. She said it was somewhat difficult to look at them holistically and prioritize the initiatives without some background operational information. For example, she noted the Planning Department was flooded with development projects. She suggested receiving periodic updates on the City’s operational needs, particularly in items that were not anticipated. She felt like there were a few items where the City had a little “wiggle” room:

- Bulk Refuse Collection program changes – She felt that it worked well as is and noted Public Works had a lot going on. She suggested it be reduced to a low priority. She asked Council and staff for feedback about why the priority level was chosen.
- Business License Audit – She believed that this initiative could be downgraded from high to medium priority. She acknowledged the importance of this project but also noted that considering other things the Planning Department was working on, it could be downgraded.
- Employee Onboarding Automation – She asked the IT Division if this project was necessarily a medium priority. She noted that staff predominantly used this and explained if it did not interfere with the operational needs of staff, it may not require medium priority level.
- Evaluation of Business License Process – She asked if this project was the same as the Audit. Mr. Del Grande said that the Business License Review was a two-fold project – reviewing Code and categories and ensuring businesses were falling in proper categories and reviewing businesses and ensuring everyone was paying what they should be paying. Ms. Wallace believed that was already going on. Mr. Del Grande confirmed that was step 1 for a couple of years. Mr. Coleman responded the audit was actually reviewing the data that was in the system itself. When the City migrated from CityView to Munis, there were some issues with data quality in the migration. Ms. Wallace stated that it would be high priority. Mr. Coleman confirmed that is the case.
- Fremont Trail Connector – She stated that it was headed as Public Works as the primary and asked if that was accurate. Mr. Coleman responded it was headed as Public Works due to the stage of the project. He said Public Works had done the bidding design and construction inspection. He noted it was a Parks project but was one of the gray areas with Public Works. Public Works was involved with a lot especially with infrastructure projects. Ms. Wallace asked if it was high priority because it is already in progress. Mr. Coleman answered it was nearly completed at this point.
- The Newark Partnership combined with Main Street Construction – Promotion of Business – She stated she does not see The Newark Partnership as a high priority. She noted that the City was a partner and facilitator and not primary. Whereas, the Main Street construction and the promotion of businesses she believed to be more important. She stated there had been a decline with all of the City’s businesses. She felt that the City should “get out ahead of that” before coming into the busy season and try to do a lot more communications work around Newark.

Ms. Wallace agreed with everything else under priorities. She pointed out that under the Boards and Committees heading, WILMAPCO was missing. Mr. Coleman stated it was missed because the table has migrated and evolved. He initially asked the Directors and Deputy Directors. However, Mr. Fortner, who attended the technical advisory meetings for WILMAPCO, and Mr. Fruehstorfer, who attended the public advisory committee meetings for WILMAPCO, were not managers. Mr. Coleman noted the Technical Advisory Committee meetings were attended by Mr. Filasky on occasion but Mark Neimeister, who is a manager, also attended. He did add some that were attended by managers but did not necessarily include all of them that were not at the manager level.

Ms. Wallace echoed Mr. Lawhorn and believed there were items where staff could be a bit more critical. She noted there was an obligatory responsibility to attend for some. She thought in the future staff could be a bit more judicious with their time. There were organizations that were not governmental or quasi-governmental that staff may not need to attend. She believed some of the committees may not have started as a City committee but may have transitioned out of such. Staff may not have to be at every single meeting and may just be able to provide updates.

Ms. Wallace believed the electronic Council packets were a high priority and thought the City Secretary's office would concur on this as this was a way to help provide better efficiencies in that department, for Council and the public, especially with the increase in meetings.

Mr. Markham said he would define it as a working, living list so he did not want to hear in the future that something may not have been included on the list and things could always be added. Mr. Markham believed some on the list were important to residents, some were important to Council and some were just items that must be done. He thought the Police would have included firing range project on this list. Mr. Coleman noted it was included and included more than just the range and has a more complex title.

Mr. Markham believed there were things that may not feel like they were critical currently, but there had been stages before where there were items reviewed because there were problems. He inquired about item 71, Recodification program. He understood it was "in process" but had been in process for some time. He asked Ms. Bensley when the process was done previously and Ms. Bensley responded that it had not been done since 1970. Mr. Markham believes it was imperative that it be completed as quickly as possible as it was out of date.

Mr. Markham referenced the City map update, item 19, and reminded all that former Council member Morehead had brought up this topic as well. It appeared to Mr. Markham that this was a GIS project. Ms. Bensley noted the last time this was discussed, the reason for the delay was the items that were required by the Charter to be in the map were all not all contained in the GIS program, meaning it was a manual update for part of the project. She said they would circle back and see if since then it had been improved to where it had all of the parts needed to complete. Mr. Markham believed that GIS would have to have this in order for the City to do their business.

Mr. Markham noted that in reference to item 38, electronic Council packets, had been discussed for some time in the hope of decreasing the use of paper copies. He recalled when discussed previously it was met without success.

Mr. Markham believes the Electric Rate Study (Item 35) and Green Energy Electric Rate (Item 51) tied together. Mr. Coleman noted the Green Energy Electric Rate could or could not be a part of the Rate Study. Mr. Markham thought it was an example of items that were dependent upon one another, meaning they would flow together even though they may have slightly different priorities. Item 56, Main Street Construction – promotion of businesses, he agrees should have a fairly high priority. Regarding item 101, Windows Server 2019 Configuration and Test, he did not see how something as critical as this could be a low priority. Mr. Reazor said it was considered critical because "we have to get there" and understand the capabilities and be ready to deploy, but it was categorized as a low priority because it was a while before this had to be "in play." Mr. Markham suggested changing the name to "Planning the Windows Server 2019 Configuration and Test." Mr. Markham also believed that even though the item was in the planning stages, it should be higher on the list.

Mr. Markham said he would like to see the City pursue a larger renewable energy project at some point. He is not certain how this fit in with other Council ideas, but he would like to see it on the list.

Mr. Hamilton wanted the electronic packets to go forward as soon as possible to help save paper. He also noted with regard to Council Chamber upgrades prioritizing as it pertained to safety is number one. Mr. Clifton added that he would elaborate further on this item as he was the one that asked that it be included on the list.

Mr. Hamilton requested an item be added to the list to address Code Enforcement fines and the fact that frequently the offenders continue the same habits (ex: fines for not cutting grass). He believed when analyzing the importance of the items on the list, importance needed to be placed on money lost. He thanked Mr. Horning for adding the Comprehensive Plan to the list. He noted there had to be coordination with UD to build a smarter town, which included the development of STAR Campus. He said he would not overrule staff with what they considered priorities but felt safety was first.

With regard to committees, Mr. Hamilton appreciated BikeNewark but did not believe staff had to devote so much time to the organization. Mr. Coleman clarified there were two different monthly meetings: a regular meeting and an engineering meeting. Mr. Spadafino went to the regular meeting and Mr. Filasky went to the engineering meeting.

Mr. Hamilton asked for clarification on number 66, other Capital projects. Mr. Coleman clarified they were Public Works projects under \$1 million and anything not explicitly included on this list. This would include a lot of smaller capital projects that did not make the cut.

Mr. Hamilton agreed with Mr. Lawhorn that it was an opportunity to develop staff and delegate and he believed that was an important part of growth and provided different perspectives. He hoped by using this approach the department directors may be freed up. He understood The Newark Partnership was fledgling at this time, but noted they were currently an independent entity. He would like the City to keep an eye on them as the City is contributed a large amount of funding to them.

Ms. Hughes said the list was comprehensive and helpful to her. She felt the police department initiatives were a high priority and she agreed with what she heard from her fellow Council members.

Mr. Clifton noted with regard to Council Chambers renovations of \$25,000, it had already been approved in the CIP. However, his concern was about comfortable seats for the public attending the meetings. He also noted it was very difficult to see the Council members on Livestream which could make it difficult to tell who was talking. He believed the Ethics Board needed forward progress. He conferred with the City Solicitor and the City Solicitor does not believe that all of the boards could have seven members, but Mr. Clifton was a strong proponent of making as many boards as possible with seven members so each Council member have an appointment. He believed it was much more critical to the Board of Ethics because theoretically they could have the five members of the Board of Ethics that all may live on the same block. He did not believe this was good public policy as each Council district should be represented. He thought it was good policy to get other staff members involved in some of the other processes. It saved the directors time and it built the abilities of those below a director level in the City processes.

Mr. Clifton thanked Mr. Coleman for he and his staff putting the chart together. He thought some of the projects noted were nearing completion. He asked how difficult it would be to convert to a 1-10 or a 1-100 scale percentage of completed (bar graph) where it would be apparent where these projects on the chart lie. Mr. Coleman said he would have to think about ways this could be accomplished because even showing a percentage complete on one item may be a lot more work remaining than a percentage complete on something else. He also suggested using a "level of effort" column and a percentage complete or percentage remaining column.

With regard to committees, Mr. Coleman noted with The Newark Partnership was that staff was attending meetings and providing input. For example, he was on the Board of Directors and Ms. Gray attended the Economic Enhancement Committee. Paula Martinson from the Parks and Recreation Department was also asked to be on their Community Engagement Committee. He noted that all three staff members could probably delegate other staff to attend and that would be the plan in the future. He reported City staff was present only in the capacity to answer questions or provide suggestions. Ms. Wallace suggested this item be removed from this chart and added to the Boards and Committees. Mr. Coleman noted it appeared on both charts but would be removed from the front.

Ms. Wallace asked how to move forward to give direction to staff. She noted that personally she could live with what everyone else had said. Mr. Clifton agreed and noted unless there were very divergent issues with other Council members, he agreed with Ms. Wallace.

Mr. Coleman clarified that the Council Chamber upgrade amount of \$25,000 was in 2020, not 2019. He also noted security improvements in City Hall, including the Council Chamber, had not been included in the budget. He mentioned after the ALICE training staff made some security recommendations with some locations being identified in the Police Department, Court and Council Chambers. He noted that Mr. Clifton had also mentioned some security improvements in the front of building. Deputy Chief Farrall and Chief Tiernan suggested the U.S. Marshals come do another assessment of City Hall as the last assessment was done in 2013 and many believe it would be worthwhile to come in and do a reassessment. He added there was a possibility of some money being available in an out year, possibly 2021 would show some grant funding available at the state level from the federal government for security improvements.

Mr. Clifton believed having the security at the front of the building in addition to the additional safety measures already in place or additional ones that may be considered seemed to make sense because if someone would be unable to get something in the building then it made everyone safer.

Mr. Hamilton did not think bullet proofing the dais and leaving the public exposed was a good idea. He would rather have an extra police officer at the meeting.

Ms. Wallace asked if this could be discussed at a future meeting as she has some concerns about the public's ability to have an alternate exit. Mr. Clifton said that topic was part of the Council Chamber improvements. He reiterated he did not like closing off the public's building to them but with the current climate in the country it was worth addressing. He would be happy to discuss it further at a later meeting.

The discussion was opened to questions from the public.

Lou Spinelli, District 2, thanked everyone for their work and appreciated all the work being done. He was happy to hear there was interest in sustainability from Council. He had multiple plug in vehicles, LEDs and as many things as he could incorporate himself. He would like to see further development in that area.

Mr. Hamilton suggested Mr. Spinelli volunteer on some committees or boards if his time permitted. Mr. Clifton said he knew Mr. Spinelli was well versed on electric vehicles and the dynamics surrounding electric vehicles. Mr. Markham believed there were some interesting things on the radar including some of the projects the Conservation Advisory Commission was working on. He highly recommended Mr. Spinelli attend some of their meetings. He also believed the financial hurdles that had been in place were much lower these days, especially in terms of solar and LEDs.

The discussion was returned to the table.

Mr. Coleman mentioned that during the departmental budget hearings, this matter could return to be sorted by department as part of a further discussion to assist in answering questions on the projects.

Ms. Wallace asked how frequently the list would be updated. Mr. Coleman did not believe it would be helpful to do it more frequently than quarterly or semi-annually. Initially staff would try to provide updates quarterly and, if there was discussion with Council on an item deemed to be a priority, the list could return and be part of the discussion.

Mr. Horning asked if the Directors or the City Manager needed direction regarding anything on the list in terms of the fact that it may not be able to be completed and it was getting in the way of other things, etc. Mr. Coleman was not ready to say that it had reached that level but perhaps that was another column to include that said "Active" or "Inactive" as far as if staff was working on a project or if it was on the back burner.

Ms. Hughes said in reference to Council Chamber improvements, she thought it should be mentioned under more important as it had been some time since the Council Chamber was renovated. Mr. Clifton reported it was 1975. She also reported that when she had watched a meeting via Livestream it was difficult to discern who was speaking as the faces blended in with the mural. Mr. Coleman reiterated that it would take some time to plan the renovations so the start date of 2020 was fairly realistic. Mr. Clifton asked for updates on this project to be provided to Council.

Mr. Lawhorn believed that some slight modifications would be helpful. He liked the suggestion to have "Active and "Inactive" columns, estimated completion date and percentage complete. He thought those would be helpful but he would not recommend spending considerable time trying to get the exact numbers. He thought ballpark was sufficient. He also suggested adding an anticipated start date as well. He believed having the document as a living document was important as well.

Mr. Horning suggested publishing this list on the City website so residents could view the document as well. Mr. Coleman said it was currently on the website as a PDF document and staff could look for a way to publish it as an excel document.

- 6. 3. **ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR PUBLISHED AGENDA**
 - A. **Council Members:** None
- 7. 3-B. **OTHERS:** None
- 8. **Meeting adjourned at 8:46 p.m.**

Renee K. Bensley, CMC
Director of Legislative Services
City Secretary

/tas