

**MINUTES OF A BOARD MEETING OF THE
RECREATIONAL AUTHORITY OF
ROSEVILLE AND EASTPOINTE
HELD ON THURSDAY, MARCH 8, 2012**

The meeting was called to order at 5:30 p.m. at the Roseville Recreation Center, 18185 Sycamore, by Chairperson Aiuto with the following Board Members present:

Duchane, Frontera, Klinefelt and Switalski

Attorney Rich Albright administered the oath of office to Charles Frontera.

Administrator present: Attorney Rich Albright and Director Anthony Lipinski

Motion by Switalski, seconded by Duchane, to amend the minutes of the regular meeting dated January 26, 2012, with the following changes: second paragraph delete "Klinefelt" and move Aiuto (arrived at 6:28 p.m.) between paragraph beginning "Gerald Sanscartier's..." and "Russ Goodrich's...".

Yeas: Switalski, Klinefelt, Duchane, Frontera and Aiuto

Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED

Motion by Switalski, seconded by Klinefelt, to approve the minutes of the special meeting dated February 16, 2012, as written.

Yeas: Switalski, Klinefelt, Duchane, Frontera and Aiuto

Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED

Discussion on the Bond Capacity for the Authority:

Chairperson Aiuto asked if the Board wishes to discuss this in closed session or in open session.

Attorney Rich Albright said the Board can go into closed session to discuss this because it is an attorney-client privileged document but the Board can vote to discuss in open session by waiving privilege.

Board Member Duchane said we can waive privilege because there is nothing in the document that we can't discuss in open session. Board Member Switalski concurred. Mr. Albright said the legal opinion doesn't have any content in it regarding strategy.

Motion by Switalski, seconded by Frontera, to waive attorney-client privilege on the bond capacity letter.

Yeas: Switalski, Frontera, Duchane, Klinefelt, Aiuto

Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED

Board Member Switalski said his conclusion is that we could go for a bond but would need a vote of the people; limits how much we can bond; if we want to go for a five year or less bond we could do it without a vote of the people; not eager to go ask the residents for more money but does want to know what our authority is.

Vice Chairperson Klinefelt said the five year isn't a bond levy above the mil but if you go to a vote of the people you would levy more than the one mil. Board Member Switalski said you would need to stay in the one mil levy and pay it off within five years. Vice Chairperson Klinefelt said that prior to this legal opinion we thought any bond we did had to be paid from within that one mil and that we couldn't seek from the residents more money, unfortunately that was what was discussed and that was what we conveyed to the residents; original opinion was that the attorneys thought it would be within that one mil and when they researched and found some gray area, they had to do more research and that changed the opinion on that. Attorney Rich Albright said this opinion gives the Board more leeway in trying to fund for building maintenance or renovations. Board Member Duchane said we have the opinion that we operate within our mil or the option is to present it before the voters for a funding proposal that would exceed that one mil.

Vice Chairperson Klinefelt commented that when we were talking about the renovation, we were going to do a loan or a bond on that. Director Lipinski responded that the renovation would be done from the one mil. Vice Chairperson Klinefelt asked would we need to borrow the money for renovations. Director Lipinski responded that he doesn't know for sure if we were going to borrow that money, his understanding was that the money would be spread out over twenty years. Board Member Switalski commented that for the Authority to go bond we are subject to the vote of the people and if we were to borrow to fund renovations or expansion we would need to do all kind of planning. Vice Chairperson Klinefelt commented that when she says borrow it is like bonding – issuing bonds to raise the money to make the repairs; asked if the five year limit on the first section applies to issuing bonds for the renovations because we are not going to have the money up front to do this project and the intent to pay back that money is spread out for twenty years, so does that section of the legal opinion not allow us to do that on a twenty year loan.

Board Member Duchane commented that his understanding of the question is can we market bonds for twenty years working without voter approval for additional funding and his opinion is that you can't because of the five year limit. Vice Chairperson Klinefelt asked the finance people if we got in our budget to do a project that will take twenty years to pay back with the intent to issue bonds to cover that up front or was it to do some sort of conventional loan. Mr. Cady responded that the numbers that were thrown at him were anywhere from \$2.1 to \$3 million to do the renovations to this building and he put into the budget a payment of \$230,000 for bonding for twenty years but could go for \$1 million for five years and then go for another \$1 million for another five years, the payment in the budget would cover that. Board Member Duchane commented that we needed to know the financial parameters we were working with before proceeding to evaluate the costs of the projects. Vice Chairperson Klinefelt commented that we won't have enough money in the Authority to do a five year thing, we need to spread it out, and what she is hearing we can't. Mr. Cady responded that what is in the budget for five years right now would get you about \$1 million. Board Member Switalski asked Mr. Albright if we could bond for twenty years as long as we paid it out of our one mil. Board Member Duchane said the legislative intent was five years and his conclusion was that you would need a vote of the people. Mr. Albright responded that anything over five years has to be voted on by the residents. Chairperson Aiuto asked that if we have a budget, the money is included in the budget, but if we needed to upgrade a field, that money comes out of our budget and if it took six years to pay off we would need to go to a vote of the people. Vice Chairperson Klinefelt responded that only if you are issuing bonds. Board Member Duchane said nothing stops us from doing things in segments – phases of a project; it is a limitation on obligations for five years; his understanding is that we can't obligate the Authority for more than five years.

Chairperson Aiuto introduced the new City Manager of Roseville, Scott Adkins.

Chairperson Aiuto asked Mr. Albright if he will bring another opinion forward and asked can the finance individuals be included in the distribution. Mr. Albright responded that if the Board would like to do that, they would need to waive the privilege. Board Member Duchane commented that he doesn't see anything in this opinion that would have a relationship issue to privilege.

Motion by Duchane, seconded by Klinefelt, in this particular case relating to this subject in opinions that are being requested by the Board relating to bonding, financing capacity of the Recreational Authority of Roseville and Eastpointe, that the Board waive its privilege and disseminate it as the officials see as appropriate to have the appropriate insight provided to us.

Yeas: Duchane, Klinefelt, Frontera, Switalski and Aiuto
Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED

Discussion and/or Action on Facility Assessment Proposal from Partners in Architecture and AEW:

Director Lipinski commented that we have Dave Gassen and Mike Malone of Partners in Architecture and Ed Neiman of AEW present to discuss a facility assessment proposal. Mr. Gassen commented that their understanding of the issue is a structural issue and some efforts to look at possible expansions; looked at some of the tools we used in the past for communities to be successful in making long-term plans; facility assessment is that we go through an in depth process of looking at your building and we have provided a proposal that we can discuss: "Understanding your Facility Needs" – this will be a detailed inspection of the facility; gather information from the staff and use that for problematic and maintenance needs. Chairperson Aiuto asked when the Eastpointe facility assessment was done. Mr. Gassen responded 2006/2007 and this was only a portion of the assessment done for Eastpointe. Mr. Malone explained that in Eastpointe we did a prioritization; we do this to find out what we currently have in this facility and where we need to improve and will ultimately lead to a plan and reviewed the facility assessment overview. Chairperson Aiuto asked do you do these assessments every twenty years. Mr. Malone responded that they would suggest updating every year or two so you are always in tune with what your facilities are doing. Mr. Gassen explained that they were involved in a very similar thing fifteen years ago and over time looked at that report and prioritized and reprioritized and now they are just finishing up that plan and outlined the aspects of the overview.

Vice Chairperson Klinefelt asked once you do this assessment does this put an obligation on us to change it to be in compliance with new laws. Mr. Gassen responded that the answer is no but there are groups that are advocates for accessibility and if you have a report that says you are looking at fixing these things, then you can address this. Mr. Neiman responded that because we are creating a document, that does not create the problem, the answer is no but it is important to remember that the ADA is a civil law. Mr. Malone explained that the accessibility law changes next week. Mr. Gassen commented that they could use the document as a planning tool.

Chairperson Aiuto asked what the exterior envelope is. Mr. Gassen explained that it is the outside walls, windows, roof or anything that keeps you water tight. Mr. Malone explained that the next page is broken down by needs and focuses on most critical items first; setting a direction – try to develop a common knowledge bank with the Authority, both administrations and report our findings so everyone is on the same page; Director Lipinski sent over a list of potential needs for this facility; identify the mission and objective of the Authority and what are the goals of the Authority. Mr. Gassen said you look at options to address current and future needs; prepare some solutions; look to gain consensus with the stakeholders; look to determine how you would fund whatever you determined to do; we know there is a focus on the structure and there might be some items that aren't as obvious; the report approach is to look at the whole building, map out what your needs will be in the future..

Board Member Switalski commented that when we met before we were talking basically about the foundation and out of the discussions your idea of looking at the whole building and bringing this building into something that will last, that is something we need to do; if we expand – how much money and this approach for \$2,700 looks like a good program.

Board Member Duchane said this will be our capital improvement program and it may give us some options we can afford to do out of the operating budget instead of other funding.

Motion by Klinefelt, seconded by Frontera, that we hire the team of AEW and Partners in Architecture to do the facility conditional assessment in the amount of \$2,700.

Yeas: Klinefelt, Frontera, Duchane, Switalski and Aiuto
Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED

Chairperson Aiuto asked how long the assessment will take. Mr. Gassen replied approximately four weeks. Chairperson Aiuto commented that that would be before the next meeting. Mr. Gassen replied that they can make that work.

Discussion and/or Action on Classification and Compensation Study:

Director Lipinski commented that correspondence was sent regarding this and will defer to Board Member Duchane. Board Member Duchane said fundamentally on July 1st a new special Recreational Authority was created so we are starting with a clean slate; next step is how we staff and operate this Authority; we appointed the Roseville recreation director without any discussion on salary, compensation, benefits, where would it go and how he would work for the Authority instead of a city; the City of Eastpointe has two full-time employees and others that assumed would be working for the Authority; we passed Resolution No. 1 to start the mechanics of the change and the question is what are we changing to; as a new Authority we would not begin with the assumption that we have labor agreements to recognize; on July 1st we are starting fresh and Mr. Lipinski will cease to be an employee of Roseville and become an employee of the Authority and he doesn't know what he will be paid or what his benefits would be; what is appropriate to compensate our chief executive or others of the Authority and that may not be the same as they are currently receiving in either of the two cities; he has the classification and compensation study for Eastpointe and it put the Recreation Director in a range of \$65,000 to \$84,000 and we are running an organization with a population of 82,000 and 30,000 homes; could take a stab at this or have it independently done; he doesn't want to spend additional money on the study; may make everyone more comfortable if we have an independent party to work with to help us do what is appropriate to run this organization, serve the taxpayers, serve the people and professionals that we hire but instead of any favoritism one way or another; he wouldn't be able to vote today to bring everything forward.

Board Member Switalski commented that he thinks Board Member Duchane is right and can't continue on the way it is right now because we have two different organizations that have different compensation systems; need to take a look at it to come up with something for the Authority that will last into the future and sustain with the budget we have; options are hire a firm to do a study or do it ourselves; there is relatively few full-time employees and would like to do it between the cities instead.

Vice Chairperson Klinefelt commented that first of all would have to know what kind of money we are talking about to see if it is a viable option to bring in an outside firm; doesn't have a problem with it if the price is right; if we are talking about the full-time positions doesn't think there are enough of them to do a study; wouldn't mind having someone give us a letter outlining what they do and get a fee.

Board Member Duchane said the fees can vary; if we use Michigan Parks and Recreation Association standards he is concerned about ratios; could run about \$10,000 to \$15,000 and the question is will it be accepted and utilized.

Vice Chairperson Klinefelt commented that if we are not able to get all of this is taken care of she would think that whatever employees are in the model come July 1st that we would be able to do a month by

month on their contracts as is until we have negotiated something or set a budget but would like to get it done by July 1st.

Chairperson Aiuto asked Mr. Cady is this something that he and his team can give them information on. Mr. Cady responded that the Michigan Municipal League has an annual compensation study that is out there and that could be a guideline but if you want a full blown compensation study based on what other recreation authorities are it would be about eight to twelve weeks. Chairperson Aiuto asked if there is a guide by the Michigan Municipal League. Mr. Cady said it will tell you based on population what recreation directors are paid in other cities but not what their duties are. Chairperson Aiuto said his concern is that if we have only three employees he wouldn't want to spend \$10,000 to \$15,000 but agrees we should have something to start with.

Board Member Switalski said he has sticker shock at \$10,000 to \$15,000; would not want to go past July 1st but not in favor of spending that much money on a study but do need to do it with internal resources of both cities.

Vice Chairperson Klinefelt commented that if we don't want to go past July 1st then the question becomes are we negotiating contracts or are we setting an organizational chart and budget and plugging people in and this is now what you are going to make. Board Member Duchane asked if she was talking collective bargaining. Vice Chairperson Klinefelt responded that at this point it wouldn't be collective bargaining. Chairperson Aiuto's opinion is that we are going to have a position with a salary and offer that to a person and they can choose to take it or not.

Board Member Switalski commented that we need to set up the organization and get the building assessment.

Board Member Duchane commented that we can probably come up with a recommendation to the Board and go from there; this has set the parameters; will work with combined staff and through Director Lipinski and give the Board a recommendation.

Chairperson Aiuto asked Mr. Adkins if our finance people can work with Eastpointe finance to do this. Mr. Adkins responded that they would be able to do that.

Motion by Duchane, seconded by Switalski, that the respective originating organizations of Eastpointe and Roseville staffs work with our Executive Director to develop a classification and compensation plan for the Authority Board to review.

Yeas: Duchane, Switalski, Frontera, Klinefelt and Aiuto
Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED

Discuss 2012/2013 Roseville-Eastpointe Recreational Authority Proposed Budget:

Director Lipinski commented that the intent was to have as much information prior to the meeting as possible; came up with the most current information available and Ms. Lamb and Mr. Cady worked on this in the last couple of days to finalize everything.

Ms. Lamb explained that this is another revision of the revised budget; basically her understanding was that when we first met the Board gave the impression that they would like a larger fund balance at the end of each year; main change was that Director Lipinski went through the part-time personnel and consolidated a few positions and/or duties which allowed substantial savings; this corresponds with the organizational chart from the packet.

Board Member Frontera asked if the Board dismissed Option 1. Ms. Lamb replied that they didn't dismiss it as much as go in the direction of Option 2. Board Member Duchane replied that there wasn't any formal decision but it was dismissed.

Ms. Lamb explained that the single spreadsheet corresponds with the organizational chart and tried to quantify the position with the hours that that position would work and rate of pay and some of the other benefits based on information that she knows currently based on their contracts; realizes this information will change but this was the best information she had at the time; basically full-time staff for the Director, and Assistant Director and because they are full-time there is a retirement contribution, health care, etc and this would be reimbursed to the respective cities; part-time personnel would be the Youth Coordinator position at \$18/hour for 30 hours with no benefits; three clerical staff with rate of pay and scheduled hours; six building supervisors same way; seasonal personnel - Summer Day Camp Director, two Assistant Day Camp Directors and counselors associated with the program at a set rate or pay, the hours for that program and no benefits; Lead Park Attendant position and eight Park Attendant positions; full-time Senior Director with an hourly rate of pay with benefits and part-time Senior Activity Coordinator at a reduced rate of pay and the only caveat with that position is that person is part of Roseville's retirement system so there would be a reimbursement scheduled right now by the Authority to reimburse Roseville. Vice Chairperson Klinefelt asked will the Authority pay into the OPEB forever. Ms. Lamb responded that she thinks it would be a viable option that once the three full-time people retire it would be part of the City's responsibility. Chairperson Aiuto commented that he will call the retirement attorney to see what the answer is – what is the obligation of the Authority once a person retires. Mr. Cady said typically it would stay with the City except for the portion when they worked for the Authority but the Board needs to speak with their respective cities about and see if there is an agreement that can be reached on that. Vice Chairperson Klinefelt commented that the complication is that we are not in a position to negotiate lesser coverage after retirement so we have a financial responsibility on something that we don't have a negotiation leg to stand on.

Board Member Duchane commented that the big component of the budget is personnel; the truth is that as of June 30, 2012, if the respective cities terminate these employees and offer them a position with the Authority, we don't carry forward as an Authority any of those liabilities. Vice Chairperson Klinefelt commented that she agrees with that but there is a human aspect too and it is just how we work all that out.

Ms. Lamb commented that this supports the amounts that are in this detailed budget and this document is primarily the same as the document given to the Board before but we tried to break out some of the costs related to the Authority and tried to detail out some of the positions so it gave the Board a better feel of the expenditures related to the recreation side, senior activities side and some of the expenses that are directly related as a result of forming the Authority.

Board Member Switalski asked about the box at the bottom where it talks about not including the unfunded actuarial liability and assumes that belongs to the City. Ms. Lamb responded that the City would pick up that portion of it and the Authority would be charged the normal cost.

Vice Chairperson Klinefelt commented that with regard to seasonal personnel, she spoke with Director Lipinski this afternoon and he had the number of what Roseville employees make but not Eastpointe's costs. Ms. Lamb responded yes. Director Tony said he had some of the costs and did factor in Eastpointe's three parks. Vice Chairperson Klinefelt asked if the ones he has listed here would work solely for the Authority and not work for the City of Roseville or Eastpointe. Director Lipinski replied that is correct. Vice Chairperson Klinefelt asked if the budget is made up of what you know of the Roseville employees and your limited knowledge of the Eastpointe employees. Director Lipinski replied yes he looked at five in Roseville and three in Eastpointe and there are more parks in Roseville that have pavilions or park attendants that work at them because of events. Board Member Duchane asked what park attendants do in Roseville. Director Lipinski replied they do not operate any power equipment; they police the parks, set up ball fields, set up soccer fields, open, clean and stock restrooms and general

maintenance. Chairperson Aiuto commented that we identified three parks at \$2,500/month and this is just a number to offset the expenses of the City. Ms. Lamb replied that this helped to augment the expense of maintaining those parks. Director Lipinski said Roseville's three parks are the parks that are most used. Vice Chairperson Klinefelt asked why are we paying park attendants and paying the \$2,500/month per field and was told this is for maintenance of the parks whether we use them or not and asked what are the employees being paid in Roseville versus Eastpointe. Board Member Duchane replied that we are going to do something with our parks because we are leasing the parks to the Authority; we will maintain the parks but the dividing line is where does that service stop and active programming start; or Authority can pay back the cities for field maintenance if the cities do the work. Vice Chairperson Klinefelt commented that some employees may be working part-time for the Authority and part-time for the City of Eastpointe. Director Lipinski and Board Member Duchane need to sit down and get detailed information over who was transferred over and what their rate of pay is.

Ms. Lamb continued review of the budget; broken into four sections 1) estimated revenue – property values have been adjusted for the recent drop in property values, plus program revenues and interest income; 2) estimated expenditures for parks/recreation programs – personnel section is broken down by full-time, part-time and seasonal, looked at both cities' programs and came up with the numbers and took three percent inflationary increase; full-time personnel – Executive Director and Assistant Director and then part-time personnel – Youth Sports Coordinator, three clerical people and six building people. Vice Chairperson Klinefelt asked if the breakout is different but the numbers are the same as budget Option 2 except you plugged in the three percent inflationary aspect for future years. Ms. Lamb replied said they are not the same because some of the changes reflect how Director Lipinski feels the Authority should run some of their programs and one of the part-time positions has been eliminated. Ms. Lamb explained that they put in a line item for salary & wages – overtime and salary & wages – part-time building security Eastpointe facility (police reserves used at the Community Center); line item for office supplies; tried to break down expenditures for this building and Eight Mile facility. Vice Chairperson Klinefelt asked was the building contractual custodial set up for the Eight Mile building. Ms. Lamb replied that she broke it down into two pieces. Vice Chairperson Klinefelt asked what the hourly break down is for custodial. Ms. Lamb replied she is trying to keep it in line with what you are paying currently at Eastpointe for that building. Vice Chairperson Klinefelt commented that we may want to bid that service out at a later date. Chairperson Aiuto requested that Director Lipinski copy the entire Board on any questions that are asked. Ms. Lamb explained that building maintenance supplies have been cut down and Roseville is leasing to the Authority two to three cars. Vice Chairperson Klinefelt asked what equipment the cities are putting into the Authority. Ms. Lamb responded just the two buildings. Vice Chairperson Klinefelt asked if the \$500/month is for two to three vehicles. Ms. Lamb replied yes. Board Member Switalski said he had \$100/month. Ms. Lamb responded that this would be for insurance, maintenance, etc.; adjustment in there for building additions and improvements and equipment and this will help with those feasibility studies or any equipment the Authority deems necessary; total amount of expenditures for the Authority in 2013; 2012/13 is \$1,000,000 and in 2013/14 it drops down and then you will see an inflationary increase; 3) estimated expenditures - senior activities – full-time and part-time people, reimbursement back to cities for benefits and retirement; custodial charge for the Eastpointe building; broke out utility and communication costs; at end of senior activities for 2012/13 we are at \$223,000 with a reduction in 2013/2014 and marginal increases for inflationary after that; 4) estimated Authority related expenditures – bond payment at \$230,000 for next five years; primarily first year expenditures which would cover the expenses related to the asset transfer, master plan, attorney fees; third item is repayment to Roseville for the State lighting grant project; fourth item is park usage fee – cities maintain their own parks and Authority pays each city \$45,000. Board Member Switalski asked that Director Lipinski see if we are getting a good deal paying back the cities. Vice Chairperson Klinefelt said we don't have any written agreements on this yet. Ms. Lamb explained that the fifth item is professional service fees for annual audit and website design and last item is administrative charge of \$5,000 per month to Roseville for accounting, payroll, purchasing, personnel issues and any other services.

Board Member Duchane said that in addressing administrative charges we should compare it to SERESA. Ms. Lamb explained that it is a little bit different because Roseville owns the building with

SERESA and we provide the building maintenance, accounting, personnel issues, information services and the amount includes a rent component. Board Member Duchane said that it seems if you isolate building maintenance and lease payments, there is a formula to follow in what your cost recovery charges would be. Ms. Lamb explained that services we provide to SERESA we grossly undercharge for them. Vice Chairperson Klinefelt asked that as an Authority person can I contract that stuff out so the concept is to cut down on the expenses but you are creating a third entity that needs finance, audit, custodial, etc. so when it is all said and done you don't save any money. Ms. Lamb commented that she thinks that if the Authority had to provide all those services the cost would far exceed what we have budgeted here. Vice Chairperson Klinefelt and Ms. Lamb discussed the services being performed by Roseville. Ms. Lamb said one reason it was situated under Roseville primarily because it is utilizing our programs and the Authority is building off a good existing structure. Board Member Switalski asked are we getting a fair deal and suggested to Director Lipinski that he find out if the \$60,000 administrative charge is good. Vice Chairperson Klinefelt commented that we don't need to look into that because they have a built in system and the Authority would need to buy everything. Board Member Duchane commented that there is some benefit to help out one of our members and some logic to it to keep it in the house; we have \$15,000 insurance and bonds on the facility and does that include the whole package. Ms. Lamb replied this is commercial insurance on the facility and it is a portion of general liability for this building. Mr. Cady replied this is the estimate of the building and property liability and extended to the liability of the operation. Ms. Lamb said the last box is the savings and if the building is sold then there will be more savings.

Hearing of the Public:

No one came forward.

Director Report:

Director Lipinski announced that March 25th is the Roseville Handicapped Association's Spring Fling Dinner Dance from 4:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. at the VFW on Gratiot just south of Gratiot and it is their main fundraiser for the handicapped; announced Easter Egg Hunt (Eastpointe and Roseville) scheduled for March 31st at 10:00 a.m. at Huron Park; announced this building will be shut down from March 31st to April 6th for maintenance and this is something that we normally do around the holidays; had a conversation yesterday with Southeast Michigan Food Systems Navigators looking into a food service program for kids in the summertime but will only do it if we can get a grant to pay for the staff to do this; commented that the ad for programs was in the Eastsider; Veteran's Park is getting surveillance cameras through a grant; announced Eastpointe Recreation Department has a Holland Tulip Festival trip scheduled for Saturday, May 5th at a cost of \$15 for adults and \$10 for kids with 20 spots open; openings in zumba, yoga, pilates and fitness works programs as well as one day kids classes (bunny hop, mosaic crafts).

Mary Grant announced Celebrate Eastpointe on Friday at 11:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m., sold 80 tickets, all food will come from Eastpointe businesses and twenty different businesses have donated gift certificates, flowers, popcorn, restaurant gift certificates, Hallmark cards, etc., commented that we do house an AARP tax assistance program for low income individuals.

Director Lipinski commented that Ms. Bobbie Wilson nominated a couple of people to the Michigan Recreation Parks Association – Frank Heinrich, Youth Sports Coordinator was awarded the Youth Sports Staff Member of the Year and will be honored next week in Lansing and Beth Aiuto was selected Community Service Award Honoree for Roseville through the Michigan Recreation Parks Association; Lion's Club in Eastpointe is being awarded a community service award through the Michigan Recreational Parks Association for their work in Eastpointe over the years – financial contributions by Lion's Club for picnic pavilions and gazebos at Kennedy Park, Viet Nam Veteran's Memorial, play structure at Spindler Park, sponsoring refreshments for Holiday Tree Lighting/Visit with Santa, annual Senior Housing Commission Christmas Party, the Lion's 5K run, Eastpointe Music in the Park sponsor; pleased to hear

that someone on our staff received a State honor for youth sports staff and thanks to Ms. Wilson for nominating him; thanked Ms. Lamb and Mr. Cady on their budget work and welcomed Mr. Adkins to the City.

Board Member Reports:

Vice Chairperson Klinefelt thanked everyone for putting up with the firing squad this evening.

Board Member Duchane had nothing to report.

Board Member Frontera thanked the Board for selecting him and that he is excited to be on the Board.

Board Member Switalski had nothing to report.

Chairperson Aiuto asked Mr. Albright about the Open Meetings Act and if we are in need of creating a committee can we create a committee of two to meet with Administrators and requested that Mr. Albright research this. Board Member Duchane responded that as our structure goes we can. Vice Chairperson Klinefelt asked if we create a subcommittee, do they also have to follow the same Open Meetings Act rules that we follow. Chairperson Aiuto asked do we need to identify the format by which we run a meeting. Board Member Duchane replied that we decided on Roberts Rules of Order.

Motion by Switalski, seconded by Frontera, to adjourn the meeting at 8: 17 p.m.

Yeas: Switalski, Frontera, Duchane, Klinefelt and Aiuto
Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED

Linda S. Lince, Acting Secretary