

\*\*\*\*\*DISCLAIMER\*\*\*\*\*

THE FOLLOWING IS AN UNEDITED DRAFT TRANSLATION. THIS TRANSCRIPT MAY NOT BE VERBATIM, HAS NOT BEEN PROOFREAD AND MAY CONTAIN ERRORS. PLEASE CHECK WITH THE SPEAKER(S) FOR ANY CLARIFICATION.

THIS TRANSCRIPT MAY NOT BE COPIED OR DISSEMINATED UNLESS YOU OBTAIN WRITTEN PERMISSION FROM THE OFFICE OR SERVICE DEPARTMENT THAT IS PROVIDING CART CAPTIONING TO YOU.

THIS TRANSCRIPT MAY NOT BE USED IN A COURT OF LAW. -DH

\*\*\*\*\*DISCLAIMER\*\*\*\*\*

>>PRESIDENT SCAMAN: IT IS 6:03 PM AND I WOULD LIKE TO CALL THE FINANCE COMMITTEE OF THE VILLAGE BOARD ORDER.  
CLERK WATERS PLEASE TAKE THE ROLL.

>> TRUSTEE PARAKKAT.

>> HERE.

>> TRUSTEE ROBINSON.

>> HERE.

>> TRUSTEE WESLEY.

>> HERE.

>> PRESIDENT SCAMAN.

>>PRESIDENT SCAMAN: HERE.

DO WE HAVE ANY PUBLIC COMMENT THIS EVENING?

>>CLERK: NO WE DO NOT.

>>PRESIDENT SCAMAN: VERY GOOD.

I WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES FROM FEBRUARY 22 OF 2024 WITH THE ADDITION OF THE VILLAGE PRESIDENT CALLED A RECESS BEFORE ADJOURNMENT.

>> SO MOVED.

>> SECOND.

>>PRESIDENT SCAMAN: THANK YOU.

ALL IN FAVOR?

>> AYE.

>>PRESIDENT SCAMAN: NEW BUSINESS THIS EVENING'S DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED PROPERTY TAX LEVY POLICY.  
VILLAGE MANAGER JACKSON?

>>VILLAGE MANAGER: PRESIDENT SCAMAN AND TRUSTEE MEMBERS, DONNA GADON, INTERIM FINANCE DIRECTOR WILL TAKE THIS ITEM.

DONNA, DO YOU WANT TO TAKE THIS ITEM 1ST BEFORE THE OTHER ONE?

>> IT DOES NOT MATTER.

SHE CANNOT CALL IN.

>>VILLAGE MANAGER: THIS IS A CONTINUATION AND DISCUSSION WE STARTED ON FEBRUARY 22 BY THE TAX LEVY POLICY.

SO WE ARE PREPARED TO DO AN OVERVIEW OF IT AND ALLOW YOU GUYS TO HAVE A DISCUSSION ABOUT IT AND MAKE A JUDGMENT ON HOW YOU WANT TO PROCEED FORWARD.

>>PRESIDENT SCAMAN: THANK YOU.

>>VILLAGE MANAGER: DONNA?

>>DONNA GADON: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

THIS IS A TAX LEVIED POLICY THAT WAS PUT TOGETHER BY MYSELF AND A FEW OTHER PEOPLE, AND OF COURSE PAUL TO MAKE SURE OUR POLICY FALLS IN LINE OF WHAT YOU ALL ARE LOOKING FOR AND IT IS SAYING - THERE IS A LIST OF ALL THE THINGS WE HAVE TO TAKE INTO CONSIDERATION WHEN DOING THE POLICY AND THEN IT LISTS - LET US KNOW IF - ITEM C, THE TAX LEVY LIMIT, WHAT WE HAVE TO DO IF WE WANT TO GO ABOVE 5%.

WHAT WE HAVE BEEN TALKING ABOUT IS FOLLOWING HOW WE HAVE BEEN DOING THINGS AT 3%, BUT IT STILL WOULD BE - WHAT YOU WOULD BE DOING IS DOING A TAX LEVY, BUT THIS IDENTIFIES THAT YOU WILL BE DOING IT IN CONJUNCTION WITH TAKING THESE THINGS INTO CONSIDERATION.

SO FOR EXAMPLE, LIKE HEALTH AND INSURANCE COSTS, SOCIAL SECURITY, OF COURSE THE POLICE AND FIRE PENSION, BOND DEBT, WHICH ALSO HAS A IMPACT ON OPERATING EXPENSES.

AND SO WE PUT THIS TOGETHER SO ANYONE COULD UNDERSTAND EXACTLY HOW THE LEVY IS TAKING PLACE AND EVERYTHING WE TOOK INTO CONSIDERATION TO GIVE A GOOD LEVY.

AND THEN JUST AS WE WERE JUST TALKING ABOUT THE LAST ITEM IS ON AN ANNUAL BASIS, THIS POLICY WILL BE RENEWED, REVIEWED AND IF THERE IS NO AMENDMENTS OR THERE IS NOTHING THAT NEEDS TO BE CHANGED IT WILL JUST BE A MENTION TO THE BOARD THAT THE POLICY WAS REVIEWED, NO CHANGES ARE NEEDED AT THIS TIME.

SO IT COVERS A LOT THAT WE TALKED ABOUT AND THAT WE WERE GOING TO START THE DISCUSSION.

>>PRESIDENT SCAMAN: VERY GOOD.

SO IT IS APPROPRIATE THEN TO START OUR DISCUSSION OF WHAT IS BEFORE US.

I WOULD TURN IT OVER TO TRUSTEES WHO WOULD LIKE TO START US OUT THIS EVENING, UNLESS THERE ARE NO COMMENTS.

VILLAGE TRUSTEE ROBINSON?

>>TRUSTEE ROBINSON: I HAD A COUPLE OF THINGS, DONNA.

SO I WOULD LIKE TO SEE SOMETHING SORT OF MORE ADMINISTRATIVE.

THE SCOPE LANGUAGE SAYS THE VILLAGE WILL ADOPT ANNUAL TAX LEVY INCREASES AND I'M ASSUMING THAT IS BECAUSE BASED ON OUR DISCUSSION OF WHAT HAPPENS WHEN WE DO NOT DO THAT, BUT I STILL DO THINK THERE IS ROOM TO LEND THAT FLEXIBILITY IF A BOARD DECIDES, BASED ON SORT OF AN UNEXPECTED REVENUE INCREASE, MAYBE WE TAKE - WE DO NOT TAKE AN INCREASE.

SO THE WAY IT IS WORDED IS IT IS AN INCREASE, I'M ASSUMING AS COMPARED TO THE PREVIOUS YEAR?

>>DONNA GADON: YES.

>>TRUSTEE ROBINSON: IF WE COULD CHANGE "THE VILLAGE WILL ADOPT" TO "THE VILLAGE MAY ADOPT".

IT SO IT KEEPS IT CONSISTENT.

I THINK THE END OF THAT SENTENCE PROBABLY WOULD NEED TO BE ADJUSTED AND YOU LET ME KNOW WHAT THE PROPER WAY IS TO TWEAK IT BECAUSE I DO THINK IT SHOULD BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE POLICY.

I JUST DO NOT THINK IT SHOULD BE THAT WE HAVE TO TAKE AN INCREASE EVERY YEAR NECESSARILY.

SO I DO THINK THE END OF THAT SENTENCE THEN DOES NEED TO BE - NEEDS TO HAVE SOME SORT OF ADJUSTMENT BECAUSE IT STILL SHOULD BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE POLICY.

>>VILLAGE ATTORNEY: I THINK THE WORD YOU WOULD LOOK FOR IS "IF THE VILLAGE ADOPTS A TAX INCREASE IT WILL DO SO IN ACCORDANCE WITH THIS POLICY".

>>TRUSTEE ROBINSON: OKAY, THAT MAKES SENSE.

>>DONNA GADON: SAY THAT ONE MORE TIME, PAUL.

>>VILLAGE ATTORNEY: IF THE VILLAGE ADOPTS A TAX LEVY INCREASE IT WILL DO SO IN ACCORDANCE WITH THIS POLICY.

>>DONNA GADON: OKAY.

>>PRESIDENT SCAMAN: IF THE VILLAGE WERE TO CHOOSE TO BASICALLY IS WHAT YOU MEAN?

>>TRUSTEE ROBINSON: AND THEN CAN YOU TALK ABOUT HOW THE 5%, HOW YOU ARRIVED AT THE 5%?

>>DONNA GADON: THAT IS STATE LAW.

IF YOU GO ANYTHING ABOVE, THAT IS WHY - WHY IF YOU DO A TAX INCREASE IS 4.99 BECAUSE IF YOU DO A 5% TAX INCREASE YOU HAVE TO PUBLISH AND HAVE HEARINGS.

WE HAVE THE HEARINGS ANYWAY, BUT YOU ARE REQUIRED TO HAVE A HEARING IF IT IS 5%.

>>TRUSTEE ROBINSON: I SEE.

SO IS THAT TAX LEVY LIMIT MEANT TO REFLECT THE STATE LAW REQUIREMENT THEN?

IT SEEMS LIKE WHAT IT IS IS A CHANGE FROM THE 3% TO THE 5%.

>>DONNA GADON: THAT A STATE LAW REQUIREMENT.

>>TRUSTEE ROBINSON: IS NOT INTENDING TO CHANGE THE FLOOR, THAT THRESHOLD FROM 3% TO 5%?

>>DONNA GADON: NO.

>>TRUSTEE ROBINSON: OKAY.

THAT WAS MY SECOND POINT OF CLARIFICATION AND THEN - GENERALLY WHAT I WAS SORT OF LOOKING FOR HERE IS SOMETHING THAT IS MORE FORMULAIC, THAT YOU HAVE THIS LIST OF THINGS UNDER ITEM B THAT WE WILL CONSIDER. THEY ARE ALL RELATED TO COSTS THOUGH AND, YOU KNOW, PLEASE POINT OUT IF I AM MISSING SOMETHING, THERE ISN'T A REFERENCE TO AN INCREASE IN REVENUE SOURCES.

>>DONNA GADON: NO, THERE ISN'T.

>>TRUSTEE ROBINSON: FIRST WHAT WOULD YOU RECOMMEND THAT WE ADD THAT?

>>DONNA GADON: GO AHEAD.

WE WILL GO BACK TO WHAT I SAID BEFORE IS THAT YOU SHOULD INCREASE IT BY SOMETHING, EVEN IF IT IS JUST 1%.

SO YOU DO NOT LOSE THAT BASE AND THEN IF YOU SAY WE ARE NOT GOING TO INCREASE - WE ARE NOT GOING TO INCREASE OF WAVE REVENUES INCREASE, BUT ONE OF REVENUES DECREASED THE FOLLOWING YEAR?

SO REALLY THAT IS WHY I DID NOT PUT IT IN THERE BECAUSE I TRULY BELIEVE THAT YOU SHOULD INCREASE IT, EVEN IF IT IS JUST 1%.

>>TRUSTEE ROBINSON: RIGHT.

THIS IS WHAT WE TALKED ABOUT BEFORE, THAT THERE WILL BE A NATURAL RISE IN COST SO EVEN IF THERE IS A REVENUE INCREASE IT STILL MAY BE APPROPRIATE TO HAVE A LEVY INCREASE BECAUSE OF THAT NATURAL RISE IN COST.

WERE YOU GOING TO ADD SOMETHING?

AND I DO GET THAT AND I ACTUALLY WONDERED IF - I THOUGHT THAT WAS A REALLY GOOD PIECE OF ADVICE.

I WONDER IF THAT SHOULD BE INCORPORATED IN HERE AS WELL?

>>DONNA GADON: OKAY.

>>TRUSTEE ROBINSON: I HAVE NO SPECIFIC LANGUAGE TO SUGGEST, BUT I THINK THAT THAT PART IS VERY IMPORTANT FOR BOARDS TO KEEP IN MIND. THAT THERE IS THIS CORRESPONDING RISE IN COST THAT CAN HAPPEN FROM YEAR TO YEAR AND I JUST DO NOT SEE THAT IN THIS DOCUMENT AND SO, UNLESS YOU THINK THAT SHOULD - THAT ADVICE SHOULD LIVE SOMEWHERE ELSE?

>>DONNA GADON: I CAN AND IT BECAUSE IT WILL GIVE CLARIFICATION GRID FOR EXAMPLE I DO KNOW THAT IN THE SOUTH SUBURBS OF CHICAGO, THE SOUTH SUBURBS - THEY HAVE GOTTEN HIT WITH HUGE PROPERTY TAX INCREASES. SOME OF THAT IS BECAUSE THEY EITHER DIDN'T INCREASE TAXES OR THEY DIDN'T INCREASE IT ENOUGH SO THEY HAVE THESE HUGE JOBS BECAUSE THEY HAVE TO PLAY CATCH UP AND THAT IS WHAT WE WANT TO MAKE SURE IN THIS DOCUMENT THAT IF YOU DO NOT DO SOMETHING AT SOME POINT YOU MAY HAVE TO PLAY CATCH UP, WHICH WILL CAUSE A HUGE INCREASE.

>>TRUSTEE ROBINSON: BECAUSE THEN THAT IS FELT WITHIN IT ONE 12 MONTH PERIOD, VERSUS BEING SPREAD OUT AS THEY OCCUR.

>>DONNA GADON: AND THEN THAT SETS YOUR BASE.

NEXT YEAR YOU WILL HAVE A PROPERTY INCREASE BASED ON THE HIGH TAX INCREASE YOU HAD BECAUSE NOW THAT HIGH INCREASE IS YOUR BASE.

>>TRUSTEE ROBINSON: OKAY.

THOSE WERE AT LEAST MY INITIAL THOUGHTS ABOUT SORT OF MAKING THIS A LITTLE MORE ROBUST AND REFLECTIVE OF SOME OF WHAT I THINK WE HAVE LEARNED OVER THE LAST TWO YEARS.

>>DONNA GADON: OKAY.

>>PRESIDENT SCAMAN: DONNA, BEFORE I TURN OVER TO ANOTHER TRUSTEE, SOME OF THE DIALOGUE THAT YOU HAD REGARDING WHY IT IS THAT YOU WOULD NOT RECOMMEND A 0% LEVY WAS FULLY EXPLAINED IN ONE-ON-ONE MEETINGS. CAN YOU TAKE JUST A MOMENT TO EXPLAIN FOR THE PUBLIC.

I THINK THEY GET A LOT OF THE CONTEXT IN YOUR DIALOGUE WITH TRUSTEE ROBINSON, BUT FOR ANYBODY LISTENING THAT IS DIGESTING THAT AS AN UNDERSTANDING FOR THE FIRST TIME TONIGHT, CAN YOU EXPLAIN WHY YOU WOULD NOT RECOMMEND A COMMUNITY TAKING A 0% LEVY?

>>DONNA GADON: WE CAN GO BACK TO THE CURRENT TAX LEVY THAT WE DID FOR THIS YEAR.

LAST YEAR THERE WAS A 0% INCREASE BECAUSE BOTH FIRE AND POLICE PENSIONS CAME IN BETTER THAN WE THOUGHT.

SO EVEN THOUGH THERE WAS A PREDICTION THAT THAT NUMBER WOULD REVERSE THE NEXT YEAR WE CHOSE NOT TO DO A TAX INCREASE.

IT DID REVERSE FOR THIS YEAR AND BECAUSE WE DIDN'T TAKE THE INCREASE IN THE OPERATING ACCOUNT, IT ACTUALLY WENT DOWN SO BY NOT TAKING A SMALL INCREASE WE WOULD HAVE - HAD WE HAVE TAKEN IT WE WOULD'VE HAD APPROXIMATELY EXTRA \$502 MILLION, WHERE THIS YEAR THE OPERATING ACCOUNT TOOK A HIT.

I THINK IT WAS ABOUT \$300,000 THAT WE HAD TO DECREASE THE OPERATING BECAUSE WE DID NOT TAKE THE INCREASE THE PRIOR YEAR.

SO WHAT IT DOES IS IS IT REALLOCATE YOUR EXPENSES.

THEY ARE EXPENSES THAT ARE FIXED, WHICH IS YOUR DEBT, YOUR FIRE AND POLICE PENSION AND FROM THAT YOU SEE WHAT IS LEFT OVER AND THAT GOES TO YOUR OPERATING ACCOUNT.

SO WHEN YOU REDUCE THE AMOUNT THAT COULD POTENTIALLY COME IN FROM THAT BASE FROM YOUR OPERATING ACCOUNT, THEN YOU ARE ALSO HAVING TO LOOK AT IT GOING ACROSS THE BOARD AND THAT IS MONEY THAT YOU WILL NEVER GET BACK.

ON THAT BASE.

>>PRESIDENT SCAMAN: IS A COMPOUNDING LOSS OVER TIME?

>>DONNA GADON: IS INDEFINITE.

>>PRESIDENT SCAMAN: TRUST TO WESLEY?

OH, SORRY I DID NOT SEE THAT.

>>TRUSTEE WESLEY: A QUESTION I HAVE IS BECAUSE WE ARE HOME RULE AND WE DO NOT HAVE A CAP ON OUR ABILITY TO LEVY, DOESN'T MATTER IF WE MAKE IT UP IN A SUBSEQUENT YEAR?

MEANING IF WE ONLY NEED TO PERCENT THIS YEAR OR IF WE DON'T NEED ANY PERCENT, LET'S SAY TWO YEARS AGO WHEN WE TOOK A 0% AND THEN THE NEXT YEAR WE FOUND THAT WE NEEDED A LITTLE BIT MORE, ISN'T THE REAL REASON THAT WE WERE SHORT AND WE MADE IT UP OUT OF RESERVES IS BECAUSE WE HAD SELF ENFORCED 3% CAP AND WE COULD HAVE INCREASED THE 4% AND COVERED IT?

>>DONNA GADON: YES.

YOU CAN.

BUT AS YOU INCREASE, YOU KEEP INCREASING IT AND THEN YOU ARE GOING AGAINST WHAT YOU HAVE BEEN SAYING ALL ALONG THAT WE WANT TO DO A 3%. WHEN YOU DO HOME RULE, THAT MEANS YOU CAN INCREASE TAXES HOWEVER YOU SEE FIT OR YOU CAN ADD ADDITIONAL TAXES LIKE A CIGARETTE TAX, A GAS TAX OR ANY OTHER SORT OF USE TAX, BUT WHEN IT COMES TO PROPERTY TAX YOU WANT TO BE IS CONSISTENT ACROSS THE BOARD AS POSSIBLE SO THAT WHEN YOU DO THAT, THEN YOUR RESIDENCE CAN SAY LAST YEAR WE DID NOT GET A - WE GOT 0% AND THIS YEAR WE GOT 4% AND NOW YOU HAVE INCREASED THE PROPERTY TAXES AND THEY ARE GOING LIKE THIS AND SO YOU TRY TO BE MORE CONSISTENT ACROSS SO THEY SEE A PROPERTY TAX INCREASE AND THEY ARE NOT SHOCKED THAT ONE YEAR WE HAVE TO GO ABOVE FIVE OR 6% TO MAKE UP FOR WHEN WE WERE NOT TRYING TO BE AS CONSISTENT AS POSSIBLE.

>>TRUSTEE WESLEY: I THINK THAT'S MORE OF A STYLE ISSUE BECAUSE MAYBE GIVEN A 0% INCREASE FOR ONE YEAR IT MIGHT HELP SOME FOLKS OUT AND EVEN THOUGH THEY GET A 6% THE NEXT YEAR MAYBE THOSE FOLKS SELL THEIR HOUSE AND THEY ARE GOOD AND OTHER PEOPLE CAME IN AND SO ON AND SO FORTH.

>>DONNA GADON: YES, IF THEY ARE NOT LIVING ON A FIXED INCOME.

>>TRUSTEE WESLEY: OKAY.

YEAH, OKAY.

I SEE YOUR POINT THERE.

TO PIGGYBACK ON WHAT TRUSTEE ROBINSON SAID EARLIER, I WAS HOPING AS I RENTED THIS AGAIN, I SEE A LITTLE BIT OF THAT IN THIS IN TERMS OF - IN ITEM B, OR POLICY SECTION B, LIKE HOW WE'RE LAYING OUT USE OF EXPENSES AND HOW WE TAKE INTO ACCOUNT WHEN WE LAY OUT THE POLICY.

I WOULD'VE LIKED TO HAVE SEEN - LIKE ITEM NUMBER 10 IS A REDUCTION IN OTHER VILLAGE REVENUE SOURCES.

WOULD HAVE LIKED TO HAVE SEEN THE SECTION ABOUT AN INCREASE IN OTHER VILLAGE REVENUE SOURCES AND THIS MIGHT BE A SEPARATE POLICY, BUT FOR ME - I HONESTLY THINK THE LEVY IS THE LEAST INTERESTING PART OF HOW WE CONTROL FINANCES FROM THIS GOVERNMENT BECAUSE EVERY OTHER GOVERNMENT HERE - EXCEPT THE TOWNSHIP NATIONALLY PUT IT DIFFERENTLY, THE SCHOOLS TAKE MOST OF THE MONEY FROM THE PROPERTY TAXES, OVER 60%.

WE ARE 10% OPERATIONALLY, 15% WHEN YOU INCLUDE OUR PENSION LIABILITY, WHICH FLUCTUATES A LITTLE BIT, BUT MOSTLY GOING TO BE THAT 5% NOT REALLY SUBJECT TO CHANGE.

THE LEVERAGE WE DO HAVE THOUGH TO REALLY MANIPULATE THE AFFORDABILITY OF THE VILLAGE COMES INTO THE OTHER ASPECTS, THAT OTHER GOVERNMENTS DO NOT HAVE.

HOUSING POLICY, ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, SALES TAX IN THOSE THINGS. ALL THE THINGS THAT ARE OUTSIDE OF THE PROPERTY TAX WINDOW. LIKE THE SCHOOLS, DEAN 97, I DON'T HAVE THE ACTUAL NUMBER, BUT IF THEY RAISE THEIR LEVY TO PERCENT, I BELIEVE IT IS SOMETHING LIKE \$4 MILLION.

IF WE RAISE OUR LEVY FOR PERCENT IT IS LIKE EIGHTPOINTSOMETHING MILLION DOLLARS.

SO THE NUMBER LOOKS BIGGER WHEN WE DO IT, BUT THE ACTUAL TOTAL AMOUNT THAT WE ARE TAXING OUR RESIDENTS IS HALF, RIGHT?

IT IS A LOT LOWER.

FOR ME FOR A FINANCE POLICY, MAYBE IT LIVES IN A DIFFERENT DOCUMENT, BUT I THINK WHAT I WOULD LIKE WHEN WE'RE TALKING ABOUT HOW WE INFORM HOW WE ULTIMATELY CREATE REVENUE HERE IN SHORT AND LONG TERM IS THAT WE ARE TALKING ABOUT THOSE OTHER REVENUE SOURCES AS WELL.

>>DONNA GADON: THAT IS IN THE REVENUE POLICY.

SO YOU WILL HAVE FORTHCOMING ABOUT 12 NEW POLICIES AND PART OF THOSE IS A FUND BALANCE POLICY WHERE YOU NEED TO COME IN, REVENUE POLICY, EXPENDITURE POLICY, HOW TO DO THE BUDGET POLICY. THOSE ARE COMING, THOSE ARE SEPARATE AND THEN THEY WILL ALL BE PUT IN A BOOK SO IT IS A FINANCIAL POLICY THAT ANYBODY COULD FOLLOW.

>>TRUSTEE WESLEY: GOT IT.

>>DONNA GADON: REVENUE POLICY IS JUST WHAT YOU WERE TALKING ABOUT.

>>TRUSTEE WESLEY: AND THEN IT ALL DOVETAILS INTO ONE COHESIVE FINANCE POLICY?

ALL RIGHT!

OKAY.

I NEED TO RETHINK THE REST OF MY QUESTIONS THEN.

I YIELD MY TIME, PRESIDENT SCAMAN.

>>PRESIDENT SCAMAN: -

>>TRUSTEE PARAKKAT: THANK YOU DONNA, FOR THIS.

I HAVE A SET OF QUESTIONS AND SOME OF THEM OVERLAP WITH WHAT TRUSTEE ROBINSON HAS COVERED, BUT I WILL START.

I THINK FIRST I WANT TO TALK ABOUT THE EXPLANATION AROUND 3% VERSUS 0% AND WIPER CENTER AT INCREASES ARE IMPORTANT.

CAN YOU EXPLAIN THAT ONE MORE TIME?

>>DONNA GADON: 0% VERSUS A PERCENTAGE INCREASE: WHEN YOU INCREASE TAX EVERY YEAR YOU CREATE A BASE AND THAT BASE, WHATEVER THAT IS, WHEN YOU INCREASE AT THE VERY NEXT YEAR, SO IN 2023 YOUR BASE EQUALS THE SAME AS 2022.

SO WHEN WE WENT TO DO A PROPERTY TAX INCREASE FOR 2024 IT WAS BASED ON THE EXACT SAME NUMBER THAT 2022 AND 2023, HOWEVER YOUR EXPENSES WENT UP.

SO IF YOU DID JUST 1% TAX INCREASE, NOW YOU HAVE A BASE THAT IS 1% HIGHER IN 23 THAN IT WAS IN 2022.

AND THEN IN 2024 IF WE SAW THAT IT NEEDED TO BE - THESE ARE EXAMPLES, 3%, THAT IS ALL THE BASE WE HAD IN 2023.

SO EACH YEAR YOU WERE CREATING A NEW BASE.

SO BECAUSE THERE WAS NO TAX INCREASE IN 2023, THERE WAS A DECREASE IN OPERATING TAX LEVY.

BECAUSE THE BASE REMAINED THE SAME.

>>TRUSTEE PARAKKAT: THE CASE AROUND 0% WAS ONE ASPECT IS WHAT YOU MENTIONED, THE PENSIONS COMING IN LOWER, WRITE ABOUT A MILLION LOWER THAN NORMAL, BUT THAT IS NOT THE ONLY PART OF THE ISSUE.

IT IS ALSO THE INTEREST REVENUE THAT WAS AVAILABLE DURING THE - THE INTEREST ENVIRONMENT CHANGED SO THERE IS MORE REVENUE COMING IN, PLUS THE INFLOW OF OUR BUDGET DOLLARS SO THERE ARE SEVERAL FACTORS THAT STACKED UP.

GIVING RELATE TO THE COMMUNITY, YOU SAID IT IS A COMPOUNDING ISSUE, I SEE IT AS A COMPOUNDING BENEFIT TO KEEP OUR COMMUNITY MORE AFFORDABLE IN THE LONG RUN BECAUSE THE BASE, YOU ARE KEEPING THE BASE LOW.

ULTIMATELY TAXATION SHOULD NOT JUST BE VILLAGE CENTERED ACTIVITY.

IT HAS TO BE A CITIZEN CENTERED ACTIVITY.

SO FROM A CITIZEN'S PERSPECTIVE IT IS A COMPOUNDING BENEFIT TO HAVE LOWER TAX BASE.

>>DONNA GADON: IT IS A BENEFIT TO HAVE A LOWER TAX BASE, BUT IF YOU DO ZERO.

YOU JUST SAID THAT YOU HAD ADDITIONAL MONIES COMING IN FOR ARPA WAS COMING IN, WHICH IS ONE TIME.

IT IS A REVENUE THAT WILL GO AWAY.

YOU HAVE INTEREST, WHICH CAN FLUCTUATE FROM YEAR TO YEAR, ELECTION TO ELECTION.

SO WHEN YOU TAKE THAT AWAY AND YOU DO NOT HAVE A SOLID BASE, WHAT DO YOU HAVE?

SO IF YOU DO IT GRADUALLY, THEN AT LEAST YOUR BASE WILL BE ABLE TO COVER SOME OF THE EXPENSES, SOME OF THE REVENUE THAT YOU WILL NO LONGER HAVE BECAUSE, YEAH, WE DID HAVE - LAST YEAR I SAW THAT WE HAD A GOOD YEAR COMING IN FOR INTEREST, BUT THAT DOES NOT MEAN THAT WILL BE REFLECTIVE IN THE FUTURE.

>>TRUSTEE PARAKKAT: IT DOESN'T, BUT WE ALSO INCREASED EXPENSES BY \$3.8 MILLION.

SO IT IS NOT JUST ABOUT ONE ASPECT OF THIS POLICY.

IT IS MULTIPLE ASPECTS SO WE HAVE A WAY TO CONTROL EXPENSES AS WELL TO KEEP THE LEVY IN CHECK.

I'M JUST POINTING THAT OUT.



>>DONNA GADON: THAT IS TRUE.

>>TRUSTEE PARAKKAT: RELATING THAT BACK TO THE POLICY WE HAVE IN FRONT OF US.

THERE, I DO AGREE WITH CORY AND THE POINTS THAT LUCIA RAISED. YES, TAX LEVY IS ONE ASPECT AND WE MAY HAVE A REVENUE POLICY ELSEWHERE, BUT IT NEEDS TO FEED AND BECAUSE WE'RE MENTIONING REVENUE AS ONE OF THE LINE ITEMS IN THIS BECAUSE WE ARE ASKING THE BOARD TO CONSIDER REVENUE AS A LINE ITEM. IN THIS DOCUMENT IT IS UNIDIRECTIONAL WHERE THE REVENUE GOES DOWN. I DO FEEL THAT WE AS A BODY - WE HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO INFLUENCE REVENUE, BIDIRECTIONALLY SO WE CAN EITHER INCREASE IT OR DECREASE IT. WE HAVE THE ABILITY TO MANAGE THAT SO IT HAS TO REFLECT - THIS POLICY DOCUMENT SINCE IT'S REFERENCING REVENUE IT HAS TO SHOW THE BIDIRECTIONALITY OF IT.

>>DONNA GADON: I WILL AGREE WITH YOU THAT AS FAR AS REVENUE THAT WE KNOW THAT WILL COME IN THAT WE ARE NOT - BECAUSE REVENUE IS BUDGETED AND SO WE ARE ANTICIPATING INCREASES, YOU CAN ANTICIPATE AN INCREASE IN REVENUE AND YOU HAVE TO BE ABLE TO SAY IN ORDER FOR THIS BUDGET, IF WE ARE GOING TO LOOK AT DOING A LOWER AMOUNT FOR THE TAX LEVY, THAT REVENUE, WE HAVE TO KNOW THAT REVENUE IS GOING TO COME IN. PROPERTY TAXES WE KNOW WILL COME IN, BUT IF YOU ARE ANTICIPATING A GRANT COMING IN AT \$500,000, BUT IT ONLY COMES IN AT \$300,000, YOUR REVENUE IS NOW SHORT. EVEN IF YOU OVERESTIMATE, IT STILL HAS TO COME IN LINE THAT REVENUE IS PROJECTED OUTSIDE OF THE PROPERTY TAXES.

>>TRUSTEE PARAKKAT: I GET THAT. AND THE EXAMPLE I WOULD SAY IS WE HAVE THE ABILITY TO CREATE, BUT SAY REVENUE BECAUSE IT'S TOPICAL AND IT'S THIS MEETING. TODAY WE ARE GOING TO DISCUSS TV STATIONS AND CHARGING FOR IT. AS A REVENUE. WE HAVE THE ABILITY TO CREATE REVENUE OPPORTUNITIES IN THIS VILLAGE, RIGHT? SO THAT IS WHAT I AM REFERRING TO. WE MAY NOT BE ABLE TO PREDICT EXACTLY, BUT I WOULD LIKE US TO HOLD OURSELVES ACCOUNTABLE FOR CRATING REVENUE STREAMS OUTSIDE OF THE LEVY.

>>TRUSTEE PARAKKAT: 14 I AGREE WITH YOU - -

>>DONNA GADON: - - WE SAID WE WERE GOING TO BRING IN \$25,000 AND CHARGING STATIONS, I WOULD NOT NECESSARILY JUST LOOK AT THAT TO COUNT AGAINST ANYTHING BECAUSE THAT IS A PROJECTION BASED ON SOMETHING THAT HAS NEVER BEEN DONE.

SO WE HAVE NO IDEA IF THAT IS WHAT IS GOING TO COME IN AT.

>>TRUSTEE PARAKKAT: EXACTLY. I'M USING THAT AS AN EXAMPLE. THERE ARE OTHER REVENUE SOURCES THAT WE HAVE. WE HAVE TO BE ABLE TO PROJECT THAT AND STICK TO THAT.

SO WHATEVER THAT HAPPENS TO BE, THAT WAS JUST AN EXAMPLE.  
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, IF WE WANT TO SAY THAT WE WANT TO BRING X NUMBER  
OF NEW BUSINESSES, WE HAVE 100 STOREFRONTS THAT ARE OPEN AND WE WANT  
TO BRING IN AT LEAST 50 OF THAT, WE SHOULD BE ABLE TO STICK TO THAT  
AND EXPECT RETURNS COMING FROM IT, RIGHT?  
SO THERE IS THAT ASPECT OF LOOKING AT REVENUE OUTSIDE OF THE LEVY THAT  
IS WITHIN OUR CONTROL TO SOME EXTENT.

>>DONNA GADON: I WILL AGREE WITH YOU TO SOME EXTENT.

>>TRUSTEE PARAKKAT: OF THAT IS FINE.

THEN THE POLICY IS GOING TO REFLECT THAT IS ALL I'M SAYING.

>>PRESIDENT SCAMAN: I THINK WE NEED TO HAVE SOME CONSENSUS ON  
DETERMINING AND DECIPHERING WHAT WE WANT IN AND WHAT WE DON'T WANT IN.  
IS IT ACCEPTABLE TO ALL THAT ONCE THE REVENUE POLICY IS APPROVED BY  
THE VILLAGE BOARD THERE BE A REFERENCE IN EVERY POLICY TO CHECK THE  
OTHER POLICY BECAUSE WE CAN SEE THE WRITTEN - THE NEED FOR IT TO BE  
COMPLETELY AND UTTERLY DIFFERENT AND MY RATIONALE FOR THAT RIGHT NOW  
IS THAT YOU ARE NAMING DIFFERENT REVENUE SOURCES, BUT - SO DIFFERENT  
DIALOGUE FROM THE TAX LEVY.

THEY DO NOT AFFECT EACH PERSON IN THE VILLAGE OF OAK PARK EQUALLY AND  
THAT SOME REVENUE SOURCES - IF THEY ARE - IF THERE IS A REVENUE SOURCE  
THAT IS REALLY AFFECTING EVERY SINGLE PERSON EQUALLY, THEN MAYBE IT  
SHOULD BE IN THE TAX LEVY AND NOT MASKED UNDER A FEAR OR A FINE.

SO THERE IS A WHOLE DIFFERENT MENTALITY THAT WE NEED TO HAVE, THAT  
THIS BOARD NEEDS TO AGREE ON AND HOW IT IS THOSE REVENUE SOURCES ARE  
GOVERNED AND WHAT IS THE GUIDANCE FOR DEVELOPING THOSE REVENUE SOURCES  
THAT ALSO FITS WITH OUR VALUE SYSTEM?

SO THAT IS - AND FOR US TO SEPARATE OUT RIGHT HERE THE REVENUE SOURCES  
THAT - ALL OF THAT IS GOING TO BE SPELLED OUT IN A REVENUE POLICY AND  
NOT ALL REVENUE SOURCES WOULD APPLY EQUALLY AND SO THE NEED FOR THIS  
DOCUMENT SHOULD REFERENCE A REVENUE POLICY, BUT IT SHOULD NOT BE  
INCLUSIVE OF THE LEVY POLICY.

>>TRUSTEE PARAKKAT: WHAT I'M REACTING TO IS ITEM NUMBER 10 IN THE  
POLICY DOCUMENT WHERE IT SPECIFICALLY CALLS OUT A REDUCTION IN OUR  
VILLAGE REVENUE SOURCES.

IF WE ARE CALLING OUT REVENUE SOURCES AND A REDUCTION IN IT, IT IS  
FAIR GAME TO LOOK AT THE OTHER SIDE AS WELL, RIGHT?

OTHERWISE WE REMOVE THAT.

OTHERWISE I AGREE.

>>PRESIDENT SCAMAN: AGAIN, IF I DO NOT GET THIS RATE, PLEASE DO  
INTERRUPT ME.

VILLAGE MANAGER JACKSON, BUT OKAY, SO WE KNOW THAT COME 2026 WE ARE  
GOING TO LOSE 1% OF OUR GROCERY TAX.

THAT IS NOT DECIDED BY US.

THAT IS STILL DECIDED BY OUR LOCAL - IT IS A REVENUE SOURCE, RIGHT THAT WE ARE GOING TO LOSE, BUT IT IS STILL ENCOMPASSED IN WHAT IS ALLOWED US IN OUR LEVY.

AND WE DO NOT CONTROL IF SOMETHING IS TAKEN AWAY LIKE THAT.

SO IT IS STILL GOING TO BE FACTORED IN - THE PURPOSE OF THIS DOCUMENT IS TO - AS I SEE IT, HELP US DETERMINE WHAT AN APPROPRIATE LEVY SHOULD BE EACH AND EVERY YEAR AND BEFORE WE CREATE A BUDGET IN GUIDANCE FOR THAT BUDGET.

THAT RIGHT NOW THE 3% STICKS UNTIL THIS BOARD DETERMINES OTHERWISE, , BUT THAT THIS POLICY OUTLINES EVERYTHING THAT SHOULD BE CONSIDERED WHEN DETERMINING WHAT AN APPROPRIATE LEVY SHOULD BE FOR EACH AND EVERY YEAR MOVING FORWARD, BUT THAT LEVY THAT WE GET AND WHAT WE GET FROM THE STATE, WHAT WE GET FROM - IT IS PREDETERMINED AND NOT BY US. ANY REVENUE SOURCES THEN BECOME PART OF THE BUDGET PROCESS AND I IMAGINE THAT IS GOING TO BE IN THE BUDGET POLICY.

SO WE WILL SEE A LOT OF REDUNDANCY IF WE DO NOT ACCEPT SOME SEPARATION OF A FORMULA THAT GUIDES OUR DECISION-MAKING.

IF WE WANTED EVERY DOCUMENT TO SAY EVERYTHING, THEN THERE IS NO POINT MANAGER JACKSON?

>>VILLAGE MANAGER: WITH THAT EXAMPLE WITH THE GROCERY TAX, IF YOU DO NOT FIND A SUBSTITUTE FOR THAT TO RETAIN IT OR FIND AN ALTERNATE REVENUE SOURCE TO MAKE UP THAT \$1 MILLION LOSS FROM THE ELIMINATION OF THE GROCERY TAX, THEN YOU HAVE A DECISION-MAKING ON POLICY.

YOU HAVE A REDUCTION IN REVENUE, RIGHT MIKE THAT HAS BEEN IMPOSED BY A DECISION MADE AT THE STATE LEVEL.

IF YOU MAKE IT CHOICE OF WHAT LEVEL OF SERVICES YOU WANT - - REDUCTION IN REVENUE.

DO YOU WANT TO MAKE THAT UP HERE WITH THE TAX LEVY?

DO YOU WANT TO MAKE IT UP WITH ANOTHER REVENUE SOURCE OR DO YOU JUST WANT TO REDUCE SERVICES AS A RESULT OF THAT?

THOSE ARE THE TYPES OF - THIS IS THE TYPE OF GUIDANCE WE ARE TRYING TO CREATE AND IT SPEAKS TO THAT CROSS REFERENCE WITH ALL THE OTHER POLICIES.

SO I DO UNDERSTAND REALLY QUICK WHAT IS BEING SPOKEN ABOUT IN TERMS OF THE REVENUE AND THAT IS GOING TO BE DEALT WITH IN A SEPARATE POLICY, BUT I DO WANT TO ACKNOWLEDGE THAT I THINK WHAT WE WOULD BE DOING IS MAKING IT EXPLICIT IN THIS POLICY THAT WE ARE LOOKING AT THAT BECAUSE THE ASSUMPTION IS THAT WE ARE ALWAYS TRYING TO BROADEN THE BASE AND SOFTEN THE IMPACT ON THE TAXPAYERS THROUGH STRATEGIC ACTION LIKE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND SO FORTH, RIGHT?

SO THAT IS KIND OF ASSUMED, BUT I THINK WHAT WE ARE SPEAKING TO HIS MAKING THAT EXPLICIT.

>>TRUSTEE PARAKKAT: THAT IS EXACTLY THE POINT I AM MAKING INTO THIS 1% TAX THAT IS GOING AWAY, LET'S SAY IF IT WAS - INSTEAD OF 1% IT BECAME 2%.

THAT'S A REVENUE INCREASE.

IT HAS AN IMPACT.

I'M SAYING IF WE REFERENCE THAT HERE IT COULD GO EITHER WAY.

AT THIS POINT IT IS JUST GOING IN ONE DIRECTION AND THAT IS WHAT I'M TRYING TO SHIFT AND TO EMPHASIZE THE FOCUS ON EXACTLY WHAT YOU HAVE SAID, KEVIN.

>>PRESIDENT SCAMAN: THE DOCUMENTS ONCE WE REFERENCE AND WILL - -

>>DONNA GADON: DID YOU LOOK AT NUMBER 12 WHERE IT SAYS OTHER FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS IS APPLICABLE AND THAT COULD BE REVENUE.

>>TRUSTEE PARAKKAT: THERE IS ALREADY A LINE ITEM FOR REVENUE AND I'M JUST SAYING IS HAS REDUCTION.

IT CAN BE BOTH REDUCTION OR INCREASE.

>>TRUSTEE ROBINSON: I THINK THAT IS A QUESTION THAT I ACTUALLY WOULD LIKE YOU TO ANSWER.

IS IT YOUR ADVICE TO US THAT THE LEVY NUMBER IS A COST DRIVEN ANALYSIS?

>>DONNA GADON: YES.

>>TRUSTEE ROBINSON: WITHOUT THE ADDITION OF LOOKING AT POTENTIAL REVENUE INCREASES.

>>DONNA GADON: WE WILL LOOK AT POTENTIAL REVENUE INCREASES, BUT IF THEY ARE ONE OFFS OR IF THEY ARE REVENUES THAT YOU HAVE DECIDED TO DO NEW THINGS, FOR YOUR EXAMPLE, WE HAVE 50 EMPTY STORES, AS A PROVEN FINANCE PERSON I'M NOT GOING TO TAKE THE NUMBER THAT YOU ARE SAYING YOU HAVE 50 STORES BECAUSE IT IS BEYOND OUR CONTROL TO GET PEOPLE IN ALL 50 OF THOSE STORES.

>>TRUSTEE ROBINSON: I WILL MAKE MY QUESTION MORE SPECIFIC. IS IT YOUR ADVICE THAT WE DO NOT INCLUDE REOCCURRING STABLE REVENUE SOURCES IN THE TAX LEVY POLICY?

>>DONNA GADON: YES.

>>TRUSTEE ROBINSON: THAT IS YOUR ADVICE TO US?

>>TRUSTEE ROBINSON: I CAN INCREASE IN REVENUE THAT WE KNOW IS GOING TO BE THERE YOUR TEAR?  
WHY?

>>DONNA GADON: NOT RECURRING BECAUSE WE ARE ALREADY TAKING THOSE INTO CONSIDERATION.

>>TRUSTEE ROBINSON: I THINK I WILL CHANGE MY ORIGINAL ASKED TO YOU A LITTLE BIT BECAUSE I THINK THIS IDEA THAT PRESIDENT SCAMAN IS GETTING AT, BUT NOT ALL REVENUE SOURCES ARE GRADED EQUAL I THINK IS A POINT WELL TAKEN AND I THINK IT COULD CREATE SOME CONFUSION IF THAT CLARIFICATION IS NOT MADE IN THIS DOCUMENT.

>>DONNA GADON: WHEN YOU SAY REOCCURRING, SAY SALES TAX, WE HAVE A PROJECTION, USE TAX PAID WE HAVE A PROJECTION BUT WE GET NUMBERS FROM THE STATE ON A LOT OF THE NUMBERS THAT WE HAVE.  
THOSE ARE REOCCURRING ONES.

I'M THINKING THAT WE'RE NOT GOING TO PUT IN HERE, SHOULD NOT BE IN HERE IS SOMETHING THAT YOU ARE PROJECTING - YEAH, I JUST SAYING THAT IS NOT REOCCURRING AND IT IS SOMETHING NEW. WE WOULD NOT TAKE THAT INTO CONSIDERATION.

>>TRUSTEE ROBINSON: UNDERSTOOD AND I THINK THAT THAT IS PRUDENT, BUT THEN WOULD YOU ADD LANGUAGE QUALIFYING THE TYPE OF REVENUE SERVICE - QUALIFYING THE TYPE OF REVENUE INCREASE WE SHOULD CONSIDER?

>>DONNA GADON: MEANING?  
NEW REVENUE?  
OR NEW SOURCES?

>>TRUSTEE ROBINSON: THAT IS NOT ONE TIME AND THAT IS NOT - IT IS NEW AND WE DO NOT KNOW WHAT THAT IS GOING TO LOOK LIKE YEAR AFTER YEAR. NOT ANY OF THOSE TYPES OF REVENUE, BUT ACKNOWLEDGING THAT THERE ARE DIFFERENT TYPES OF REVENUE AND THERE IS CERTAINLY A TYPE THAT WE CAN COUNT ON YEAR AFTER YEAR THERE MAY BE AN INCREASE. SO THEN.

>> WE WOULD HAVE A CLARIFICATION OF THE DIFFERENT REVENUES THAT WOULD COME IN.

>> DO YOU THINK IT SHOULD BE ADDED TO THIS?  
IT SOUNDS LIKE YOU DON'T.

>>DONNA GADON: THEN WE SAY LOOK AT THE REVENUE POLICY ON HOW WE BRING IN REVENUE WITH DIFFERENT SOURCES. THIS IS JUST SAYING ALL THE POLICIES GO IN TOGETHER THIS IS JUST SAYING THESE ARE SOME OF THE THINGS THAT WE TAKE INTO CONSIDERATION TO DO THIS TAX LEVY.

>>TRUSTEE ROBINSON: I THINK I WOULD WITHDRAW MY ASKED THEN AND MAYBE THESE TWO WOULD STILL ASK THAT THE REVENUE PIECE BE INCLUDED, BUT LIKE GETTING THIS ADDITIONAL DETAIL AND DISTILLING IT DOWN MORE, I'M CONCERNED THEN IN THAT CASE THAT IF THERE IS A REFERENCE IT IS JUST NOT GOING TO BE QUALIFIED ENOUGH TO BE WELL UNDERSTOOD AND IT'S GOING TO CREATE SOME CONFUSION AS TO HOW THE LEVY NUMBER SHOULD BE ARRIVED AT.

>>PRESIDENT SCAMAN: JUST A QUICK CLARIFICATION OF THAT.

>> ARE NOT SAYING WE INCLUDE ALL THE REVENUE DETAILS HERE. I'M SAYING BECAUSE WE HAVE INCLUDED A LINE ITEM, WE CLARIFIED THAT OR REMOVE THAT AND REFERENCE THE REVENUE POLICY IF THAT IS OUR PREFERENCE. LET US BE CONSISTENT.

>>TRUSTEE PARAKKAT: LINE ITEM 10 AS IT READS NOW IS A UNIDIRECTIONAL MOTION OF REVENUE AND I JUST WANT THAT TO BE REDUCTION OR INCREASE. IF YOU ARE INCLUDING THAT LINE, THAT WOULD BE THE CONSISTENT WAY TO HANDLE THAT.

I'M ALSO OKAY WITH IT BEING COMPLETELY REMOVED AND REFERENCING THE REVENUE POLICY.

>>DONNA GADON: I UNDERSTAND.

>>PRESIDENT SCAMAN: WHAT WOULD YOU RECOMMEND?

>>DONNA GADON: I NEED TO REALLY LOOK AT THAT.

>>TRUSTEE PARAKKAT: I AM NOT DONE.

THE NEXT ONE IS SIMILARLY ON THE COST SIDE, WHICH IS LINE ITEM 2. SO AGAIN, COST - WE'RE TALKING ABOUT INCREASE IN COST.

THAT ALSO CAN GO EITHER WAY.

AND THEN AT THE EXAMPLE - THERE HAS TO BE AN EXAMPLE.

LET'S SAY WE ELIMINATE A DEPARTMENT OR SOMETHING LIKE THAT IN THAT INSTANCE.

THEN OUR OVERALL COSTS COULD POTENTIALLY GO DOWN AND IN THE POLICY WE WILL NEED TO GIVE ROOM FOR THAT JUST TO STAY CONSISTENT SO WE ARE GIVING ROOM FOR BOTH.

JUST LIKE ON THE REVENUE SIDE WE ARE DOING BOTH.

YES.

>>PRESIDENT SCAMAN: MAYBE THAT JUST MEANS NEUTRALIZING HER NUMBER TWO RATES PER LABOR COSTS, RELATED OPERATING COST TO SUPPORT GENERAL FUND OPERATIONS.

PERIOD.

WHATEVER THE GENERAL FUND OPERATIONS ARE.

IT IS, WHAT IT IS.

THE ANNUAL INCREASE OR WHATEVER THE ANNUAL AMOUNT IS FOR THIS COMPONENT TIES ADDITIONAL DOLLARS AVAILABLE FOR NEW GROWTH AS SET FORTH IN ITEM 1 ABOVE.

SO YOU ARE JUST NEUTRALIZING IT.

IS THAT SUFFICIENT?

>>TRUSTEE PARAKKAT: THAT WORKS AND THE THIRD ONE IS AROUND THE RESERVE LEVELS.

IT IS MENTIONED AS AMPLE, WHICH IS VERY SUBJECTIVE AND I WOULD LIKE THAT TO BE QUALIFIED A LITTLE FURTHER AS A PERCENTAGE OF OR SOME WAY TO SAY WHAT AMPLE IS.

SO IT IS A NUMBER 11.

SO SOME WAY TO - WHAT?

[CROSSTALK]

>>DONNA GADON: I WAS GOING TO SAY WE COULD DO THAT.

>>PRESIDENT SCAMAN: I'M SORRY, PLEASE, WOULD YOU RECAP THAT A LITTLE?

>>TRUSTEE PARAKKAT: NUMBER 11, TO SAID STAIN AMPLE RESERVE LEVELS.

THE WORD "AMPLE" IS SUBJECTIVE AND WE HAVE OPPORTUNITY TO QUALIFY AND MAYBE QUANTIFY IT A LITTLE FURTHER AS A PERCENTAGE OF SOMETHING OR A RANGE OF SOMETHING THAT IS A LITTLE MORE QUALIFIED THAN AMPLE.

>>PRESIDENT SCAMAN: CAN IT JUST BE SUFFICIENT?

IS THAT MORE NEUTRAL?

ON THE VILLAGE MANAGER FORM OF GOVERNMENT THERE STILL A FOUNDATIONAL RESPONSIBILITY THAT WE ARE PROVIDING THE BASIC SERVICES THAT A MUNICIPALITY IS RESPONSIBLE FOR.

>>TRUSTEE PARAKKAT: OF THIS IS ABOUT RESERVES, RIGHT?

>>VILLAGE MANAGER: THERE'S A POLICY FOR THAT AND IT REFERENCES THAT.

>>DONNA GADON: HERE IT IS REFERENCING THE FUND BALANCE OF POLICY.

>> IS THAT GOING TO REMAIN INTACT OR IS THAT A NEW POLICY? WHY CAN'T WE JUST REFERENCE THAT INSTEAD OF SAYING THE WORD "AMPLE"?

>>TRUSTEE ROBINSON: (SPEAKER AWAY FROM MIC).

I'M SORRY, JUST AFFECTED BECAUSE SHE IS SAYING IT IS ALREADY INCLUDED IN HERE BY THE SECOND PART OF THAT SENTENCE.

SO IT ALREADY QUALIFIES AMPLE.

IF I UNDERSTAND YOUR ANSWER.

>> THAT IS SUFFICIENT AND IT GIVES ENOUGH GUIDANCE AND THE OTHER POLICY?

>>VILLAGE MANAGER: YES BECAUSE YOU ALREADY HAVE A RESERVE POLICY THAT IS ALREADY APPROVED AND SUBJECT TO REVIEW ON AN ANNUAL BASIS. SO THAT IS REALLY WHAT IS THE GUIDANCE THERE. THAT IS THE QUALIFIER.

>>TRUSTEE PARAKKAT: ARE WE REVIEWING THAT AS PART OF THIS PROCESS BECAUSE I KNOW WE ARE ALL ABOVE OUR THRESHOLD RIGHT NOW. SO OUR THRESHOLD IS I THINK 13 MILLION TO 23 MILLION OR SOMETHING LIKE THAT.

>>DONNA GADON: I DON'T LIKE - AND COLD. YOU WILL REVIEW THE POLICY, THE FUND BALANCE POLICY.

>>TRUSTEE PARAKKAT: AND THAT WILL TAKE PRECEDENCE? WE'RE JUST POINTING TO THAT?

SO WHILE AMPLE IS USED, AS STILL SUPERSEDE THAT?

>> I STARTED WITH THIS POLICY AND WE ARE IN THE PROCESS OF ALL THE DEPARTMENTS THAT ARE NECESSARY TO REVIEWING THE POLICIES, BUT THIS IS THE ONE THAT YOU WILL ASK ME FOR.

AND SO YOU WILL GET THE OTHER ONES AND YOU CAN SEE HOW THE CROSS REFERENCE - -

>>PRESIDENT SCAMAN: SAFE TO SAY WE SHOULD HAVE HAD ALL THESE ALL ALONG?

OKAY.

>>TRUSTEE PARAKKAT: THE LAST POINT I WILL MAKE IS ON THE FIRST ITEM, WHICH IS THE 12 MONTH INFLATION TREND, RIGHT?

SO SHOULDN'T WE ALSO BE CONSIDERING OUR PREVIOUS LEVY INCREASES, HISTORICAL TRENDS, 12 MONTHS OF COURSE.

- A FEW FACTORS, NOT JUST THE LAST 12 MONTHS BECAUSE WOULDN'T - IF WE JUST CONSIDER THE LAST 12 MONTHS, WOULDN'T THAT - TO YOUR POINT ABOUT CERTAIN UPS AND DOWNS, WOULDN'T IT COST US.

>>DONNA GADON: WE CAN ADD THAT.

>>TRUSTEE PARAKKAT: THE GOAL OF TRYING TO MAKE IT SMOOTH, IF WE COULD USE OTHER METRICS THAN 12 MONTHS.

>>PRESIDENT SCAMAN: IT THEN AT THAT FURTHER SUPPORTS THE TEACHINGS AROUND WHY WE WOULD NOT GO WITH A 0% LEVY IF WE WANTED TO BE A SMOOTH INCREASE.

>>TRUSTEE PARAKKAT: I WAS NOT REFERENCING - THE SMOOTHNESS IS BASED ON HISTORICAL TRENDS.

SO THE AVERAGE HISTORICAL INFLATION FROM THE LAST 100 YEARS TO MAINTAIN THIS 2.82% AND THAT IS WHERE THE 3% COMES.

>>PRESIDENT SCAMAN: IS THAT RIGHT?

I WAS THERE.

THAT WAS NOT REFERENCED IN ANY WAY.

DO YOU HAVE FURTHER QUESTIONS?

>>TRUSTEE PARAKKAT: I DON'T HAVE ANY FURTHER QUESTIONS.

>>PRESIDENT SCAMAN: OKAY.

>>TRUSTEE WESLEY: COUPLE THINGS.

A TOUCHING ON SOME OF THESE POINTS.

IT IS OUT OF ORDER THAN I INTENDED.

ON THE SMOOTHNESS, I'M NOT SURE I CARE ABOUT SMOOTHNESS TO BE HONEST BECAUSE THERE'S A DOWNSIDE TO SMOOTHNESS AND THAT SMOOTHNESS IS A GRADUAL KIND OF ROAD UP THE MOUNTAIN.

LIKE I WANT TO KEEP IT SMOOTH, KEEP IT SMOOTH AND THEN - I'M STILL THINKING ABOUT THIS OR NOT SURE YET.

I'M THINKING THERE MIGHT BE SOME MIRRORED IN 3% ONE YEAR BECAUSE WE ONLY NEED THREE AND 7% ONE YEAR AND BACK DOWN TO 2% BECAUSE THAT IS WHAT WE NEED THE NEXT YEAR AND IF WE EVER GET TO THE POINT WHERE WE NEED 6%, THE SMOOTHNESS MEANS THAT WE GO TO SEVEN, EIGHT, NINE THE NEXT YEAR AND RECESSED THE BASE ANYWAY AS YOU WERE SAYING.

SO IT'S NOT SEVEN, EIGHT, NINE FROM THE NEXT YEAR, BUT SEVEN, EIGHT, NINE FROM THE PREVIOUS YEAR WHEN WE DID THE JUMP.

AND IT IS REALLY WEIRD TALKING WITH THIS, I'M SORRY, BUT YOU KNOW WHAT I MEAN.

YOU GO FROM 100,000 NOW THIS YEAR WE'RE SHORT ON EVERYTHING AND SO WE INCREASE THE LEVY TO GET 125 AND NOW THAT IS OUR NEW BASE AND DO WE DO 2% FOR 125 OR ARE WE TRYING TO MAKE 2% BACK FROM 100 BECAUSE THAT WAS A ONE-OFF YEAR AND OUR OTHER REVENUE SOURCES INCREASED AND GOT US BACK TO WHERE WE WANTED TO BE?

SO THAT IS MY CONSIDERATION ABOUT TRYING TO MAINTAIN THE SMOOTHNESS OF THE LEVY, BUT THAT ONE IS REALLY THE SMALLEST POINT.



JUST THE LAST THING, TRUSTEE PARAKKAT SAID.  
SO FOR NUMBER 10 ON THE REDUCTION IN THE VILLAGE REVENUE SOURCES, CAN  
WE JUST SAY A CHANGE?

A CHANGE IN OTHER REVENUE SOURCES?

>>DONNA GADON: YEAH, OKAY.

I FEEL LIKE THAT IS MAYBE A LITTLE BIT BETTER.

>>TRUSTEE STRAW: LONG-TERM OR ONGOING CHANGE.

I THINK THAT GOES TO THE POINTS THAT TRUSTEE ROBINSON WAS REFERENCING  
EARLIER WHERE YOU WANT SOMETHING THAT IS SORT OF A REOCCURRING THING.  
SO LONG-TERM OR ONGOING CHANGE IS SOMETHING THAT I HAD IN MY NOTES  
DURING THIS DISCUSSION IF THAT IS.

>>DONNA GADON: I WOULD NOT SAY ONGOING BECAUSE THE TAX LEVY IS  
EVERY YEAR AND SO THIS WILL APPLY TO EACH YEAR.  
SO THE CHANGE IN OTHER VILLAGE REVENUE SOURCES WOULD APPLY TO THE YEAR  
THAT WE ARE ACTUALLY DOING THE LEVY.  
SO INSTEAD OF SAYING "ONGOING" BECAUSE IT IS NEW EVERY YEAR.

>>TRUSTEE STRAW: I THINK THE DISTINCTION BEING MADE WAS LIKE WITH  
THE REDUCTION IN THE GROCERY TAX WHERE THAT IS A REDUCTION THAT IS  
GOING TO BE A LONG-TERM CHANGE IN OTHER REVENUE SOURCES.  
SIMILARLY IF IT WAS AN INCREASE TO THE TAX, WHERE IT WOULD BE A LONG-  
TERM CHANGE TO OTHER REVENUE SOURCES, THAT IS THE ONLY PART OF THE  
DISTINCTION.

>>PRESIDENT SCAMAN: ARE WE COMFORTABLE LEAVING IT WITH "CHANGE"?

>>TRUSTEE STRAW: ONE YEAR INCREASE, ONE YEAR DECREASE.

IT IS NOT ANY CHANGE, IT IS A CHANGE THAT IS PROJECTABLE TO THE  
FUTURE.

>>TRUSTEE WESLEY: I GET WHERE YOU'RE AT WITH THAT.

I WAS JUST TRYING TO AWAY FROM THE INCREASE OR REDUCTION.

JUST CALL IT A CHANGE.

MOVING ON FROM THAT.

WHAT IS MISSING HERE FOR ME IS BOARD GOALS AND OTHER PRIORITIES.  
WE DO NOT HAVE THAT ENUMERATED HERE IN ANY OF THESE ITEMS AND I THINK  
THAT IS IMPORTANT.

BECAUSE BOARDS HAVE GOALS AND GOALS COST MONEY AND MONEY HITS THE  
LEVY.

BOARD GOALS AND PRIORITIES.

>>PRESIDENT SCAMAN: IS THAT NOT PART OF THE BUDGETING PROCESS  
ITSELF THOUGH?

>>TRUSTEE WESLEY: I WAS IN MY NEXT QUESTION IS WHEN DO WE GET  
THIS AND HOW DOES IT LOOK.

MY IDEAL AS WE'RE TALKING THROUGH THIS, MY IDEAL POINT IN THE PROCESS  
WHERE WE SEE THIS IS BEFORE WE START TALKING ABOUT THE LEVY AND WHEN  
WE GET THIS DOCUMENT IT HAS NUMBERS.

SO EACH ONE OF THESE 12 POINTS WOULD HAVE A NUMBER ATTACHED TO IT.

SO LIKE WHEN I LOOK AT SOCIAL SECURITY, MEDICARE, FICA, ANY OTHER RELEVANT TAXES, WE HAVE A NUMBER OF THAT THAT IS IN THE BUDGET DON'T WE?

LIKE IT IS ITEMIZED.

I THINK I REMEMBER SEEING IT IN THE LAST BUDGET.

>>DONNA GADON: OKAY.

THIS POLICY IS A POLICY THAT WILL BE RESET.

IF YOU ARE LOOKING AT IT TO SEE WHERE IT IS IN THE BUDGET, THAT WILL BE ON THE BUDGETING SIDE.

>>TRUSTEE WESLEY: I FOLLOW, I GUESS WHAT I'M TRYING TO SAY IS THAT IF THIS POLICY IS SETTING THE LEVY, THAN IT DOES NOT HAVE ENOUGH INFORMATION TO SET THE LEVY.

BECAUSE LIKE IF WE ARE SAYING - IF WE LOOK AT THESE AND ABSTRACT WITHOUT ANY NUMBERS ATTACHED TO IT AND SAY 5%, I DON'T KNOW HOW I BACK INTO 5% BECAUSE I DON'T HAVE ANY NUMBERS HERE.

I DON'T KNOW IF HEALTHCARE AND OTHER INSURANCE COSTS WENT UP A LOT OR A LITTLE PRE-TO SEE WHAT I'M GETTING AT?

>>VILLAGE MANAGER: YOU GET THAT THROUGH THE BUDGET PROCESS. THAT IS EXPLAINED IN THE BUDGET DOCUMENT.

>>TRUSTEE WESLEY: SO DOES THIS, THE END?

>>VILLAGE MANAGER: THIS IS THE POLICY THAT PROVIDES GUIDANCE TO THE STAFF ON HOW TO PREPARE THE BUDGET.

SO THESE ARE ALL THE CONSIDERATIONS THAT THE FINANCE DEPARTMENT AND THE MANAGEMENT IS CONSIDERING WHEN THEY'RE DEVELOPING THE BUDGET.

>> SO THIS IS FOR YOU GUYS?

>>VILLAGE MANAGER: FROM A GOVERNING STANDPOINT YOU WILL MAKE SURE THAT WE'RE LOOKING AT ALL THESE THINGS AND THEN YES, WE ARE PROVIDING YOU WITH INFORMATION AS PART OF THE BUDGET PROCESS THAT CORRESPONDS WITH EACH OF THESE CONSIDERATIONS THAT ARE OUTLINED.

>>TRUSTEE WESLEY: SO AS PART OF THE BUDGETING PROCESS I WOULD LIKE TO SEE NUMBERS START TO SHOW UP NEXT TO EACH ONE OF THESE POINTS, RIGHT?

AND THEN ALL OF THOSE NUMBERS ROLL UP THEN TO A PERCENTAGE INCREASE OF THE LEVY.

RIGHT?

THAT IS EASILY COMMUNICABLE TO THE COMMUNITY, RIGHT?

>>DONNA GADON: THAT IS IN THE BUDGET PROCESS.

>> IF THIS COMES IN THE MIDDLE OR THE END OF THE BUDGET PROCESS AND IF WE CAN PRODUCE THIS DOCUMENT THEN AS A ONE PAGER SO TO SPEAK THAT WE GIVE BOTH TO US AND THE COMMUNITY AND IT'S LIKE, OKAY, SO WE'RE INCREASING THE LEVY A PERCENT, BUT HERE IS WHY.

LIKE INSURANCE PREMIUM COSTS WENT UP AND THAT ACCOUNTS FOR 2% OF THE LEVY NOW.

SO YOU HAVE ALL OF THAT AND ALL OF THAT IS NOW SITUATED AND YOU CAN SAY, OKAY COMMUNITY, THIS IS THE 7%, EACH ONE OF THESE ITEMS.

>>DONNA GADON: AS YOUR SIN, IF YOU INCREASE IT BY 8%, WE GIVE YOU WHY WE HAD TO INCREASE IT.

THIS IS WHAT IT WAS LAST YEAR, IT WAS INCREASED BY THIS THIS YEAR AND THIS IS WHAT IT WAS LAST YEAR.

OH NO, THAT IS HIGHLY EXPLAINED AND WE'RE NOT GOING TO COME AND SAY WE WANT YOU TO INCREASE BY A PERCENT WITHOUT EXPLANATION.

THEN IT IS BROKEN DOWN SO THAT YOU CAN SAY, YOU KNOW, PENSIONS WENT UP.

THIS WENT UP.

>>TRUSTEE WESLEY: YOU GUYS ALWAYS DO, BUT NEVER IN THIS FORMAT AND I THINK IF WE USE THIS FOR A POLICY FORMAT AND MAPPING TO THIS IN THAT WAY, IT MAKES IT EASY TO COMMUNICATE.

>>VILLAGE MANAGER: GOT YOU.

>>PRESIDENT SCAMAN: FOR THE RECORD, JUST BECAUSE WE ASK FOR DOES NOT MEAN WE ARE GOING TO SAY YES.

>>TRUSTEE WESLEY: OF COURSE, YES.

I THINK AT THE END OF THE PROCESS WHENEVER WE DO SO YES WE SHOULD BE ABLE TO HAVE THIS DOCUMENT WITH ALL OF THOSE NUMBERS.

>>PRESIDENT SCAMAN: VERY MUCH APPRECIATED.

THANK YOU.

>>TRUSTEE WESLEY: BLAH BLAH BLAH.

>>PRESIDENT SCAMAN: AND IT SPEAKS TO THE SIDE OF IT.

>>TRUSTEE WESLEY: ABSOLUTELY.

OH, JUST A POINT THAT WE HAVE A FUND BALANCE POLICY.

YEAH, WHATEVER.

WE WILL TALK ABOUT THAT NEXT.

>>VILLAGE MANAGER: I WANT TO MAKE SURE AND CLARIFY.

SO WE ARE ADDING OR NOT IN LINE RELATED TO BOARD GOALS AND PRIORITIES. ONE OF THE THINGS I WANT TO POINT TO THE SCOPE.

WE TRY TO CAPTURE THAT GENERALLY IN THE SCOPE LANGUAGE HERE IN THOSE TWO SENTENCES IN ORDER TO STAY RESPONSIVE TO EFFICIENCY AND NOT OVERBURDEN THE TAX BASE WE WILL ADOPT AN ANNUAL LEVY INCREASE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THIS POLICY.

SO WE TRY TO CAPTURE ALL THERE, BUT I WANT TO CLARIFY THAT IF YOU ARE ASKING TO BE MORE EXPLICIT ABOUT BOARD PRIORITIES AND GOALS - THAT COULD MAKE IT CLEARER WHERE WE ARE SAY, HEY LOOK, WE HAVE A BASELINE OF SERVICES THAT WE PROVIDE AND CITIZENS COME TO EXPECT, BUT THEN THERE IS THESE STRATEGIC INITIATIVES THAT WE ADOPT EVERY COUPLE OF YEARS BUT ALSO COST MONEY IF THAT IS WHAT YOUR SIN, THEN YES, ADDING A LINE MAY MAKE THAT MORE CLEAR.

>>TRUSTEE WESLEY: ABSOLUTELY.

I THINK ULTIMATELY IF WE DO IT THIS WAY WE END UP WITH SO MUCH MORE TRANSPARENCY AROUND HOW WE LEVY AND SPEND MONEY THAN WHAT WE HAVE NOW AND I THINK IT WOULD BE AN AMAZING THING.

>>PRESIDENT SCAMAN: DO WE WANT THAT LINE ADDED UNDER SCOPE OR DO WE WANT THE LINE ADDED UNDER POLICY?

>>TRUSTEE WESLEY: I WOULD PUT IT UNDER B, AS A LINE ITEM AS ONE OF THOSE NUMBERS UNDER B.

>>VILLAGE MANAGER: I THINK THAT WORKS AND I THINK THE SCOPE COULD CAPTURE JUST THE BASELINE SERVICES THAT WE PROVIDE.

>>PRESIDENT SCAMAN: I AM COMFORTABLE WITH IT UNDER SCOPE, BUT IF IT'S MAJORITY OF THE BOARD UNDER B, THAT IS FINE. ALSO RECOGNIZING THAT THIS IS A DISCUSSION THE NIGHT AS YOU LISTEN TO ALL THAT YOU HAVE HEARD, YOU ARE STILL GOING TO BRING BACK SOMETHING THAT WOULD THEN HOPEFULLY BE ON CONSENT AGENDA, BUT THAT WE CAN ACTUALLY READ AND AFFIRM, RIGHT? JUST FOR THE RECORD. TRUSTEE STRONG?

>>TRUSTEE STRAW: CONSISTENT WITH SOMETHING THAT TRUSTEE PARAKKAT SAID ON THE CONSUMER PRICE INDEX. RIGHT NOW UNDER SECTION 3B1, WE HAVE A 12 MONTH LOOK BACK. I THINK FOR ANY OF THESE ITEMS WHERE WE ARE LOOKING AT COST INCREASES OVER TIME HAVING ONE, THREE, FIVE, AND 10 YEAR LOOK BACK WHERE WE CAN LOOK AT THE ANNUALIZED INCREASE IN COSTS SO WE CAN HAVE A SENSE BOTH FOR RECENT SPIKES OR RECENT DECREASES AS WELL AS A LONGER-TERM TREND LINE, SINCE I THINK OFTEN TIMES WE ARE GOING TO TRY TO CHART THAT MEDIUM COURSE WHERE WE ARE NOT OVERREACTING TO THE RECENT PAST, BUT WE ARE STAYING CONSISTENT WITH A LONGER TRENDLINE. I THINK THAT HAVING THE DATA BROKEN OUT IN SHORTER-TERM AND LONGER-TERM CHUNKS IS GOING TO JUST GIVE US A LITTLE BIT MORE TO THINK ABOUT AND SO IN ADDITION TO DOING IT FOR CPI, I THINK IT WOULD MAKE SENSE OR WE ARE LOOKING AT LABOR COSTS. WHERE WE ARE LOOKING AT HEALTH INSURANCE COSTS. ALL OF THOSE SORT OF LONGER-TERM COST INCREASES WHERE SOMETIMES, YOU KNOW, THOSE HEALTH INSURANCE COSTS, THEY GO UP MIGHTY FAST AND UNDERSTANDING HOW THEY ARE GOING UP BOTH IN THE SHORT TERM AND OVER THE LAST DECADE IS GOING TO HELP US BE THINKING IN A LONGER-TERM MINDSET WHEN WE'RE TALKING ABOUT WHETHER WE SHOULD BE DOING A 0% LEVY INCREASE OR MAYBE FINDING SOMETHING THAT IS GOING TO GIVE US A BASE THAT KEEPS UP WITH THE LONGER-TERM DEADLINES.

>>PRESIDENT SCAMAN: NOW YOU ARE TALKING ABOUT AN ANALYSIS THAT WE WOULD WANT TO BE DOING, AGAIN, - I DON'T KNOW THAT THAT IS PART OF THIS POLICY.

>>TRUSTEE STRAW: SHIRT. I'M NOT SAYING THAT WE NEED THIS FOR CONSIDERING THE POLICY. I'M SAYING WHEN WE - -

>>DONNA GADON: HISTORICAL TREND IS WITHIN THE BUDGET, YES.

>>DONNA GADON: THANK YOU. OKAY.

IT.

>>PRESIDENT SCAMAN: ANY OTHER QUESTIONS FOR THIS BECAUSE, YOU KNOW, VERY MUCH APPRECIATED.

I DO THINK EVERYTHING TRUSTEE WESLEY SAID ABOUT - ALL OF THIS IS GOING TO REALLY, REALLY HELP AND I DO WANT TO JUST POINT OUT THAT WE SPENT AN HOUR ON AN AGENDA ITEM IN THE MEETING IS POST BE ENDING AND WE'RE SUPPOSED TO BE STARTING ANOTHER MEETING AND WITH PEOPLE IN THE AUDIENCE AND IF WE COULD PLEASE EMAIL, CALL STAFF AND ASK THEM QUESTIONS SO THAT WE CAN COME TO THE BOARD TABLE AND WE CAN STAY ON TASK AND BE CLEARER TO THE COMMUNITY ON WHERE IT IS THAT WE AS POLICYMAKERS STAND AND NOT HAVE TO NECESSARILY DEBATE THE MEANING OF THINGS AND GET OFF TRACK AND I DO CONSIDER IT GETTING OFF TRACK BECAUSE YOU ARE NOT LEARNING AT THE BOARD TABLE, FOLKS.

OKAY?

YOU ARE THE ONES MAKING THE DECISIONS.

I WOULD LIKE YOU TO MAKE THE CALLS YOU NEED TO MAKE IT SO THAT YOU ARE READY TO MAKE THE DECISION WHEN YOU COME TO THE BOARD TABLE AND YOU ARE LISTENING TO YOUR COLLEAGUES ABOUT - TO COLLECTIVELY THEN WITH THE FEEDBACK FROM YOUR COLLEAGUES MAKE A DECISION.

OKAY?

I'M NOT INCLINED TO TABLE THE NEXT AGENDA ITEM, BUT I'M VERY TEMPTED TO.

BECAUSE WE ARE HOLDING OFF PEOPLE WHO HAVE BEEN WORKING 14 HOURS TODAY TO HAVE THEIR LIQUOR LICENSE APPROVED TONIGHT BECAUSE WE DID NOT NECESSARILY COME PREPARED FOR THE AGENDA AS PRESENTED.

YOU KNOW?

WE ARE LOSING STAFF BECAUSE WE HAVE FIVE HOUR MEETINGS.

IT IS NOT FAIR TO KEEP THEM HERE.

OKAY.

NEXT AGENDA ITEM -

>>DONNA GADON: THE NEXT AGENDA ITEM, THE PERSON THAT YOU FEEL YOU WANT TO TABLE IT, ARLENE WILL BE HERE.

SHE IS OUT SICK TODAY AND WE THOUGHT SHE MIGHT HAVE BEEN ABLE TO CALL IN, BUT SHE IS REALLY SICK.

I CAN GO OVER IT OR YOU CAN EMAIL US YOUR QUESTIONS AND WE CAN ANSWER YOUR QUESTIONS AND THEN WE CAN COME BACK AND THEN PRESENT THE ANSWERS TO THE QUESTIONS YOU HAVE.

>>PRESIDENT SCAMAN: IS EVERYBODY OKAY WITH THAT?

I WOULD ENTERTAIN A MOTION TO ADJOURN.

>> SO MOVED.

>> SECOND.

>>PRESIDENT SCAMAN: DID YOU HAVE ANYTHING YOU WANT TO ADD?

>>VILLAGE MANAGER: I THINK THE COMMUNICATION STAFF WOULD LIKE US TO TAKE A 10 MINUTE BREAK BEFORE SESSION?

>>PRESIDENT SCAMAN: YES.

>>PRESIDENT SCAMAN: I'M SORRY?

>>TRUSTEE ROBINSON: WE HAVE TO DO A CALL TO ADJOURN?

>>PRESIDENT SCAMAN: ALL IN FAVOR?

>> AYE.

>>PRESIDENT SCAMAN: FOR THE AUDIENCE, WE NEED TO TAKE 10 MINUTES BEFORE WE CAN START THE RECORDING SO WE WILL START THE REGULAR BOARD MEETING AT 7:11 PM.  
THANK YOU.

[10 MINUTE RECESS]