

firefighters. Councilmember Bird asked if it was standard. Ms. Volek said it varied from city to city. It was not done nationally.

Councilmember Cimmino referenced Councilmember Bird's comments and said one of the reasons she did not vote for the final budget was because they did not have the figures available at that time since negotiations were not completed. She said they started the meeting by recognizing the police volunteers, and there was a cost savings according to Assistant Chief of Police, Joel Slade, of \$331,000. In a way it put it into perspective; the first year they would be paying the \$249,400 and the second year would be \$256,633. She understood there was a shortfall they needed to work with staff on. Obviously they did not want to go to arbitration. They wanted to get rid of the lawsuits, and they did not need a new one. Councilmember Cimmino asked for clarification on a couple of dates listed on Page 11b and 46. Karla Stanton, Human Resources Director, and Ms. Volek advised the printed version went out with incorrect dates but by the time the contract was published online, the dates had been corrected. A couple of proofs were run on the contract and the second proof was done after the printed version had gone out.

Councilmember Astle moved for approval of the MPEA/Police 7/1/2013 to 6/30/2015 union contract, seconded by Councilmember Ronquillo.

Councilmember Ulledalen offered an amendment that they begin working on a public safety levy for the Police Department to fund the ongoing operations and think about what they really needed for the Police Department, seconded by Councilmember Astle.

Ms. Volek advised a staff committee was beginning to work on it already under Mr. McCandless' direction. They would come up with a list of several options for the Council to consider. Councilmember Ulledalen asked for a timeframe. Ms. Volek said it was October because it had been asked for in a council initiative. Councilmember Ulledalen asked if it could be accelerated. Ms. Volek said she thought it could; they needed to identify options and put dollars to them. It would be tough, but they could do it if Council wanted staff to focus on it. She said she would like to do it properly and make sure they had enough information for Council. Councilmember Ulledalen said his concern was they had done a cost of services study, they had done a business plan, they had done priority based budgeting, and now they had to re-do the strategic plan. If they did not get a levy passed, they would be looking at laying off 80 people, and a significant number would be in the Police Department.

Councilmember Ulledalen said he just wanted to clarify it with Ms. Volek because the problem was he could just see it getting "bounced down the road, down the road, down the road" and then what if a levy failed in FY13 or 14. What was a reasonable time to accelerate to? Mayor Hanel advised they had a date identified to bring it back to Council in October, so there was the answer. Councilmember Ulledalen said he would like to advance the date to start working on it earlier. He said he would like to have a date in his amendment that was more concrete than October. Councilmember Ulledalen asked what the schedule looked like for the next two to three months and why they could not start discussion in August.

Ms. Volek advised the agreement with the school district was that the City would not step into the arena while the district was promoting their second mill levy in November.

Councilmember Bird asked if they could expect something from staff in October. Ms. Volek said Council would receive a set of recommendations in October.

Councilmember Pitman said he thought they could wait until October. They were getting through the contracts, and they knew it was coming. Even though it seemed like they were kicking the can down the road, they were actively pursuing it. He did not see the point in throwing it in as a condition of the contract when they knew in three months they would be there.

Mayor Hanel said he would speak against the motion on the floor and revert back to the intent of voting on the police contract. He said if there was any other business that needed to be considered, it would be best as an initiative.

Councilmember Astle confirmed with Ms. Volek that a public safety levy would not be on this year's election. Ms. Volek advised since the school district did not have discussion during the library levy it was her understanding the intent was that the City would not have significant discussion that would confuse voters in regard to the November election by the school district.

Councilmember Cimmino said it was her understanding they had more or less made a gentleman's agreement that the City would not put it on the ballot this go-around because they knew the plans of School District 2.

On a roll call vote, the amendment to the motion was approved 6 to 5. Councilmembers Cimmino, McFadden, Bird, Ulledalen, Astle, and Crouch voted in favor. Councilmembers Cromley, Ronquillo, Pitman, McCall, and Mayor Hanel voted in opposition.

Councilmember Cromley asked if the contract with the employees would be null and void if they did not get the feedback by October. He said they just made a condition on the contract.

Attorney Brooks said he was a little confused and asked if it would be a new section to be put into the contract.

Councilmember Ulledalen said it would be safer if he withdrew his motion. It would be the better thing at this point.

Councilmember Cromley said if the motion would stand, the contract would have to go back to the employees. Attorney Brooks said they could move to reconsider what was just done with a simple majority.

Councilmember Ulledalen moved to reconsider, seconded by Councilmember Astle.

Councilmember Cimmino said the amendment was not a condition and was just to review the public safety mill levy for the Police Department. It had nothing to do with approving the contract before them that evening, and it was not a condition. It was an amendment.

Mayor Hanel said it was tied to the contract. Councilmember Cimmino disagreed.

On a voice vote, the motion for reconsideration was unanimously approved.

On a voice vote, the original motion to approve the contract was approved 10 to 1. Councilmember Ulledalen voted in opposition.

**PUBLIC COMMENT on Non-Agenda Items -- Speaker Sign-in required. (Restricted to ONLY items not on this printed agenda. Comments here are limited to 3 minutes. Please sign in at the cart located at the back of the council chambers or at the podium.)**

The public comment period was opened. There were no speakers, and the public comment period was closed.

## **COUNCIL INITIATIVES**

- **Pitman**: MOVED to place on a future agenda changing the shared revenue with the Billings Kiwanis special license plates from 50/50 to 80/20 with 80 going to the Kiwanis, seconded by Councilmember McFadden. On a voice vote, the motion was approved 9 to 0. Councilmembers Astle and Cromley abstained.
- **McCall**: MOVED to direct staff to bring back criteria, a plan, for marketing the Empire Garage first floor space and to answer any of the legal questions posed that evening, seconded by Councilmember Ronquillo.

Councilmember Ulledalen said they needed to see what they could do to get creative; maybe they needed some outside advice. What he hoped they would not do was run an ad consecutively for three weeks in the back of The Billings Times. What could they do to get creative and aggressive and possibly enlist some help?

Councilmember Cimmino asked if there was a timeframe to be working within. Councilmember McCall said that was a very good question and asked Ms. Volek how long it would take. Could they have it in a couple of weeks, a month?

Ms. Volek advised a Request for Proposal (RFP) process to hire a consultant was a two-month process.

Councilmember McCall said she was not saying specifically it should be an RFP. What she would like is to have information on their options to market the property and answers to their legal questions. She asked if it could be done in two weeks. Ms. Volek said the August 5 agenda was already full, so August 19 would work better. Councilmember McCall said she would recommend receiving the information by August 19.

Councilmember Ulledalen said maybe Mr. McCandless could give them some guidelines on what made sense in terms of the timeline relative to the completion of construction. Was there some date in regards to financing or conclusion when ideally they would finally like to get it done? Looking at the vacancies in Park I that had sat forever, the City was not good at being a landlord.

On a voice vote, the motion was unanimously approved.

- **Ronquillo**: Said in March he had asked for a crossing for the kids at the Friendship House, and it was still not done. He would appreciate staff looking into the status.

There was no further business, and the meeting adjourned at 9:40 p.m.



CITY OF BILLINGS

BY: Thomas W. Hanel  
Thomas W. Hanel, Mayor

ATTEST:

BY: Cari Martin  
Cari Martin, City Clerk