



CITY OF  
BLOOMINGTON  
SPECIAL SESSION  
MEETING  
MAY 22, 2017

# AGENDA



**SPECIAL MEETING SESSION AGENDA  
OF THE CITY COUNCIL  
CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
109 E. OLIVE STREET, BLOOMINGTON, IL 61701  
MONDAY, MAY 22, 2017; 5:15 P.M.**

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call of Attendance
3. Public Comment
4. Consideration of approving the minutes of the Special City Council Meetings for May 8, 2017. *(Recommend that the reading of the minutes be dispensed and approved as printed.) (5 minutes)*
5. Closed Special Meeting
  - A. Claims Settlement – Section 2(c) (12) of 5 ILCS 120/2 (5 minutes)
  - B. Collective Bargaining – Section 2(c) (2) of 5 ILCS 120/2 (30 minutes)
6. Adjourn Closed Session and Return to Open Session
7. Discussion and possible direction regarding the John M. Scott Trust. *(Review, discuss and provide a consensus on the operational structure of the John M. Scott Health Trust.) (Presentation by Jeff Jurgens, Corporation Counsel 5 minutes and Council discussion 25 minutes.)*
8. Adjourn *(approximately 6:30 PM)*



**SPECIAL SESSION MEETING  
AGENDA ITEM NO. 4**

FOR COUNCIL: May 22, 2017

**SUBJECT:** Consideration of approval the minutes of the Special City Council Meetings for May 8, 2017

**RECOMMENDATION/MOTION:** That the reading of the minutes be dispensed and approved as printed.

**STRATEGIC PLAN LINK:** Goal 1. Financially sound City providing quality basic services.

**STRATEGIC PLAN SIGNIFICANCE:** Objective 1d. City services delivered in the most cost-effective, efficient manner.

**BACKGROUND:** The Special City Council Meeting Minutes have been reviewed and certified as correct and complete by the City Clerk.

In accordance with the Open Meetings Act, Council Proceedings are made available for public inspection and posted to the City's web site within ten (10) days after Council approval.

**COMMUNITY GROUPS/INTERESTED PERSONS CONTACTED:** Not applicable.

**FINANCIAL IMPACT:** Not applicable.

Respectfully submitted for Council consideration.

Prepared by: Cherry L. Lawson, C.M.C., City Clerk

Recommended by:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "David A. Hales".

David A. Hales, City Manager

**Attachments:**

- May 8, 2017 Special Session Meeting Minutes

**SPECIAL SESSION CITY COUNCIL MEETING**

City Hall Conference Room  
109 E. Olive Street, Bloomington, IL 61701  
Monday, May 8, 2017; 5:15 PM

1. Call to Order

The Council convened in Special Session in the Council Chambers, City Hall Building at 5:15 p.m., Monday, May 8, 2017. The meeting was called to order by Mayor Renner.

2. Roll Call

Mayor Renner directed City Clerk, Cherry Lawson to call the roll and the following members of Council answered present:

Aldermen Joni Painter, Diane Hauman, Mboka Mwilambwe, Jamie Mathy, Scott Black, Kim Bray, Karen Schmidt, David Sage, Amelia Buragas and Mayor Tari Renner.

Staff present: David Hales, City Manager; and Steve Rasmussen, Assistant City Manager; Jeffrey Jurgens, Corporation Counsel; Cherry Lawson, City Clerk; Nicole Albertson; Human Resource Director; Angie Brown, Assistant Human Resource Director; Jim Karch, Public Works Director; Brett Keltz, Operations Manager; Colleen Winterland, Superintendent; Jason Harden, Deputy Superintendent.

3. Public Comment

There were no comments offered.

4. Consideration of approving the minutes of the Special City Council Meetings for April 24, 2017.

Mayor Renner asked for a motion to approve the minutes.

**Motion by Alderman Painter second by Alderman Schmidt to approve the minutes as presented.**

**Ayes: Aldermen, Painter, Schmidt, Sage, Mwilambwe, Buragas, Bray, Black and Mathy.**

**Nays: None**

**Motion carried.**

5. Closed Special Session Meeting

A. Collective Bargaining 2(c) (2) of 5 ILCS 120/2

Mayor Renner requested a motion to go into Closed Session per Section 2(c) (2) of 5 ILCS120.

**Motion by Alderman Hauman second by Alderman Schmidt to enter into Closed Session Meeting per Section 2(c) (1) of 5 ILCS120, Section 2(c) (21) of 5 ILCS 120/2, and Section 2(c) (5) of 5 ILCS 120/2.**

**Ayes: Aldermen, Painter, Black, Schmidt, Sage, Buragas, Mwilambwe, Mathy and Bray.**

**Nays: None**

**Motion carried.**

Mr. Jurgens requested a change in the order of the items presented on the agenda for discussion Personnel – Section 2(c) (1) of 5 ILCS 120/2 (30 minutes), Review of Minutes – Section 2(c) (21) of 5 ILCS 120/2 (5 minutes), and Acquisition of Property – Section 2(c) (5) of 5 ILCS 120/2 (30 minutes).

6. Adjourn Closed Session

Mayor Renner asked for a motion to adjourn the Closed Session Meeting.

**Motion by Alderman Schmidt seconded by Alderman Bray to adjourn the Closed Session Meeting.**

**Motion Carried (Viva Voce).**

Return to Open Session

Mayor Renner asked for a motion to adjourn the Closed Session Meeting.

**Motion by Alderman Schmidt seconded by Alderman Painter to return to the Open Session Meeting.**

**Ayes: Aldermen, Painter, Black, Schmidt, Sage, Buragas, Mwilambwe, Mathy and Bray.**

**Nays: None**

**Motion carried.**

7. Presentation and discussion of proposal to create a Transportation Advisory Commission and draft ordinance. (*Recommendation for discussion only.*) (*Presentation by David Hales, City Manager and Alderman Amelia Buragas 5 minutes, Council discussion 25 minutes.*)

Mr. Hales announced the presentation of a draft ordinance dealing with establishment of a Transportation Advisory Commission, noting this title could change. Mr. Hales and staff recommend Council give favorable consideration of this particular request. He does see a number of benefits and value in establishing such a committee such as complete streets and the implementation plan for complete streets, which is still a work in progress and has made little progress to date. This and the future is going to entail greater citizen participation and transparency over what that means on an implementation, how to continue to do street planning, design and trying to incorporate multimodal use and activity on these streets. He notes seeing great value in having such a committee that could be a focal point of what up to now has been handled by a lot of staff not necessarily in a most open public way. Even though there has been some recent attempts to incorporate more of a public process as we have done with other committees, he does see some very significant benefit in moving to a full committee similar to what some other cities have done. He stated that as they continued to discuss not only this committee, but a task force later on. In the future, he hope to have more discussion on ways to do a little better job with many of the existing committees including more interaction with the Council such as providing an annual report sometimes. That would be a way for them to give feedback on what they have dealt with for that year, and allows the Council to provide policy guidance and direction.

Mr. Hales stated, with this draft ordinance, one of the things that he would recommend upon as part of the discussion is any whether to add or modify the ordinance. The more you could be specific, the better; if this is created and members appointed, to make sure that the members of that committee have a good, solid understanding of what you are asking them to do. Secondly, the timeline this item has come to Council for discussion. It has been the protocol to have an item discussed in a work session, then return to Council on a regular agenda (generally two weeks for final Council action. We have worked with Alderman Buragas as she has done a great deal of research and analysis of what other cities have done and how they have created such committees so we have incorporated that information.

Alderman Buragas stated, since last January Council has been discussed what this proposal would look like, and have received some clarification from staff with regard to the personnel makeup of this particular Commission. Council discussed earlier whether this would be a hybrid Commission, whether it continues to be a staff Commission, or whether it would be more closely aligned with the other boards and Commissions which were all volunteer citizens. Staff felt it would be best to be consistent with the other Commissions, and to move towards a citizen-based Commission that is supported by staff and where staff is making recommendations and providing guidance. However, the actual advisory Commission itself would be full of citizens and residents. She noted they discussed numbers and felt that 7 was as good a number as any because 5 would make it difficult to get quorum. She stated this was one of the main results from their conversation in January. She stated the discussions were to make sure that the language in any proposed ordinance is very clear as to expectations. For example, they do not want lay people making

technical engineering specification recommendations. The goal is to help them out and to bring it earlier into the process public comment on more of these policy issues. The staff is happy to answer any questions.

Alderman Schmidt inquired about the existing STAC and the technical questions that they address. She asked how they would continue do that as it relies on regulations and various manuals and protocol. What happens if there was a question to the Commission, and what formula STAC uses that needs to be imposed on that and what does that conversation look like and who are they advising.

Alderman Buragas responded that part of it will be a learning process for everyone because it is really difficult until they get into the process, having already spoke with Mr. Hales and Mr. Karch. It is her understanding that it would be completely outside of this Commission or body to physically have the engineering specifications for a road, and to make any comment on that and it is just very much outside what they are doing. When it comes to something policy-related such as appropriateness of implantation of complete streets or roads, and what that look like. If there were a change that would have an impact on the public where there is a policy level decision then that would be discussed there. This would not be something where the Commission could make recommendations that are contrary to state law, federal regulations, or things like that. They are looking for that policy level area. She feels part of that would be the staff liaison, the traffic engineer, making sure that the way that these questions are posed and the way information is brought to the Commission is appropriate for what that Commission has been empowered to do.

Alderman Schmidt stated, when any of the Council receive requests from a resident maybe for traffic calming and say that is a STAC conversation and here is the form, etc., she questioned whether that was something that funnels into this Commission or if it is something that Public Works continues to work with.

Alderman Buragas suggested that that was a good example of something that would go to this commission for traffic calming measures; however, because that is a policy level decision and, for example, do you want to use speed bumps somewhere, that would be a policy level decision. Within that, there would be some decisions for example, the size of the speed bump. This board would never be responsible for that for example, a 4-foot high bump and things that would be clearly outside the norm.

Alderman Schmidt commented that when STAC makes a decision about traffic calming, they apply a number of metrics to that. Alderman Buragas responded that she agrees that that would be part of the report to that body. Buragas suggested that is pretty similar to what the planning Commission does, the zone and board of appeals, where they are given a technical analysis that kind of under-lays or is the foundation for the policy level decision. She stated it has always been clear that this will always be an Advisory Commission. They will not do anything that the Council will not have final oversight over so we will always be the final oversight body here to make sure that there are no issues.



Alderman Hauman questioned whether Community Development would be presented with issues going from infrastructure to looking at streets.

Alderman Buragas stated that in one of the earlier drafts, they had specifically placed that in the ordinance. She thought it might be worth having that discussion whether we want to put it back in because some of the policy level decisions really need an interdisciplinary viewpoint and community development. She also thought the Police Department needs to be part of this. At one point in time, we had a draft that actually had a review process laid out more explicitly saying that these other departments will review any staff recommendation and have the ability to comment on that and provide their own commentary. There is a great deal of value looking at transportation which really goes outside beyond the bounds of any single department, even though it is very well grounded in Public Works and as a result, the traffic engineer should really be the main liaison, but this had been looked at and was removed.

Mr. Hales stated, he would recommend on the side to allow flexibility. As an example, for the City Manager to appoint any and all staff members that might be needed because the group that might look at one issue, like a speed limit on a street, is going to be different than the width of the street and adding a bike lane or even several other matters on that. Rather than being tied down to list each and every one of those people, when they may not always be needed on the issue, instead leave it up to the City Manager. Up to now, all of the policy issues brought to the Council has always been intended to see who all needs to give input and if not, there may not be any input coming to them but does not want to necessarily limit what might be good and valuable input. He feels this is the case with the makeup or what STAC is. He stated people from outside and even in meetings he has sat in on, have questioned what value and benefit they are getting on some of those because it was such a localized issue. Community Development plays a very critical role, especially as the gatekeepers of the comprehensive plan, and what it is trying to be achieved there. They will continue to be a part of the entire staff that could be called upon depending upon the matter at hand for the preparation of recommendations that will go to this committee.

Alderman Hauman stated she would feel more comfortable if there was some mention that these departments could be used as resources. She requested to know what the specific goals of the Commission would include and how would they know that this has been successful.

Alderman Buragas stated that what motivated her to explore this issue and speak to Council members, was the dissatisfaction with the current process and concerns from residents that they were not part of that process; that decisions were made behind closed doors that they could not participate in as the City had done it that way for a long period of time. Looking at how other departments handle it and have moved past that with other boards and Commissions, which leads to her two main goals which are transparency and involvement. She states the meetings will be public, there will be agendas, and there will be minutes so if there is any question about what is decided, there is an easy answer and there will be opportunity for public comment. Given the recent conversations that are policy based, it would be very helpful to the Council to begin having these conversations.

Alderman Hauman stated she did not wonder whether it will be helpful, but she would just feel more comfortable if there were specific goals that the Commission was responsible for.

Alderman Buragas responded that there are goals to help with implantation of complete streets including what does that look like, providing advice, brainstorming, and making recommendations to the Council about what actions could be taken. There are many people in the community that are interested in this area and the hope is to have a very active Commission that works closely with staff to collaborate and to provide greater input in the process.

Alderman Hauman responds that the word advisory is not used in most of the other Commissions.

Alderman Buragas responded that for consistency of nomenclature, she would be more comfortable with the use of a Transportation Commission because it is not the Planning Advisory Commission and it is not the Historic Preservation Advisory Commission. She stated this is just a matter of nomenclature. If it is kept in there being an artifact of STAC, it might cause confusion that there was some intent there above and beyond what the ordinance states.

Alderman Hauman asked for an example of what would happen if staff makes one decision and the Advisory Commission favors a different one. Alderman Buragas responded that like any other board and Commission, the Council would make the final recommendation as this has been seen with zoning, planning, and Council as the elected officials make the final decision.

Alderman Painter thanked Alderman Buragas stating, she is very supportive of this as she too had signed off on the request. She asked whether this would interface with STAC. She asked how the process works of reporting to STAC first, going through STAC and if not an answer to go to the Commission or what steps need to be taken.

Mr. Karch commented that part of the resolution was to dissolve the Staff Traffic Advisory Commission in its current form and the City Manager would designate who would be before the Transportation Advisory Commission and would appoint the appropriate people; even people like Parks and Recreation, Cultural Arts and there might be Constitution Trails and the Council to where that is currently what is done now with STAC. It starts off with a set group but it can bring others in, as well.

Alderman Sage responded with a couple of questions. He referenced back to the January 17 Committee of the Whole Meeting. They had talked about opening up the STAC meetings and talking about an incremental approach to change to try to induce and encourage greater public comment. He wondered if this has been done with STAC.

Mr. Karch stated it was important for the Council to know that they did not ignore the conversation on January 17. Since that time, any issue that came before the staff of the Transportation Traffic Advisory Committee, citizens were invited to come in, that it was considered as an education-type process. He stated they did take that as an interim step from the City Council between then and now.

Alderman Sage asked for clarification as he had reviewed the Committee of the Whole Meeting from January 17. He commented on an incremental approach. Alderman Mwilambwe had mentioned that, as well, and Alderman Black may have alluded to it although in a different wording. He recalls that even the Mayor at 1 hour and 38 minutes said yes, maybe we open it up to more incremental approaches. Sage requested some clarification stating if staff went back and did what we asked them to do; he is having trouble understanding how then Council arrived at a new Commission. He expressed concern over the process of allowing the current system to continue, the effectiveness of it, receiving feed or the evaluation of it.

Alderman Buragas responded with her perspective of that meeting, comments were made and then the directive was given to staff to come to the Council with a proposal and this is now staff coming to the Council with a proposal. She feels one aspect would have been to do a hybrid Commission, but again it is her understanding staff thought it was best to be consistent with the other boards and Commissions. Certainly if people were not comfortable with that, they could take a different approach but she feels that the other boards and Commissions work very well. Under the close oversight of the traffic engineer, she feels there could be some very nice results out of this proposal.

Alderman Sage stated his recollection would differ a little bit from that in that the direction of staff was to come back with some recommendations on how to incrementally open up STAC to allow more public engagement, open meetings, posting of agendas, minutes, or that type of thing. It appears that upon reviewing and starting at 1 hour and 32 minutes into the meeting to review the comments of the Council, it does appear that staff did what Council asked them to do and so that is why he is still puzzled as to the rationale or all of a sudden the appearance of a brand new board and Commission. He asked specifically about the materials as presented. This was in Section 301 looking at point 4. The first sentence where it states that items shall be placed on the Commission agenda by the chairperson of the Commission, appropriate City staff and then calls out some specific staff, he wanted to know if there were other boards and Commissions. He stated the process/protocol that has been followed is that there was direction from the City Council, the elected officials, something that comes out of some prioritization document that would go to staff and then from staff would be channeled up and worked through a respective board or Commission as this is how the flow of topics and material works with the boards and Commissions. He asked whether there were other boards and Commissions and specifically the issue of traffic management and public safety where we would have a chairperson of a Commission putting things on the agenda.

Alderman Mathy stated that the Cultural Arts Commission, the chairperson works with staff but the chairperson has items placed on the agenda that had been talked about in the meeting as well as staff items.

Alderman Sage commented about outside conversation with staff, the chairperson at Cultural Arts District has the arbitrary authority to put something on the agenda.

Alderman Mathy responded that they work together but it could be brought forward by that person.

Alderman Sage responded that he was uncomfortable with that aspect of it. He would like to see more of a streamlined flow from the Council or something coming out of an approved budget document, something else that has prioritization or preapproval from the Council, to staff and then up to the public members of a board or a Commission. He expressed concern about a chairperson having the ability to put things on the Commission agenda that are related to issues around public safety. He wanted to know how to jump from incremental changes to public access/public opening around the STAC to a brand new Commission.

Mayor Renner suggested that if the Commission does not like what a chair is doing, they can remove them if they were not working together. As understood, this went back to the early summer, commenting to Alderman Buragas, where she had a version of this proposal and was bringing it forward, doing a little bit of an incremental approach over the last couple of months.

Alderman Mwilambwe is not opposed to this generally but remembers David talking about earlier that the staff made some staff attempts and he feels like he has not heard fully from the staff about what the results of those were including did it work, did it not work? He would feel better if he heard about what worked and what has not, and he does not think the memo covers that aspect.

Mr. Hales presented his observations over the eight (8) years. He feels the current STAC Committee was one that over the years has been a lot of criticism with the rules and regulations for traffic calming devices for example, many of these have been established by the engineers. He feels they have served well but often times they would get asked questions and statements saying reporting others do not like that because it will not serve their needs and could the rules and regulations be changed. Rather than staff having the final authority over some of those rules and regulations, he feels it would insulate staff, if ultimately this committee reviews those and the Council can either approve them or delegate to the City Manager the authority to approve those. He stated this is going to be a natural evolution from what has worked okay, but given the use of committees in many other areas and establishing policies and procedures that only the Council can have a final say on or delegate that authority as they see fit; it will kind of bring this area of municipal services to on par and be consistent with other areas.

In addition, it is also going to help staff to continue to do their work in a private manner behind closed doors because there are sometimes when police and fire and engineers will sometimes have differences of opinion of how to address an issue. They can do that but ultimately there is going to be a report that is going to go onto this committee. That report will become a public document available for everyone to see including the applicant and then for the Commission to hear all sides and then make a recommendation to the Council. It really does open up more that process but the Council also has to keep in mind it does lengthen the process. Sometimes it is not going to happen as quickly or maybe as you may want to see individually because it is going to go through the committee just like the Planning Commission and many others. It is a good evolution of where we have been. Staff is still going to play a critical role in giving those professional technical recommendations and there may be differences of opinion on a technical level but those will come forward for the Committee/Commission to consider.

Alderman Mwilambwe was glad that the notion of lengthening the process was brought up. He stated they do not do anything very quickly and this was a concern of his. He is still unclear as to how this is going to work in relation to the day to day. He stated for example when they have a public safety issue like they had at the Lincoln and Bunn Street, where the ability to react very quickly was critical and he was just kind of curious and needing a concrete example to understand; wondering how this was going to interact with the Commission.

Mr. Hales responded there was no doubt that they would start with the Commission as it is identified and over this next year, we will continue to learn many things as they are put into practice. Both staff and the Commission can always come back to the Council and say we would recommend these changes. There are still some issues dealing with traffic that both the Commission and the Council may say to push that back on the administration; as they will define that so that it is very clear that is not necessarily something that the Commission and the Council want to always deal with on an ongoing basis. They just need some practice in that and to try it and within that 6 to 12 months come back with recommendations on how to fine-tune it. He stated it is a work in progress, the same with the entire complete streets philosophy and even this implantation plan would be a learning experience for everyone in something that we all really have not had that kind of experience with.

Alderman Black stated that in the way he understood STAC from before, is that if there was a project that came through it and the staff denied it or did not recommend moving forward, that was the end of the process and that it would go to David and part of the disconnect that he was feeling from the public was that there was not a citizen's voice as part of that process to kind of hear that. His fear was that if a group of people came in and for example the speed limit was 40 and they wanted it to be 30, and just settled on 35. He notes that the biggest thing that he saw is that it was designed to handle complaints which is on the PDF page 19 and receiving complaints having to do with transportation matters. He would want to see what response would be given to those complaints. Is it a written statement back or is it just a review. Having that close relationship with staff is going to be key because these issues are technical in nature and he would be uncomfortable with having people trying to write policy when they may not have the technical expertise to do so. That said, this engagement is always a good thing and Alderman Mwilambwe talks about this frequently where the more public trust we build, the better and getting people involved is a good thing.

Alderman Schmidt questioned whether there was still a Downtown Traffic Committee and is that being subsumed into this or is that why.

Mr. Hales thinks this will be a work in progress and we do need to look at that because if it is not rolled into this, then he thinks that could be problematic.

Mayor Renner stated there were some questions and concerns but they can bring it up for a vote and possible amendments in the near future.

## 8. Adjournment

**Motion by Alderman Black seconded by Alderman Hauman to adjourn. Time: 6:58 PM.**

**Ayes: Aldermen, Painter, Bray, Schmidt, Black, Mwilambwe, Buragas, Sage, Hauman and Mathy.**

**Nays: None**

**Motion carried.**

**CITY OF BLOOMINGTON**

**ATTEST**

---

Tari Renner, Mayor

---

Cherry L. Lawson, City Clerk



**SPECIAL SESSION MEETING  
AGENDA ITEM 7**

FOR COUNCIL: May 22, 2017

**SUBJECT:** Discussion and possible direction regarding the John M. Scott Trust.

**RECOMMENDATION/MOTION:** Review, discuss and provide direction on the operational structure of the John M. Scott Health Trust.

**STRATEGIC PLAN LINK:** Goal 1. Financially sound City providing quality basic services

**STRATEGIC PLAN SIGNIFICANCE:** Objective 1d. City services delivered in the most cost-effective, efficient manner.

**BACKGROUND:** On August 22, 2016, City of Bloomington Township Supervisor Deb Skillrud and members of the John M. Scott Commission (“Commission”) both gave presentations to the City Council outlining their vision for the future operation of the John M. Scott Health Trust (“Trust”). On April 24, 2017, the City Council received an audit report from Bronner Group, LLC, along with various options for how the Trust should be managed and operated.

To get to a consensus on moving forward, City staff has put together two high-level conceptual options and is seeking Council direction on how to proceed. If there is a consensus on one of these options, or something similar, the appropriate documents will then be drafted and brought back to the Council for final approval.

**Option 1: Grants & Limited Direct Services as Administered by Township Supervisor**

The first option is to maintain the current structure wherein the day-to-day operations of the JM Scott Trust are delegated to and administered by the Township Supervisor pursuant to Intergovernmental Agreement. This contemplates the continued provision of both grants and limited direct services as approved within the Trust budget. The existing Intergovernmental Agreement and the Trust documents would be revised to clarify the roles and responsibilities of the parties, including the relationship between the Township Supervisor and the JM Scott Commission. There would continue to be a focus on the importance of the JM Scott Commission’s expertise regarding the healthcare needs of the underserved in the community and their recommendations.

This option contemplates the Township Supervisor, as administrator, and the Commission, submitting a proposed budget to the City Council, as Trustee, on what grants and direct services should be funded. If Supervisor and Commission do not agree on the budget, alternate budgets would be presented and considered by the City Council for final determination. The Township Supervisor would be a non-voting member of the Commission so long as he or she serves as the Administrator of the Trust. Additional clarification and documentation, such as bylaws and

possible revisions to the intergovernmental agreements, would be necessary to clarify and further delineate the roles and responsibilities of the commission and the Township Supervisor in a manner consistent with the trust.

This option contemplates the JM Scott primarily issuing grants, however direct service programs may be offered as approved by the City Council, as Trustee. The Township Supervisor, as administrator, would be responsible for grant monitoring and compliance. For any programs offered through the Township, a separate compliance and monitoring program would be established. In addition, a conflicts of interest policy will be put into place to address situations where potential conflicts of interest might arise.

As part of the general oversight of the Trust, the City Manager, or his/her designee, would be designated as the City staff member to serve as the liaison between the City Council, Township Supervisor, and the Commission.

**Option 2: Grants Only as Administered by the City**

The second option is to move to a grants only model wherein the City Council would issue a small number of grants to various community organizations to meet the healthcare needs of the underserved. The JM Scott Commission would remain in place and would be responsible for proposing a budget and making recommendations on the entities that should receive the grants. Although this option contemplates the termination of the Intergovernmental Agreement with the Township and no direct services, one of the revolving grants could be to the Township to provide direct services like referrals, expansion of health care or dental coverage, etc.

Under this option, the Trust documents would be revised to clarify the roles and responsibilities of the parties, and Township Supervisor would continue to serve on the JM Scott Commission.

The City would be responsible for and establish a program for grant monitoring and compliance. This may take the form of designated City staff personnel, the attorneys for the Trust, or other consultants. In addition, a conflicts of interest policy will be put into place to address situations where potential conflicts of interest might arise.

As part of the general oversight of the Trust, the City Manager, or his/her designee, would also be designated as the City staff member to serve as the liaison between the City Council and the Commission.

**COMMUNITY GROUPS/INTERESTED PERSONS CONTACTED: N/A**

**FINANCIAL IMPACT: N/A**

Respectfully submitted for Council consideration.

Prepared by: Jeffrey R. Jurgens, Corporation Counsel

Recommended by:



A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "David A. Hales". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "David" being the most prominent part.

David A. Hales

**Attachments:** None