



City of Naples

City Council Chambers
735 Eighth Street South
Naples, Florida 33940

-SUBJECT-	Ord. No.	Res. No.	Page
Introduction of six new police officer candidates .			1
<u>RESOLUTIONS</u> -Increase tennis fees		82-4121	1 & 2
<u>SECOND READING OF ORDINANCES</u>			
-Fix 1982 tax levy & millage rate	82-4122		2 & 3
-Adopt 1982-83 budget	82-4123		2 & 3

COUNCIL MEMBERS	M O T I O N	S E C O N D	VOTE		A B S E N T
			Y E S	N O	
Jim Goddard, citizen, noted that he had conducted the survey of the tennis program at the request of the Parks & Recreation Advisory Board, but he added he did not realize it would create the controversy that it had.					
<u>Mr. Rothchild moved to have the Item withdrawn from the Agenda, but the motion died for lack of a second.</u>					
<u>MOTION:</u> To <u>ADOPT</u> the resolution as presented					
Anderson	X		X		
Holland					X
Rothchild					X
Schroeder		X	X		
Thornton			X		
Wood			X		
Billick			X		
(5-1)					

<u>PUBLIC HEARING AND SECOND READING OF ORDINANCES</u>					
<u>ITEM 2</u>					
PUBLIC HEARING: Opened 10:56 a.m. Closed - 11:55 a.m.					
<u>---ORDINANCE 82-4122</u>					
<u>ITEM 2-a</u>					
AN ORDINANCE DETERMINING AND FIXING THE 1982 TAX LEVY AND MILLAGE RATE FOR THE PURPOSE OF PROVIDING SUFFICIENT FUNDS FOR THE GENERAL OBLIGATION IMPROVEMENT BOND INDEBTEDNESS; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE. PURPOSE: TO FIX THE 1982 TAX LEVY.					
Above titled ordinance read in full by City Manager Jones.					
<u>---ORDINANCE 82-4123</u>					
<u>ITEM 2-b</u>					
AN ORDINANCE ADOPTING THE FINAL BUDGET FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1982-83, AND APPROPRIATING FUNDS FOR OPERATING EXPENSES OF THE CITY OF NAPLES FOR THE GENERAL OPERATION OF THE SEVERAL GOVERNMENTAL DEPARTMENTS OF THE CITY, INCLUDING ITS UTILITIES, AND FOR CONTRIBUTING TO THE SINKING FUNDS OF THE CITY TO PAY INTEREST ON AND PROVIDE FOR THE RETIREMENT OF THE OUTSTANDING BONDS AND OTHER FINED OBLIGATIONS OF THE CITY AND THE UTILITY TAX FUNDS, FOR AND DURING THE FISCAL YEAR 1982-83; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE. PURPOSE: TO ADOPT THE BUDGET AND APPROPRIATE FUNDS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1982-83.					
Title read by City Manager Jones.					

Mr. Holland returned to the Council table - 10:56 a.m.					

Richard Hechler, citizen, questioned the pending increase by the County in fees at the County landfill and his feeling that there was no provision for these increases in the proposed budget. City Manager Jones responded that the County Commissioner had only just approved that increase and that it will be absorbed as user fees and would be considered when the time came. Mr. Rothchild read a statement (Attachment #3) concerning the cover letter from the City Manager dated August 11, 1982, that was distributed with the preliminary budget. Discussion followed concerning the proposed position of internal auditor. Mr. Rothchild cited a suggestion from Ron Wood of Rogers, Wood, Hill, Starman & Gustason, that the internal auditor report to Council rather than to the City Manager. Mr. Holland also stated his feelings in agreement with that and that he would be opposed to hiring an internal auditor unless that person was under the Council rather than the City Manager. Mayor Billick suggested that the position be set up with the Council having the right to hire or fire					

Supplemental Attendance List - Special Meeting of the Naples City Council, September 30, 1982

Jim Goddard	Frank Detschaschell	Terry Thatcher
Bill Harrington	Paul Reble	Monica Baker
Kevin Gaffney	Kevin Rambosk	Sam Aronoff
David Pierson	Paul Sireci	Richard Hechler
Janet Jones	Mr & Mrs. Craig Kiser	M. W. Schryver
Ciro Dominguez	Henry Friedheim	Lyle Richardson
Thomas Penberthy	Joe Hojny	John Nagel
David Anderson	Mr. & Mrs. Griff Payne	Art Russell
Ed Embler	Gail Hayes	Gilbert Weil
	George Turner	

News Media:

James Moses, Naples Daily News	Denes Husty, News Press
Ben Garrett, TV-20	Lynn Levine, TV-9
Bob Hansen, TV-20	Ned Warner, TV-9
Gary Arnold, WEVU, TV-26	

Other interested citizens and visitors

I have spoken and asked questions at the last two Council meetings concerning the proposed tennis fee increases. It should now be evident to this Council that I oppose such an increase for the following reasons.

A. The City Manager has aptly presented his figures and arguments in favor of the fee increase. As I noted earlier, this past year the Parks / Recreation Department exceeded their budget by \$9,349. Nearly \$5,000 of that 9,349 deficit occurred within the tennis program.

* The question that logically follows and must be addressed by this Council is - Does a \$5,000 deficit within the tennis program warrant a fee increase that will generate an increase in revenue of \$26,000?

Furthermore, I oppose this increase because that extra revenue raised would go into a general fund and ^(NECESSARILY) not into the tennis program. Actually, what this means is that our tennis fees could be paying for improvement in other areas. (such as the Bay Dock?)

* B. Secondly, and perhaps more importantly is the attitude some of the Council members have displayed on this subject during the past few weeks. I would label that attitude as being quite close minded at times. Granted, the Council has investigated Tommy Boy's income and have allowed both proponents & opponents to speak on the subject.
* But that simply is not enough.

B.(cont)

This Council has not exhausted all the other available options of raising the needed revenue - besides increasing the tennis fees. Frankly speaking the Council has not done their job on this issue. Instead of pursuing income figures of the tennis pro this Council should have been seeking other ways to lessen the financial burden on the Parks/ Recreation Department as a whole. I have stated other options which could include:

1. Having those who use other recreational facilities also pay for their usage. * Why are those who play tennis continuously asked to bear the responsibility of deficit spending within the Parks/ Recreation Department while those who use other recreational facilities are paying nothing for their usage. * Is this an equitable system? Also -

2. The Council should rework the 'uniqueness' of the tennis pro's contract upon its renewal. Although the Council pays the tennis pro - (Jimmy Borg) \$ 7,000.00 I feel that Mr. Borg should pay the city a percentage of the income he earns from the lessons and sales since he does use the city's facilities to conduct these lessons and sales.

I would hope that this Council has the willingness and the backbone to pursue suggestions such as these.

Conclusion-

Finally, with my objections and suggestions being on record I would like to conclude with the following. Some members of both the press and the city council seem to believe (as conveyed by comments) that those of us who oppose the fee increase are in a minority. (Perhaps we are)... * However, I ~~do~~ believe that there are many people beyond these doors that hold the same opinions as I do but feel they can't make a difference. * I am an optimist - I believe government responds to the wishes of its people. As Alexis de Tocqueville stated -

"A majority taken collectively is only an individual, whose opinions, and frequently whose interests, are opposed to those of another individual, who is styled a minority." * Simply because someone is voicing a minority opinion does not mean less credence should be given to those statements. - This unfortunately has occurred. *

The choice is either keeping tennis in sport accessible to all or accessible only to the affluent of this community.

The problem is the fee is prepared so that it makes a short term remedy to a long range problem.

(Let us forget majority & minority) - Councilmembers - let us ~~and~~ try to work together to find a more equitable solution for everyone involved. (I urge each of you to oppose the fee increases and to find a just solution to the problem).

Sept 30, 1984

111

Attached to the preliminary budget of fiscal 1982-83 is a letter dated August 11, 1982 from the City Manager addressed to the Mayor and City Council. I am taking this opportunity to repeat my comments on several of the statements contained in that letter and to make some observations with respect to one of the items contained in the proposed budget.

I truly believe that there should be an honest dialogue with respect to this budget between the City Council and the City Manager. Nothing less should satisfy the citizens of Naples and I will neither tolerate nor endorse any misrepresentation with respect to any facet of this budget.

In his letter of August 11, the City Manager states, and I quote "During the course of the budget review departmental requests were reduced by \$3,879,650. A real tidy sum. However upon examination I found this statement to be open to serious question and doubt.

In the budget one will find an item in each departmental budget entitled "Employee Overhead" - Acct 250. For example the Police Department requested 68,307 for workers compensation; the Fire Department 18,459

the Engineering Department	25,117
Parks and Recreation Department	19,570
Public Works Department	79,828

and so on right down the list. The total of these departmental requests amounted to over \$254,000

Now the heads of the various departments had been instructed by the City Manager to list the workers compensation figure in their respective departmental budget. Before the preliminary budget was printed, the City Manager reduced the workers compensation figure to zero, thereby effecting a "saving" of \$254,000 - but the saving was strictly a mirage and a delusion - there was no saving. It was simply a device to inflate the departmental requests knowing full well that the requests would be reduced to zero.

There was a zero charge for workers compensation in the 1981-82 budget and there was a zero charge in the 1980-81 budget. The City Manager could have saved a million dollars by this same device but the saving wouldn't have been worth a plugged nickel.

Only one department head listed a zero charge for workers compensation - and that department was the City Manager's. If the City Manager knew that there would be no charge for this item in his departmental budget then he certainly knew that he was wrong in having the other department heads load their budget requests. These items could have been corrected before the preliminary budget was printed and the alleged saving reduced by \$254,000.

Under the circumstances I must conclude that this maneuver was designed to suggest that the City Manager was doing a remarkable job in presenting a tight budget. Unfortunately, however the department heads were, in my opinion, improperly used in an effort to create the impression that the City Manager did in fact reduce their budgets. If the department heads are aware of the game that was being played at their expense they could and should be resentful. This could reduce or eliminate their respect for the City Manager. If this happens it would be counter-productive and costly to the City.

I do not consider this to be a simple mistake on the part of the City Manager and that is most distressing to me.

I shall vote against this or any other budget prepared in a similar manner.

Harry Rothchild
City Councilman