

NOTICE OF SPECIAL MEETING

Mayor and Board of Commissioners of the City of Enid, Oklahoma,
the Trustees of the Enid Municipal Authority, a Public Trust,
and the Trustees of the Enid Economic Development Authority, a Public Trust

Notice is hereby given that the Mayor and Board of Commissioners of the City of Enid, Oklahoma, the Trustees of the Enid Municipal Authority, a Public Trust, and the Trustees of the Enid Economic Development Authority, a Public Trust, will meet in special session at 7:30 p.m. on the 12th day of May, 2015, in the Council Chambers of the City Administration Building, located at 401 W. Owen K. Garriott Road in said city, and the agenda for said meeting is as follows:

- AGENDA -

MAYOR AND BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS RESCHEDULED REGULAR MEETING

1. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL.
2. CONSIDER CONVENING INTO EXECUTIVE SESSION PURSUANT TO 25 O.S. §307(C)(10), TO DISCUSS ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, BECAUSE PUBLIC DISCLOSURE WILL VIOLATE THE CONFIDENTIALITY OF THE BUSINESS, AND RECONVENE TO TAKE ANY NECESSARY ACTION.
3. DISCUSS AND TAKE NECESSARY ACTION ON THE FISCAL YEAR 2015-2016 CITY OF ENID BUDGET.
4. RECESS TO CONVENE AS THE ENID MUNICIPAL AUTHORITY.
5. TRUSTEES OF THE ENID MUNICIPAL AUTHORITY SPECIAL MEETING.
6. ENID MUNICIPAL AUTHORITY SPECIAL MEETING.
7. DISCUSS AND TAKE NECESSARY ACTION ON THE FISCAL YEAR 2015-2016 ENID MUNICIPAL AUTHORITY FINANCIAL PLAN.
8. ADJOURN TO CONVENE AS THE ENID ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY.
9. TRUSTEES OF THE ENID ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY SPECIAL MEETING.
10. ENID ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY SPECIAL MEETING.
11. DISCUSS AND TAKE NECESSARY ACTION ON THE FISCAL YEAR 2015-2016 ENID ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY FINANCIAL PLAN.
12. ADJOURN TO RECONVENE AS THE ENID CITY COMMISSION.
13. DISCUSS AND TAKE NECESSARY ACTION ON THE FISCAL YEAR 2015-2016 CITY OF ENID BUDGET.
14. ADJOURN.

CERTIFICATE AS TO POSTING

I, the undersigned City Clerk of the City of Enid, Oklahoma, do hereby certify that prior to 5:00 P.M. on the 11th day of May 2015, a true copy of the above Notice of Meeting was posted at the entrance to the Administration Building of the City of Enid, located at 401 W. Owen K. Garriott Road in said City. I further certify that I received at least forty-eight (48) hours advance notice of said meeting as required by State Statutes.

DATED at Enid, Oklahoma this 11th day of May 2015.

City Clerk

(SEAL)

=====

**MINUTES OF SPECIAL MEETING OF THE
MAYOR AND BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF THE CITY OF ENID, OKLAHOMA,
TRUSTEES OF THE ENID MUNICIPAL AUTHORITY, A APUBLIC TRUST,
AND TRUSTEES OF THE ENID ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY, A PUBLIC TRUST
HELD ON THE 12TH DAY OF MAY 2015**

The Mayor and Board of Commissioners of the City of Enid, County of Garfield, State of Oklahoma, the Trustees of the Enid Municipal Authority, a Public Trust, and the Trustees of the Enid Economic Development Authority, a Public Trust, met in special meeting in the Council Chambers of the Administration Building of the City of Enid, located at 401 West Owen K. Garriott Road in said city, at 7:30 P.M. on the 12th day of May 2015, pursuant to notice given forty-eight (48) hours in advance to the Clerk of the City of Enid, and pursuant to notice thereof displayed at the entrance to the Administration Building of said city, in prominent view and which notice was posted prior to 5:00 P.M. on the 11th day of May 2015.

-MAYOR AND BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS-

Mayor Shewey called the meeting to order with the following members present and absent:

PRESENT: Commissioners Janzen, Brownlee, Ezzell, Timm, Wilson, Vanhooser and Mayor Shewey.

ABSENT: None.

Staff present were City Manager Jerald Gilbert, Assistant City Manager Joan Riley, City Attorney Andrea Chism, City Clerk Linda Parks, Director of Engineering Services Christopher Gdanski, Chief Financial Officer Erin Crawford, Interim Public Works Director Billy McBride, Planning Administrator Chris Bauer, Director of Marketing and Public Relations Steve Kime, and Human Resources Director Sonya Key.

Motion was made by Commissioner Brownlee and seconded by Commissioner Janzen to convene into Executive Session to discuss Economic Development, pursuant to 25 Okla. Stat. §307(C)(10), for the purpose of conferring on matters pertaining to economic development, including the transfer of property, financing, or the creation of a proposal to entice a business to remain or to locate within their jurisdiction, if public disclosure of the matter discussed would interfere with the development of products or services, or if public disclosure would violate the confidentiality of the business, and the vote was as follows:

AYE: Commissioners Janzen, Brownlee, Ezzell, Timm, Wilson, Vanhooser and Mayor Shewey.

NAY: None.

The meeting convened into Executive Session at 7:31 P.M.

In Executive Discussion the Commission discussed Economic Development.

Motion was made by Commissioner Ezzell and seconded by Commissioner Janzen to reconvene into special session, and the vote was as follows:

AYE: Commissioners Janzen, Ezzell, Timm, Wilson, Vanhooser and Mayor Shewey.

NAY: None.

Commissioner Brownlee absent from vote.

The meeting reconvened into special session at 8:16 P.M.

Discussion was held on the Fiscal Year 2015-2016 City of Enid Budget.

Opening comments were made by Chief Financial Officer Erin Crawford. Presentations were made regarding the Enid Event Center Convention Hall Budget, and Community Development Block Grant, Golf Course, and Enid Public Transportation Authority budgets.

Discussion was held regarding the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Budget.

Commissioner Vanhooser stated that during the CDBG funding allocation process, it had been discussed to eliminate the application process for the various organizations, and allow commissioners to determine how to allocate the funds. He stated that the system was completely broken and funding would continue to go down, and asked if there was enough support to debate that notion so that they did not have to have the same discussions the following year. If there was no support for it now, he would make a motion later, but they had to stop doing what they did year after year.

Discussion followed.

Commissioner Ezzell stated that many vital programs were supported with that money.

Commissioner Janzen stated that his only concern with that was in the past, commissioners had been told that the money was intended for start-ups of programs, rather than long-running programs. If there was no way to fund new programs, the purpose of the program was defeated.

Commissioner Ezzell stated that there was criteria for the use of the funds, which included housing, operations and start-ups.

CDBG Administrator Stephanie Carr stated that housing was not a start-up project. It was a priority of the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). When HUD referred to start-ups, that was for public service projects. In order to continue to be eligible for funding for public service projects, an organization had to improve their service year after year. Housing was different story. Organizations could do the same thing year after year, and still be eligible. She went on to say that the only organizations that fell into the public service category were the Enid Public Transportation Authority with its Bus Pass Program, and Booker T. Washington with its After School Program.

Discussion was held regarding the funding process, as it pertained to the CDBG Funding Committee.

Commissioner Ezzell asked if a new process had been proposed.

Ms. Carr stated that there were other ways that the funding process had been done in the past. She went on to say that if more commissioners could be added to the CDBG Funding Committee, perhaps it would be less of a headache when it came to final funding approval.

Commissioner Ezzell asked if the criteria the CDBG Funding Committee was bound by could be changed.

Ms. Carr responded, stating that the criteria could be changed.

Commissioner Vanhooser stated that at the end of the day, it would still be the same fight of having to cut and trim, and saying one project was not as valuable as another, which was of no benefit to anyone.

Commissioner Wilson stated that the current process was completely subjective and inequitable.

Commissioner Ezzell stated that at least there was a system, an objective system. It was an imperfect objective system, but the criteria could be adjusted.

Commissioner Wilson stated that there was no requirement or obligation to spend the funds anywhere but on the City.

Commissioner Ezzell stated that it was not an obligation, it was a choice, and to spend it all on City projects was shortsighted.

Commissioner Vanhooser responded, stating that for the expectation going forward, it was that, and organizations should be told now that this was what was going to happen in a year.

Commissioner Janzen asked if spending the money on City projects would meet the criteria for CDBG funding.

Ms. Carr stated that it would as long as the projects were eligible. She went on to say that she could prepare proposals and different scenarios, and present them to commissioners at a later date for their input.

Commissioner Vanhooser stated that it was too late to change the process this year because the funding had already been allocated. However, he went on to say to put on notice that commissioners were not going to go through the current process next year.

Mr. Gilbert stated that if commissioners did not want to have this conversation next year, he would recommend that the budget be approved as presented. Staff would begin working on a new process which would be approved by commissioners, and everyone would be put on notice now.

Mayor Shewey asked if the CDBG Funding Committee would be cut out of the process.

Mr. Gilbert stated that there would be no need for the CDBG Funding Committee and would be part of the process. He stated that the Committee put in long hours and hard work in reviewing applications and making funding recommendations. However, if that was not the way commissioners wanted to go, then he felt it should change, because that didn't honor their sacrifice and service. He stated that commissioners were basically saying that what the Committee did was capricious and arbitrary, when really, what commissioners were doing could be viewed that way too.

Commissioner Brownlee responding, stating that this was not what commissioners were intending to say. He stated that just as the years had progressed, and the available money had been reduced, the process should be reviewed to ensure it fit with the effort and the available funding. He went on to say that maybe the answer was not to go away from the Committee, but to at least look at it and/or restructure it.

Discussion was held regarding the Golf Course Budget.

Opening comments were made by Assistant City Manager Joan Riley, who noted budgeted revenues in the amount of \$608,500, and expenses in the amount of \$608,500, both of which were down from the prior year's budget. She stated that the Golf Budget, for the last several years, had been a

challenge, with one of the biggest challenges being the need for revenue growth. She noted multiple years of rising personnel costs, with no changes in personnel, and the weather, which could be your best friend, or your worst enemy, depending on what it was. She stated that some of the positive accomplishments that had been obtained were an outstanding golf course, organized and professionally managed, and a major overhaul of the current rate structure.

Ms. Riley stated that municipal golf courses were set up for the enjoyment of the citizens of the community. She stated that few made money, because as city entities, they were not in the business for profit. She stated that the transfer to the Golf Course Budget had always been an issue, and referred to the proposed transfer for Fiscal Year 2015-2016 which had been reduced from \$252,000 to \$199,000. She noted various cities across Oklahoma that provided subsidies to keep their golf courses open, stating that most subsidies were to cover operating expenses, but a few were for capital expenses as well.

Mr. Robert Adamson, 4408 Briar Ridge Road, spoke in support of the Golf Course, and the need for restrooms on the course. He stated that this was a quality of life issue, and a security issue, and urged commissioners to reconsider funding the restrooms in the proposed budget.

Ms. Pat Rainey, 2101 Wilshire Drive, addressed commissioners. She stated that the Golf Course was a great facility, and asked that commissioners continue their support.

Mr. Gilbert stated that there had always been a source of frustration with the Golf Course, particularly with the transfer. He stated that this year, staff had worked very hard to get the transfer down, and were able to do so by looking at personnel costs that were applied across the board. He went on to say that staff had presented, at this point, the best budget they could, knowing that it would not be satisfactory to some. He asked commissioners, for the transfer amount, to consider what level of support they would consider fair and okay to operate the Golf Course, and to recognize the efforts made to reduce it. He went on to say that staff would continue to look at opportunities to manage or control expenses and increase revenue at the Course.

Commissioner Ezzell stated that commissioners should keep in mind that the Golf Course was a park, and parks did not make money. Quality of life did not make money, and never would. However, it was done because it was a City service. He stated that there would always be a transfer to Golf, and that was okay, because it was a quality of life service that the City provided.

Commissioner Brownlee stated that he would not buck the \$199,000 transfer because he thought staff had done a good job in reducing that amount. What he would buck, however, was a revenue issue, in that the Golf Course was losing revenue, and this was the Commission's opportunity to do something about it. He stated that the Golf Course was losing \$100,000 a year by giving away too many rounds, having a contract that did not incentivize the City, and structuring tournaments at times when the public wanted to play. He agreed that there would always be a transfer, but last year's transfer was too much money. The \$199,000 proposed transfer for Fiscal Year 2015-2016, plus the \$60,000 Capital Improvement transfer, put the total transfer back to where it was last year. Staff needed to find a way to fund the restroom project with revenue increases that were available.

Commissioner Timm asked about income from the driving range and pro shop.

Ms. Riley stated that the driving range was in the Golf Pro's contract. That contract was given to him. He didn't bring it to the City. The City already had it, and that was the way it was set up.

Mr. Gilbert stated that staff would continue to look at ways to improve revenues. He stated that staff had worked hard to get the transfer down, but there were still some challenges. He went on to say that at this time, he did not know if a better budget could be presented to commissioners than what had been presented.

Following further comments, discussion on the Golf Course Budget concluded.

Discussion was held regarding the Fiscal Year 2015-2016 Enid Public Transportation Authority (EPTA) Budget.

Ms. Riley spoke regarding budgeted revenues in the amount of \$494,900 and budgeted expenses of \$652,9780, both of which were down ten percent (10%) and six percent (6%) respectively, from the prior year. She stated that EPTA was another fund with decreasing revenues, noting that it was mostly funded by grants which had steadily decreased over the years. She advised commissioners that the City had supported the fund since it's inception in 1984, with the amount being \$125,000 for the past five (5) years.

She stated that everyone would admit that the citizens of Enid needed affordable transportation. However, revenues were going down and were not there to meet the needs. She noted directives by commissioners in prior meetings to reduce the number of the Authority's large passenger vans, to lower fuel costs, to reduce the hours of operation, to reduce the amount of time driving across the City with no passengers on the buses, and to look for other sources of revenue. She stated that the large vans were replaced with mini-vans which were more fuel efficient and cost less for maintenance, efficiencies were improved by closing the office on Saturdays, and tablets were purchased for every bus that provided online scheduling, electronic daily manifest logging, GPS with voice directive, and ADA compliance for scheduling. She stated that in the past year, 45,109 riderships were logged. Of those, 18,256 were for employment, 10,539 were for medical, and 3,932 were for shopping purposes. She stated that the benefits were extreme to those who needed it. This was a community service, it provided mobility, independence, access, and was affordable. In addition, every dollar invested in public transportation generated approximately \$4.00 in economic return.

Commissioner Vanhooser stated that all of the changes made were operational, positive changes arguably, but at the end of the day, expenses only decreased by \$30,000. He stated that at the same time, ridership fare revenue went down, so revenue was lost on ridership changes which minimally reduced expenses. Last year's budget numbers were twice what was actually turned in, and there was no real change in the revenue side, so he felt they failed. All that was done only changed the operational status, and at the end of the day, the outlay to taxpayers had not changed.

Commissioner Vanhooser stated that this was another area where, just like the Golf Course, it needed to generate more in revenue. The expense side was what it was, but it was not meeting up to

what commissioners expected. He then moved to cut the \$120,000 transfer to EPTA by \$50,000 for Fiscal Year 2015-2016, and look at it again the next year for an additional \$50,000 cut.

Commissioner Ezzell stated that this was a service that was running lean, and had taken a huge amount of effort to become as efficient as possible. He cited differences between the public transit and the Golf Course, stating that the Golf Course was a recreational source, and that the transit was people's livelihood, with a much higher need than that of simply recreation. He stated that he understood that this cost money, but like so many public services in Enid, this would always cost more money than it made. It was important because there was no one else that could provide the service. There was no cab service in Enid, and no options if you were wheel-chair bound, or had limited means and on a fixed income. There were no other options other than the public transit.

Commissioner Vanhooser responded, stating that where there was a need, the need would be filled. He stated that too much money was being spent for what the City was getting out of it. He went on to say that cutting \$50,000 out of the transfer was a start, and EPTA would have to deal with it by either increasing revenues, or by cutting expenses.

Commissioner Ezzell stated that EPTA was a role that only a municipality had the ability to adequately fill to help some of the City's neediest citizens with really difficult problems. He went on to say that you couldn't demand an incredibly lean service to find \$50,000.00 it didn't have. And the people they served didn't have the means to do anything else.

Mr. Gilbert stated that the challenge for EPTA was harder than the Golf Course, in that the subsidy could not be cut without eliminating the service.

Commissioner Vanhooser stated that if \$50,000 was cut from the budget, there would be a change in the way the operation was run to the amount of \$50,000.

Ms. Riley responded, stating that in this situation, the changes made in operations affected ridership, which affected ODOT funding as well. She stated that you couldn't raise the amount for fares because you would lose ridership, and then you would lose ODOT funding. It was a very difficult thing to manage.

Mr. Gilbert stated that increasing contract revenue was an area that could be looked at. He went on to say that the challenge with raising revenue on the ridership side was the grant funding. If ridership went down, funding went down. If hours were cut, ridership was impacted. He stated that staff would continue to look at ways to raise revenue. However, the fund balance was exhausted, and staff felt they were at the point to where the determination had to be made to either fund EPTA or not.

Commissioner Wilson stated that the City had a duty to its citizens to provide services, and the public transit was one of those services the City should provide. She stated that this was not a luxury item like golf, or a luxury to the people who rode the transit. But the point was, they had to do it, and the City had some duty to its citizens in those situations. She went on to say that this was not a business, and it wasn't being asked to be run like a charity, but the City had to find the balance to do it right. She added that the City worked hard to generate revenue in some ways, but this was an area where that was going to happen.

In closing, Ms. Riley asked that commissioners consider, because there was no fund balance to lean on, challenging staff to raise revenues in contractual services, and not cutting the budget, because it was as lean as it could be right now.

NOTE: There was no second to Commissioner Vanhooser's motion to cut the \$120,000 transfer by \$50,000 for Fiscal Year 2015-2016, and look at it again the next year for an additional \$50,000 cut. Therefore, no vote was taken.

A recap of changes captured from the budget meetings was provided by Ms. Crawford. She noted changes not captured in the original budget, that through staff discussions, had been added, for reimbursement of the Fire Station sale and for the Gene Anderson project at Chestnut and Cleveland in the amounts of \$456,500 and \$250,000 respectively, and the removal of \$60,000 budgeted for the Meadowlake Golf Course Restrooms, which was added to the Entryway Signs Project.

Commissioner Ezzell stated that he thought part of the \$60,000 budgeted for the Meadowlake Golf Course Restrooms was to go toward the design for the boathouse, and part toward the entryway signs. He moved to split the \$60,000 budgeted for the Meadowlake Golf Course Restrooms, with \$30,000 going toward the entryway signs, and \$30,000 for design work for the boathouse, the amount yet to be determined upon further investigation by staff.

Motion was seconded by Commissioner Wilson.

It was noted that Commissioner Vanhooser left the meeting at 9:56 P.M.

Commissioner Janzen stated that he felt the restrooms at the Golf Course were more important than either one of the projects proposed, and that the funding should be put back and spent where it was originally scheduled.

Mr. Gilbert agreed, stating that staff could look at either a subsequent budget amendment for the project, or look to see what could be done within the current budget.

Following further discussion, the vote was taken as follows:

AYE: Commissioners Brownlee, Ezzell, Wilson and Mayor Shewey.

NAY: Commissioners Janzen and Timm.

Commissioner Vanhooser absent from vote.

There being no further business to come before the Board at this time, motion was made by Commissioner Brownlee and seconded by Commissioner Ezzell that the meeting adjourn, and the vote was as follows:

AYE: Commissioners Janzen, Brownlee, Ezzell, Timm, Wilson and Mayor Shewey.

NAY: None.

Commissioner Vanhooser absent from vote.

The meeting adjourned at 10:02 P.M.

CITY OF ENID, OKLAHOMA

BY: _____
WILLIAM E. SHEWEY, MAYOR

(SEAL)

ATTEST:

LINDA S. PARKS, CITY CLERK

ENID MUNICIPAL AUTHORITY

BY: _____
WILLIAM E. SHEWEY, CHAIRMAN

(SEAL)

ATTEST:

LINDA S. PARKS, SECRETARY

ENID ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

BY: _____
WILLIAM E. SHEWEY, CHAIRMAN

(SEAL)

ATTEST:

LINDA S. PARKS, SECRETARY

***** / *****