

**ST. BERNARD CITY COUNCIL MEETING  
DECEMBER 7, 2006**

The regular meeting of the St. Bernard City Council was held Thursday, December 7, 2006 in Council Chambers.

President of Council, Mr. Curtis Walden – The meeting was opened with a prayer followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

Roll call showed that all members were present: Ms. Hausfeld, Mr. Asbach, Mr. Schildmeyer, Mr. Burkhardt, Mrs. Brickweg, Mr. Meier and Mr. Zix.

Mr. Walden – Before we begin with the regular order of business I would like to ask Council to observe a moment of silence on the passing of a long time citizen of St. Bernard, James Estep.

Mr. Burkhardt made a motion to dispense with the reading of the minutes. Ms. Hausfeld seconded the motion. Council agreed 7-0.

**REPORTS OF CITY OFFICIALS**

MAYOR, Mr. Estep – I’m always pleased to recognize our citizens and employees when they lend a helping hand to others in the community. I received a letter from Mike Viox, a member of People Working Cooperatively, telling me about PWC’s annual “Prepare Affair”. This event provides gutter cleaning, leaf raking and other services to elderly people. The overall mission of PWC is to help people stay in their homes by providing emergency repairs and winterization service. The Prepare Affair volunteer effort impacts over 1,000 homes in SW Ohio and Northern KY. Mike’s letter was to acknowledge the volunteer efforts of St. Bernard’s employees at this years event, they are:

Steve Scherpenberg Joe Barnes Bill Driscoll Don Moeller Butch Baur

In addition, a number of volunteers from Roger Bacon and St. Clement participated. The St. Bernard Eagles provided the use of their facility as a meeting place for the event where 30 people gathered to volunteer their time to help 14 homeowners in our immediate area. Mike said, “It was truly a community effort and this response to a need typifies why living in St. Bernard is so special.”

Moving on to Christmas, the mail box for letters to Santa will be in front of City Hall until December 13<sup>th</sup>. Children still have time to send a letter to Santa and receive a reply before Christmas.

Santa will visit youngsters at City Hall in the main level of the Municipal Building on Sunday, December 17<sup>th</sup> from 3p.m. to 5p.m. To begin the event, Roger Bacon’s choir will perform Christmas music followed by a Magic show. Refreshments will be served. Parents should bring their cameras so they can snap a photo of their children with Santa. So, mark your calendar and plan to bring the kids to visit Santa on Sunday, December 17<sup>th</sup> from 3p.m. to 5p.m.

The first letters to area employers introducing St. Bernard as great City to relocate have been written and will be mailed Monday. I will keep you advised as I make face-to-face contact with area employers

AUDITOR, Mr. St. Clair – The November Auditor’s reports are prepared for tonight’s meeting. The receipts report and the report showing year-to-date revenue and expenses by fund are derived from the Auditor’s report. They are normally just given to Council and the Administration, but there are some copies available for the audience tonight.

Payroll for the month of November:	\$ 366,906.69
Payroll year-to-date:	4,539,067.87
Other expenditures for the month of November:	\$ 389,849.94
Other expenditures as of November 30 <sup>th</sup> :	4,546,730.51
Total expenditures through the end of November:	\$ 9,085,798.38

Before Council tonight are Ordinance Nos. 39, 40, 41 and 43, 2006. Ordinance No. 39 sets the 2007 compensation for certain full and part-time employees hired prior to 1/1/2005. Ordinance No. 40 is the appropriation Ordinance for 2007. Ordinance No. 41 provides for the transfer of cash from the General Fund Cash Account to the Master Plan-Capital Improvement Cash Account. It also provides for four additional appropriations and several appropriation adjustments. The additional appropriations account for moving cash from the General Fund to the Master Plan-Capital Improvement Fund, and increases to Service Department Professional Services, Fire Department Incidentals, and Street Maintenance Contracts. The appropriation adjustments are increases to codified ordinances, ICRC, Police Equipment Outlay, Fire Pension, Street Equipment Maintenance, and Legal Ads with corresponding decreases to City Law Library, Unofficial Juvenile Court, Gas Well Monitoring, City Hall Equipment Outlay, Police Pension, Street Maintenance Incidentals, and Building Commissioner/HIP Inspector. Ordinance No. 43 is a determination that the expenditure for the Hamilton County Fire Chiefs’ Dinner constitutes a public purpose and is effective retroactively. All these items were discussed at the COW except for the adjustments in the Law Director’s line items which was precipitated by an invoice presented to me last Monday about the codified ordinances. That is why that adjustment is in there.

Tonight I would like to go over some of the monthly reports I make to show a little bit about how the fund accounting in the City works.

First are the two Auditor reports that are stapled together and distributed to Council, Administration and the audience each month. The top page is a report of the cash balances in each fund that the City has. The General Fund accounts for the resources used for financing the expenditures in the daily operations of the City. We also have fifteen special revenue or special projects funds listed on that report. Cash into these special funds can only be used for the purposes for which those funds were established. Some of these funds have their own sources of revenue, some are totally dependent on the General Fund and some require subsidies from the General Fund. This revenue is then used to cover expenditures from those funds for specific

purposes. If you would look at the report titled General Fund Receipts, you can see all the sources of receipts that we track to those funds. Any fund that has a receipt from a transfer means that that receipt is from the General Fund. The Receipts Report ties to the Auditor's report of cash balances that we looked at previously. If you look at the Auditor's report, the second column of numbers, the Cash Account Report, titled month-to-date receipts and year-to-date receipts match the receipts report. We make that report to Council and the Administration, so they can see the details of our receipts.

The second Auditor's Report begins on the second page of the package that is stapled together. This report tracks our expenditures or disbursements by line item in each fund. The first column of numbers is the original appropriation passed by ordinance for the year just like Ordinance No. 40 on the table tonight for 2007. The next column reflects revisions, increases or decreases in appropriations, passed by Council during the year. The next two columns are the month and year-to-date expenditures. The encumbered column accounts for purchase orders that have been certified by the Auditor and are still open, and the balance column is the remaining appropriation not counting the encumbrance. The total disbursements or expenditures for each fund are also reflected in the middle column of numbers on that first Auditor's report of the cash balances for each fund which we talked about earlier.

All these reports are automatically generated by the postings that the deputy Auditor makes throughout the month. These reports are available in the Auditor's office.

I summarize all this information in a one page report of the cash basis detail of revenue and expenditures by fund. I started this report when we started borrowing money to show that, while the proceeds of a loan are shown as a receipt item, it is offset by the expenditure for which it was borrowed. Such a receipt is a one-time occurrence that eventually has to be repaid. I give the report to Council and the Administration so they can see the whole picture as kind of an executive summary.

At the next Council meeting I will talk about the budget process and how that ties to these reports.

DIRECTOR OF LAW, Mr. Geiser – Before Council tonight also one Ordinance that was not mentioned by the Auditor is Ordinance No. 42. This amends the Scat of Sight Urban Renewal Plan and adds in the property known as 4300 Sullivan Ave. or the Schlanser property that has been town down. I want to thank Gerry Wiedmann for his help in putting this together. At this time at the end of the year I want to especially thank, Carol Ungruhe and Judy Witzman and Glenna McCarty who put these ordinances together on a regular basis, especially Carol, she does outstanding work to put these together and have them before you on Thursday night with sometimes just a few hour notice to get them ready. Again I want to thank her for all the work she does.

As mentioned by the Auditor, there was an additional bill that came in that is going to cause some adjustments which were not talked about. For those who are not aware of it, that was the bill that came in because of the on-line codified ordinances, since we agreed to put it on-line, there was some

additional cost up front to have those updated because of all the changes. That's the bill that came in that was not budgeted for.

Mr. Burkhardt – On this Ordinance 42, 2006, page two and page three say Ordinance 32 instead of 42. I guess before we read it we should amend it.

TREASURER, Mr. Kathman – I have the receipts report for the month of November, 2006.

Receipts for the month of November:	\$ 860,511.11
Receipts for the year through November 30 <sup>th</sup> :	\$11,451,623.81

SAFETY DIRECTOR, Mr. Stuchell – (read by Mayor Estep) Before I read his report, I would like to thank everybody with the death of my father, everybody who paid their respects and contributions made to Hospice and Mercy Franciscan Terrace. That was awfully nice from everybody here and in the City. Now for Mr. Stuchell's report.

Please excuse my absence tonight as I had another commitment.

On Tuesday of this week, the Mayor, the Police Chief, Lt. Ungruhe, and I conducted interviews with our three remaining candidates for the Police Dept. We will be conducting further evaluations and hopefully have conditional offers issued by next week. I will keep you all informed as to the progress and I would like to thank the members of the interview team for their time and consideration.

The estimate for the traffic study will be provided to you next week for review so please look for that in your mailboxes.

I am also leaving the approval of the funds for the Fire Chief's meeting up to you all. However, I do not approve of this and will assure you that this will not happen in the future. I would ask that you please follow the Auditor's recommendation in this matter.

In closing, I have a warning for our residents during this holiday season.

If you buy gift cards from a display rack that has various store cards you may become the victim of theft. Criminals are now jotting down the card numbers in the store and then wait a few days to call to see what the remaining balance that they have on the card. Once they find that the card is activated they go online and start shopping. You may want to consider purchasing your card from a customer service representative, where they do not have the gift cards viewable to the public.

SERVICE DIRECTOR, Mr. Kempe – Effective today the new smoking law, the ban was to go into affect. However, I heard on the news tonight that the enforcement of this law will be delayed until more details on how the enforcement of the law will be handled. I would like to say though that the City's buildings are currently smoke free so there really is not much change as far as the City's buildings are concerned. New signs have been posted with the complaint phone number on them and we will be handing out notices about our no smoking policy to citizens that are renting halls.

I would like to say that the street repairs and the repayment and line painting of Church St. and Park Pl. are finished. The demolition of the Schlanser Bldg. is completed and the backfill and seeding of the property will be finished sometime next week weather permitting.

TAX COMMISSIONER, Mrs. Williams – No report.

## **REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES**

FINANCE, Mr. Zix – The Finance Committee would like to recommend passage of Ord. No. 39, 2006. This Ordinance would give certain full time and part-time non contractual employees a 3% increase in compensation. Certain non contractual employees whose first date of service with the City is after 1/1/2005 will fall into the step system of pay structure that was set by Ord. 10, 2006. I would like to thank each one of these employees for the good work they perform.

As Finance Chairperson, I would like to thank my fellow Finance Committee members, Steve Asbach and Mike Schildmeyer for the work they did in preparation of Ord No. 40, 2006, the 2007 budget Ordinance. I would also like to thank the Service Director, Joe Kempe and Auditor, Walt St. Clair for leading the effort to prepare the budget with all the dept. heads to present to the Finance Committee.

We feel we have a very good instrument to lead the City in the right financial direction for 2007. Referring to the definition of budget; it is a plan or schedule adjusting expenses during a certain period to the estimated income for that period.

I feel Council will have to do just that by monitoring this plan and doing what is right for the City in 2007.

The Finance Committee would like to recommend the passage of Ord. No. 40, 2006.

SAFETY, Mr. Burkhardt – No report.

SERVICE, Mr. Meier – The Service Dept. report for November; there were 22 trucks placed at residences

6 dumpsters

36 special pick ups

222 tons of garbage taken to the landfill.

The recycling report;

there were 15 tons of recycling material

11 tons of cardboard

343 pounds of scrap aluminum

760 pounds of cast iron

9400 pounds of scrap metal

Also, I would like to report on the ICRC. Next Thursday night St. Clement School is presenting a Christmas program at 7:00p.m. The ICRC will provide video tape of the program and rebroadcast on the public cable channels. The St. Clement Church and School is a vital part of our community, residents please take time to support the children in this. Also I do have a copy of their replay schedule, I'll go ahead and give it to people now and then I'll provide a copy to Glenna so that she could maybe put it on the City's web site.

On Sunday, Dec. 17<sup>th</sup> at 7:30p.m. on channel 24

Monday, Dec. 18<sup>th</sup> at 8:00p.m. on channel 8

Wednesday, Dec. 20<sup>th</sup> at 9:00p.m. on channel 24

Friday, Dec. 22<sup>nd</sup> at 9:30p.m. on channel 4

Sunday, Christmas Eve at 10:00p.m. on channel 8

Monday, Christmas Day at 12:30p.m. also on channel 8

PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS, Mr. Asbach – The committee met last Thursday to discuss 618 E. Ross Ave. as well as the newspaper rack ordinance. The committee will meet again soon to discuss the newspaper rack ordinance further.

Council agreed at the last COW to have Mr. Wiedmann advertise for the sale of 618 E. Ross Ave. when he gets everything together into packet form. The asking price at that time for the lot will be \$15,000.00

Also, the committee recommends passage of Ord. No. 40, 2006.

LAWS, CONTRACTS & CLAIMS, Ms Hausfeld – My committee is still working on the soliciting license ordinance. We did give a copy of that to both Glenna McCarty and Chief Moeller. I do know Glenna has talked to Chief Moeller and I've talked to Chief Moeller. He does have a couple concerns and he is getting them to me probably by Monday and then my committee will be discussing that in will probably have it ready for the next Council meeting.

BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY, Mr. Schildmeyer – No report, but I do recommend passage of Ordinance No. 40 and 41.

HIGHWAYS & TRANSPORTATION, Mrs. Brickweg – I attended the Cognis CAP meeting last Monday and I wanted to let everybody know that Cognis was having a hearing last night and the CAP group decided that we would send a statement to the EPA for the public hearing. What this concerns and I talked about it in the past, is a \$22,000,000.00 blower system that they want to put in place and they need to get a permit. Basically the letter just states that we're from the areas of Winton Hills, Winton Pl., St. Bernard and Elmwood and we asked them to please approve the permit. We believe the replacement of these old coal fire blowers will be beneficial to our communities for some of the following reasons;

Replacing the existing coal burning units with natural gas or oil burners will significantly reduce the plant's air emissions of acid gases, particulate gases and sulfur gases that contribute to global warming.

Because each day about a dozen trucks bring in coal or remove ash, we believe reduction of truck traffic is significant. Fewer trucks on our roads will mean reduced fumes, less noise and lower risk from traffic.

These are fundamental quality-of-life issues for the citizens who live near the Cognis plant and who are represented on the Community Advisory Panel. Therefore, the group strongly urges your immediate approval of the construction permit.

I have not heard from anybody at Cognis yet, they might not even have gotten word yet, but I'll let everybody know when I find out.

Mr. Burkhardt – The Committee of the Whole Report has been submitted to the Clerk.

**Committee of the Whole**  
**Nov. 30, 2006**

1. Council approved the minutes of the Nov. 16<sup>th</sup> Council meeting, 5-0. Ms. Hausfeld was absent.

2. Mayor, John Estep, absent.

3. Auditor, Walter St. Clair

A. Council agreed 6-0 to put an ord. on the table for appropriation adjustment, additional appropriation, and transfer to several line items. Council agreed to put an ord. on the table allowing the Fire Chief to spend the money needed to host the local Fire Chief's meeting.

4. Director of Law, Edward Geiser

A. Council will meet next Thursday in Executive Session at 6:30p.m. to discuss pending litigation. Ed also reported on the meeting of the Tax Board of Review. Ed discussed the Juvenile court and why we should keep it going.

5. Safety Director, Jonathan Stuchell

A. Informed Council that the interviews for the police openings will be held next week. And that they are still working on the problem on Ross Ave.

6. Service Director, Joe Kempe

A. Joe informed Council that the work on Church St. and Park Pl. was finished. Also, that the bids for the Woodside Heights sewer project would be opened Dec. 11, 2006. The demolition of the Schlanser property was also under way.

7. Tax Commissioner, Sheri Williams, absent.

8. Laws, Contracts, & Claims, Patty Hausfeld, absent.

9. Public Improvements, Steve Asbach

A. Steve's committee met and discussed the 618 E. Ross property and Council agreed to put the property back up for sale to develop housing on the sight. They also discussed the news rack ordinance and will be bringing that to Council to look at soon. Council voted 6-0 to put an ord. on the table to add 4300 Sullivan to the Scattered Sight Program.

10. Business & Industry, Mike Schildmeyer, no report.

11. Safety, Bill Burkhardt, no report.

12. Highways & Transportation, Peggy Brickweg

A. Peggy informed Council about the meeting at Cognis and that they are waiting for approval for their new boiler. This will help improve the air quality in the area.

13. Service, Kevin Meier

A. Kevin asked to be on the next COW agenda to discuss the Tax Abatement Council and asked everyone to suggest people that might want to be on the Council to bring their names to the next meeting.

14. Finance, Greg Zix

A. Council agreed 6-0 to put an ord. on the table for the 2007 Pay Ordinance. There will be a 3% increase.

B. Council agreed 6-0 to put an ord. on the table for 2007 budget.  
The budget for 2007 will be \$11,700,000.00

Respectfully submitted,  
Bill Burkhardt  
President of Council, Pro-Tem

**COMMUNICATIONS** - None.

**RESOLUTIONS AND ORDINANCES**

Motion by Mr. Burkhardt, seconded by Mr. Meier to read this evening's ordinances by title only. Motion passed 7-0.

**ORDINANCE NO. 39, 2006, FIXING THE 2007 COMPENSATION OF FULL-TIME AND PART-TIME EMPLOYEES OF THE CITY OF ST. BERNARD HIRED PRIOR TO 1/1/2005 AND CERTAIN APPOINTED OFFICIALS, AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY.**

Motion by Mr. Zix, seconded by Mr. Burkhardt to suspend with the second and third reading of Ord. No. 39, 2006.

**REMARKS**

Mr. St. Clair – I just wanted to point out in Section 4 of that Ordinance, a phrase, unless Federal or State law requires otherwise, was inserted due to the passage of minimum wage laws. That particular phrase was inserted to cover that eventuality.

Motion to suspend passed 7-0.

Motion by Mr. Zix, seconded by Ms. Hausfeld to adopt Ord. No. 39, 2006 as read. Motion passed 7-0.

**ORDINANCE NO. 40, 2006, AN ORDINANCE TO MAKE APPROPRIATION FOR EXPENSES AND OTHER EXPENDITURES OF THE CITY OF ST. BERNARD, STATE OF OHIO DURING THE FISCAL YEAR 2007, AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY.**

Motion by Mr. Zix, seconded by Mr. Asbach to suspend with the second and third reading of Ord. No. 40, 2006.

**REMARKS**

Mr. Zix – I again would like to thank the Finance Committee and thank Mr. Kempe and Mr. St. Clair for all the work they have done and the cooperation of the two groups to put together an instrument that I think will lead the City in the right financial direction.

Ms. Hausfeld – I just wanted to thank the Finance Committee also for stepping up and putting money in a line item to start taking care of some blighted properties and stuff like that around town.

Mrs. Brickweg – I will not be voting to go the emergency route. I think it is very important that the citizens get a chance to look at this budget. It hasn't been out, I haven't published for anybody to see and this is something that shows all of our expenses for an entire year and especially with the increase in their taxes I think they have every right to see what we're spending. So I would at least like to see it go one more meeting so I will not be voting for the emergency.

Mrs. Brickweg – I do want to comment on the Ordinance, would you like me to comment now, or I know we were discussing the emergency.

Mr. Walden – This would be the appropriate time to comment on the Ordinance.

Mrs. Brickweg – I would like to take a few moments to explain what I feel is in the best interest for our City's future which goes hand in hand with this budget. I decided to write down my thoughts because I realized with this being an official Council meeting, Mr. Zix will make sure that I am limited to speaking twice on a motion. I did my best to encourage Council to discuss this and come up with a decision at last weeks COW meeting and the past finance committee meeting, but both times the discussion was stopped by Mr. Zix because he did not think it was the time nor place. Maybe someday, someone will let me know where and when the right place is to discuss City business.

At both the Finance and Cow meetings we went over the budget. One of the main topics of discussion was the Fire Department's need for a new Quint truck. The fire chief informed us that he lost the grant for purchasing a new Quint. We were in the bids last year for it, but we were told we could not be considered in 2005 because the City did not use the grant money they had received for the smoke house the year before. After the news Council voted to spend their portion (\$3,000) towards the smoke house in hopes we would get the grant for the new Quint in 2006. Apparently we did not have a good rating and therefore we lost the grant and the City now has to purchase the entire piece of equipment. The cost for the Quint is around \$6000,000.00 and they also need to replace their pick up truck. The fire chief asked for \$620,000 to purchase these items.

I suggested to Council and the Administration that we take this opportunity to do what many older suburbs are doing. They are borrowing money at low rates for equipment, using their reserves for the equipment and using the bond money to purchase property. The reason many use the bonds in this manner is because you cannot borrow money from the Center of Local Government for purchasing property. The Auditor, Walt St. Clair explained that the City could get a low interest rate for a municipal bond with the Center of Local Government. The City could get a rate of 4.25% for a 20 year tax free municipal bond. Since we would not be purchasing property all at one time, the City could invest the money and make at least 5% interest currently. This would allow the City the opportunity to purchase blighted property and either fix it up to sell or tear it down for future use. To me, this is a no brainer – borrow the money, fix our declining property situation, purchase property on Vine St. so when we finally get a plan together we will own the land and we can make it work. I explained that I talked with a couple of developers and that they told me most cities start

purchasing the property first, sometimes it takes up to ten years just to purchase the property to build the plans on.

Mr. Zix kept referring to the “declining money situation” of the last few years and that we should not be borrowing money. I would like someone to explain to me how anyone can consider our City in a “declining money situation” when the City had revenues of \$11,502,733 in 2005 and as of the end of November of this year the revenues are \$11,400,000. I think it is time we stop telling people we are bringing in less and then we bring in so much more. I know when I talk to people one of their biggest complaints is the deteriorating property in St. Bernard. Since the citizens voted to increase their property taxes in order to save our City, let’s start saving it by tackling the deteriorating property.

If you wonder why I’m talking about this with the budget it is because I want to include in the budget that we will obtain a \$620,000 tax free municipal bond and I want that amount in line item MP-10 Purchasing Property. The 2007 budget has the City borrowing half for the Quint and I think it should be the entire amount and we invest what we do not use at a higher interest rate and our City can actually be making money on borrowed money. It was suggested at the last COW meeting that I vote for this budget and some Council members may change their mind in the new year and actually decide to go for the whole amount. I am sorry, but I do not have a lot of trust in that and I don’t see why we cannot decide on this now.

Mr. Asbach – Just a comment to Mrs. Brickweg, the letter that we received from the fire chief states that since we did go out for the grant that if you apply for a vehicle you should be aware that almost two thirds of those applications don’t even make it to the panel so even though we did it I don’t think it had anything to do with our rating on the Smoke House or any of that, according to the Chief’s letter.

In regards to the \$300,000 or \$600,000 would do, I just don’t see how you can continue to strap the City on continuing to buy equipment and going out for loans on them, if you did this personally, bought a house, bought a car, you always put a down payment down. I feel much better City wide with the finances putting down half of it, financing the other half instead of putting the whole \$600,000 in. I was one at the COW that was in favor of leaving the budget as is so I just don’t think you should continue to strap the City with these 20 year loans for all the equipment. Sooner or later it’s going to catch up to you and put you in a worse spot than we have been for the last couple of years.

Mr. Zix – I guess again I would like to thank the Administration for the cooperation they gave the Finance Committee for the work. We worked off their recommendation and put some other sites in there. I think I go back to the definition from Webster. He talks about a plan, a budget or a scheduling or adjusting expenses during a certain period of time with the estimated income for that period. That is just that. Adjusting the expenses that come along and I think we have to work with that, we have to do what is best for the City. We have to look to the City’s future. There is no, right now, there is no “declining income” but the income is not keeping up with the pace of inflation. We should, if anything, stay flat to get this City in a manner that we need it in. This City needs to continue to stay on a flat basis and that way we won’t have to go back to the citizenship and ask for a renewal of our tax increase. We were very fortunate and the citizens were very generous to

us. I think we have a long road ahead of us. I'm not saying that to scare anybody, I'm just saying good common sense tells us that and I think that's where we need to be and I'm ashamed some other members don't feel like that.

Mr. Burkhardt – At the COW next week, Walt, could you have numbers ready for a loan for 5, 10, 15, 20 years on the \$600,000, just what the differences would be? Then we could discuss it at the COW.

Mr. St. Clair – Yes, I could do that.

Mr. Burkhardt – Thank you.

Mr. Meier – Mr. St. Clair, if we pass this budget tonight is there anything in here that would prevent us from applying for a loan for any amount?

Mr. St. Clair – No. This is the appropriation budget for 2007, as we do every year, appropriations can be revised so it's not in stone that its \$300,000 in MP-10. It could be made \$600,000 anytime next year or it could be made zero anytime next year. That's the way it works.

Mr. Meier – Thank you Mr. St. Clair. Again I guess what I would like to reiterate is that the same as in the COW this past week, personally I'm in favor of borrowing money so we can take advantage of the rates both on the bond rate and the cost of borrowing the money. I'll express again the one concern that I have is that if we borrow money for the intent of acquiring properties before we do any acquisitions we have to know what strategy is going to be. What we're going to do with those properties and how we're going to get rid of them. I personally would not necessarily be in favor of buying additional properties, making expenditures and then sitting on those properties for any length of time, but I'm very much in favor of acquiring properties knowing exactly how long we're going to hold them, how we're going to get rid of them, and how the City would be compensated back for the cost of acquisition. With those remarks, I'm in favor of passing Ordinance No. 40, 2006 tonight because there is nothing in this Ordinance that would prevent us from borrowing any money in this next year.

Ms. Hausfeld – I also am in favor of borrowing money for the Quint and for having money for blighted property and stuff like that. Mr. Zix, this is not a dig on you but it's probably going to sound like one, common sense, you said to use common sense, well I asked our Auditor what his opinion was and he pretty much said he was in favor of borrowing the whole, he would be in favor of borrowing the whole money, the whole amount. We would actually be making money on the money that is sitting in the bank. So common sense to me, if we can make a little bit of extra money, that makes more sense to me than paying the whole thing off or even paying part of it off and not making the extra money that we could for the City on this particular item.

Mrs. Brickweg – Please bare with me, this is my second time to talk so I'm going to try and address everything that was said. The one reason that I would like to do this and its not like I'm saying we should get a loan for every piece of equipment, this is one of the first chances we have to do this

and I don't want to see us pass it up and if you look at all the old suburbs, this is what they're doing. They're trying to be proactive not reactive. If we sit back and let our City continue to go down hill, let blighted property continue and people not fixing it up, it could get to a point where we're not going to make it. I think its time we hit this problem head on, address it, we have a chance to borrow this money, and even though we're not using it, have the money in the bank gaining interest, I just really would hate to see us pass up on this. I do agree with Mr. Meier that we need a plan, we shouldn't be out there just buying property and that was one thing that was discussed at the COW, we do need to get a plan, who would look at the property, who would buy the property and Council would have to approve the buying of the property, so its not just something like we're going to give somebody \$600,000 and they're going to go out and buy what ever they want. There are checks and balances to that and I would like to wait like I said before, to let the citizens actually look at the budget but I don't see why it couldn't be discussed at the COW and if there is an agreement to do it, make the budget correct, make it with the \$600,000 in it if that's what Council wants, and vote on the budget at the next Council meeting because we're still in December, we're not in '07 and we would still be able to run the City fine with that and I guess I think I addressed everything there.

Ms. Hausfeld – I guess this is a question Walt for you, or even Greg, how important is this to pass this tonight with not waiting a week to see how residents feel or two weeks, I'm sorry?

Mr. St. Clair – This is the appropriation ordinance obviously for 2007, so we don't have anything and its not in effect until 2007, we need it passed so that we can pay invoices and expenses that we have in 2007 so its not necessary that it be passed tonight for any purpose for and bill payments or anything like that. If I may go on a little bit Mr. President, I would just like to mention to Council that the loan that we would be talking about through the Center for Local Government is a consolidated loan for various communities. In order for that loan to be feasible to go out to market, it requires a minimum of five million dollars so as communities make applications for loans and they build up the amount that's being applied for then they can go out for a loan and once again also the rates of interest that they can get will be depended upon the market at that time. Right now the interest rates are declining and in that same light, when we go to invest excess funds into bonds, we're not going to be getting the same amounts in the future that we're getting now, if we're still in a declining market so that's just kind of a caution to Council about the margin you're talking about between the interest for borrowed funds versus the interest for investments that could be narrowing or declining so just a little caution.

Mr. Schildmeyer – Walt, by mentioning that when you're going out for a loan like that and it is going to accumulate to five million before its activated, does that maybe take a year before the five million comes up and then we have to wait till we get it activated?

Mr. St. Clair – I don't know, Mike, I can check with the Center for Local Government to see what the status is as to how much it had in applications so far and see how close they are, I can do that and I'll have it back for you at COW.

Mr. Schildmeyer – Thank you.

Mr. Zix – Last week we put this together and we voted 7-0 to bring this to table and that's why I thought we would pass this tonight and I would still like to pass this tonight. As far as the interest question, I think the cost alone if we're spending it on the other end of the spectrum we're not making and money if we're not investing it so if we take a loan a certain per cent and we invest the money for a certain per cent, then we're going to make money. Otherwise, we're talking about taking a loan for the Quint and then spending the money on deteriorating property, we're not going to make any money, you don't make money on money that you don't have. Currently the City has two million dollars in loans, they had four million dollars when we were heading for disaster for a while, we made that bend, we're on that road to recovery and we paid some of them off but we still have two million. I think by strapping the future too big, we're hurting ourselves, but again I think the main thing, if you want to make the loan, that's fine, the instrument that we have here we'll get you there. It funds the Quint, you don't have to spend that money in there you could make that loan, this money isn't spent once it hits Ordinance No. 40, its just the instrument, the adjustment to your variation of expenses, the plan or the schedule to make the City work properly. I would like to pass Ordinance No. 40 tonight.

Mr. Estep – Thanks for the compliments Wigs on the way the Administration and Council have worked together and you can't overlook the way the three depts.. worked together. As you mentioned, two years ago we were headed for disaster and by everybody working together, passing a levy, two levies or an earned income tax and assessing fees and doing some things that weren't very popular, there starting to come to the top now that we did the right thing. We turned the corner. I'm a little hesitant at this point, I like the ideas of getting rid of some of the blighted property, I take an example of the piece of property on Ross Ave. How long have we tried to sell that. It's easy to sit here and say, let's take a loan and I'm not against anybody saying let's take a loan and let's get rid of blighted property but we do need a plan and we just can't pick a parcel of property and say we're going to buy that and turn around and get a developer to purchase it, build it and have somebody move in, with some of our areas we may be, or it may behoove us to find two that adjoin and make one lot out of it. Could cost us a little bit in population but it could bring a better clientele to our City and I think that's one of the things we need to shoot for is to upgrade some things that we do have. I'm a little hesitant to go out and I'm not totally against a loan but I think we've turned a corner, we're ding the right things, we're getting us back on the road, I just want to caution every body to use some and I don't want to beat the word common sense to death, but you know what I'm talking about.

Mr. Geiser – Just kind of hedging off what might happen here, I can kind of see where this is not going to pass. You need six votes to wave the second and third reading. You have one more Council meeting before the end of the year, you need to pass this before the end of the year. One option that those who are going to vote not to pass this by emergency would be to at least wave the first and second reading so that when it comes up, in case some of you are not here next meeting, there's Christmas parties coming up, then

you're going to be strapped to have a special Council meeting. Normally you always wave the second and third reading, there is an option of waving just the first and second but not the third. That is just a possibility I wanted to bring up to Council's attention.

Mrs. Brickweg – I know this is my third time speaking, a lot of people have spoken, I would just like to ask a couple of questions if I can have your permission. The first question, Ed, just from what you just said, if we do that does that mean that it would just get one other reading?

Mr. Geiser – The law requires three readings, so you normally wave the second and third reading, pass it tonight, that doesn't mean emergency, emergency means that when it is signed it goes in effect immediately rather than in thirty days, you're just waving the second and third reading. We've never done it before but you can wave the second reading and bring it back the next reading for the third reading, you'd only need four to pass it.

Mrs. Brickweg – And after that I would have no problem doing that. I have two other questions, one was to Walt, if we have three point something million, everybody is saying that we don't have all this money and that we having been bringing money but I'll tell you right now that if I had a budget of eleven four at my house I'd be happy, especially when it was projected being in the eights or nine, I think we're doing pretty well. I was curious, how much money we have, just approximately?

Mr. St. Clair – OK, yes, well that's right here on the cash account showing a balance of \$5,780,000.00.

Mrs. Brickweg – OK, so we're not really strapped then right now? We have \$5.8 million dollars, we have \$2. million in loans so that doesn't look like we're really strapping to me. I would like to encourage us that we do and I agree with John we do need a plan, we promised the people a five year plan when we did the tax increase and I'm not seeing a whole lot of plans going on, and I agree with you, we really need a plan for that, we need a plan for developing and buying and we really need to concentrate on that and I'm not sure whose exact job that is, I'd be more than happy to help with that but yes, we do need to do that but its great to have plans but if we don't own the property and we don't have the finances to actually do the plans it's just a plan.

Mr. Burkhardt – Since we don't have the votes to suspend with the second and third reading would Mr. Zix be?

Mr. Zix – Mr. President, I don't plan to rescind my motion.

Motion to suspend with the second and third reading of Ordinance No. 40, 2006 did not pass. 5-2. Ms. Hausfeld and Mrs. Brickweg voting no.

Motion by Mr. Burkhardt, seconded by Mrs. Brickweg to suspend with the second reading of Ordinance No. 40 2006.

## **REMARKS**

Mr. Asbach – I would like to ask the other members of Council if anybody plans on not being here the next Council meeting because if everybody is going to be here, there is no need, you can pass it the regular way next week, there is no reason to this Ordinance.

Mr. Burkhardt – I go ahead and agree to wave this one, just in case, because the last Council meeting, I got sick, couldn't be here, just in case something comes up, I'd rather be on the safe side instead of waiting and then not having enough votes.

Mrs. Brickweg – I will not be at the COW meeting next week, but I will be at the Council meeting.

Motion to suspend with the second reading of Ordinance No.40, 2006 passed.7-0.

Mr. Walden – Ordinance No. 40, 2006 will have it's third reading at the next Council meeting.

**ORDINANCE NO. 41, 2006, AUTHORIZING AND DIRECTING THE AUDITOR TO TRANSFER FUNDS TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS AND TO ADJUST CERTAIN APPROPRIATIONS, AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY.**

Motion by Mrs. Burkhardt, seconded by Mr. Asbach to suspend with the second and third reading of Ord. No. 41, 2006 as read.

Mrs. Brickweg – I just wanted to explain to the citizens a couple of the things on here that we had discussed at the COW meeting under the professional services in the FCMR contract, that money, we have received a check from the Water Works and we just need to reimburse the cost of the project and on the \$2500 that's going into fire dept. incidentals, the fire dept. received an EMT grant and that's what money that is.

Mr. Geiser – I just wanted to point out a clarification. When anyone thinks of professional services they think it's my budget, but that's actually not my budget.

Motion to suspend passed 7-0.

Motion by Mr. Burkhardt, seconded by Mr. Schildmeyer to adopt Ord. No. 41, 2006. Motion passed 7-0.

Motion by Mr. Burkhardt, seconded by Mr. Schildmeyer to amend Ordinance No. 42, 2006 so that the second and third pages read Ordinance No. 42 instead of Ordinance No. 32. Motion passed 7-0.

**ORDINANCE NO. 42, 2006, ORDINANCE AMENDING THE CITY OF ST. BERNARD SCATTERED SITE URBAN RENEWAL PLAN OF 1994 AS ESTABLISHED BY ORDINANCE NO. 37, 1994, AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY.**

Motion by Mr. Asbach, seconded by Mr. Meier to suspend with the second and third Ord. No. 42, 2006 as amended.

## **REMARKS**

Mr. Asbach – Just so that everyone knows, we have basically done this with a great deal of property that the City has bought over the years. We basically developed this Scattered Site Urban Renewal Plan so that we could basically control who the property gets sold to and have better controls over the property when we do sell them. This has been done any number of times throughout the City.

Motion to suspend passed 7-0.

Motion by Mr. Burkhardt, seconded by Mrs. Brickweg to adopt of Ord. No. 42, 2006. as amended. Motion passed 7-0.

**ORDINANCE NO. 43, 2006, AUTHORIZING THE EXPENDITURES OF PUBLIC FUNDS FOR A PUBLIC PURPOSE AND MAKING IT RETROACTIVE TO NOVEMBER, 2006, AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY.**

Motion by Mr. Asbach, seconded by Mrs. Brickweg to suspend with the second and third reading of Ordinance No. 43, 2006.

## **REMARKS**

Mr. Zix – This is another example of money being spent without proper authorization beforehand and I'll be voting against.

Motion to suspend passed 6-0. Mr. Zix voting no.

Motion by Mr. Burkhardt, seconded by Ms. Hausfeld to adopt Ordinance No. 43, 2006 as read. Motion passed 6-0. Mr. Zix voting no.

## **OLD BUSINESS**

Mr. Asbach – This could have been done under remarks of the last ordinance, as the safety director stated, I hate as Council that we get put in these positions where we have to approve these things after they have been spend. The safety director assured us that it wouldn't happen again, it's just hard to keep getting put in that position, I just wanted to state that.

Mr. Meier – It's been over four months, actually it's been almost five months since the two officers resigned from the police force. I feel like this length of time is unacceptable in terms of public safety, cost of overtime, loss of family to the officers who are currently providing coverage for the City. We must provide the very best candidates for open positions within the City and once hired we need to bring these people on board as quickly as possible. Our City requirement of residency, which we actually don't enforce right now, seems to be a hindrance to hiring. What I'd like to do is, I'd like to see the residency requirement brought back out of committee and brought out with an update to Council on what the status of that is and make

that a priority that we get to a resolution whether we are going to have residency or not have residency within our City. If there is a problem with an overload of work within that committee, I would gladly volunteer my time to help bring that out of committee.

Mrs. Brickweg – To add to what you just said, I think it's not an overload for the committee because we have discussed it in the committee, but the advice we have been given is, the City plans on waiting to see what happens with the appeal court with the Cleveland case and it has been discussed in the committee, why we actually even, like you said, nobody is enforcing it, so it doesn't make a lot of sense, but we had been given the advice to wait and see how they appeal those up in Cleveland. It's not a case of overload, that is just what was recommended that we do.

Ms. Hausfeld – Since I am in charge of that committee, Mr. Meier, correct me if I'm wrong, but every single one of us Council members were at a particular meeting when I asked an attorney what my committee should do because it's my opinion and you guys might not want to hear this on open floor, if we're not going to enforce the residency, then get rid of it. That's my opinion, my opinion only and I was told by our attorney that we should let it go until we see what goes on with the appeals court and my committee has discussed it and pretty much that's where we are. We're waiting to see what happens with appeals and stuff like that before we act anymore on it.

Mr. Burkhardt – Part of Laws, Contracts & Claims, I agree that we should wait, no sense making a new ordinance covering residency and then have it overturned by the State. It's just a waste time and money and effort. I think we need to wait and see what happens at the State level and then follow suit.

Mr. Meier – When we passed the property tax abatement ordinance, part of that process is that we have to have a council and members of that council need to be appointed by our City Council and any additional members may be appointed by the Mayor. What I'd like to do is to be put on the agenda at the next COW to discuss candidates for that council so we can go ahead and move forward with that.

Mr. Schildmeyer – A question going back to the residency, if we wait till this passes through the State, is that going to delay the hiring of the officers?

Mr. Estep – I think it just sort of limits or makes the list a little bit smaller of people who want to apply here. That's the only hold up I see, I know it's been a long drawn out process but we have to wait to get the list from Civil Service, and as I said, we were here several hours the other night after we got the list and there are several steps, the PHQ 1 or 3 and everything, the polygraph, and background and any interviews and then they go back for a second polygraph, it's time consuming and we're moving as fast as we can and we want to do everything so we don't get any problems down the road.

Mr. Schildmeyer – Is the residency issue brought to these new candidates?

Mr. Estep – They are aware that part of the criteria is to move in within six months and that may scare some of them off. I don't know, maybe we could update an ordinance an old ordinance and allow, I think it would just make it

a bigger mess. I sort of agree with Bill and Patty with the advice of the lawyer, not to go against the grain but probably wait to see what the State says. I agree we haven't enforced it and we all know what's going on.

Mr. Meier – Mr. Estep, I think the State already has said that they have the position we're waiting on is an appeal that or a lawsuit. Personally it doesn't matter to me what Cuyahoga County does. What I'd like to see and we see more and more, we read about the high murder rate in Cincinnati and the areas around us. I think the citizens deserve the very best candidates that we can possibly get. I think in the interest of the people of St. Bernard, I think we need to put our City interest ahead of Cuyahoga County. Personally I think that if we have an ordinance on board that we're not enforcing that we should bring this up and we should discuss and find out where we want to go. I understand that we basically tabled this on advice of a lawyer but I think that one of the crux of their position is the issue of home rule and if we follow the issue of home rule then we should be able to decide what we want for our own home which is the City. Without seeing the names on any list I'm very confident that if we did not have residency requirements, we would have a larger list. We'd be able to choose from more candidates, possibly more experienced, more qualified candidates. I think in the interest of the City and the citizens, we are constantly talking doing things for the citizens, I think just based on that we need to bring this issue back and we need to discuss it again.

Ms. Hausfeld – The issue is still there, Mr. Meier, and I will tell you my committee has met more than any other committee except for maybe the Finance Committee, this whole entire year and we have been working on things left and right and I welcome each and everyone of you to come to my committee meetings and I don't shut anybody up and as you know I like to talk and anybody is more than welcome to share their opinions with me and my committee on the issues that are in my committee. I do know that Mrs. Brickweg is gone next week so the following week we will set up a meeting, we can discuss it all you want, I'd like to hear what each member of Council feels about this particular order, or this particular ordinance and I'll be more than happy, I'm not bringing it out of my committee, it's in my committee but I'll be more than happy to listen to each and everyone of you and take into consideration, you know, I'll be the first one to admit, you guys might have a better idea than I do and I'm more than willing to listen to each and everyone of you, so if you want to come to my committee, feel free, and I'll let you know when that is, we'll set up a time tonight and I'll let you know and I'll even give it to Mrs. Kathman so that she can put it in the minutes.

Ms. Hausfeld informed me (Clerk) the meeting would be during the first week in January.

#### **NEW BUSINESS**

None

#### **AUDIENCE WISHING TO ADDRESS COUNCIL**

Sarah Spradlin, 324 E. Ross Ave. – I just wanted to defend myself. When I came up here a few weeks ago and I said that a way to maybe save the budget was to get rid of the revue committee that I am on for the minors in

the City. I didn't mean that I didn't want to do the job. I like the job, it's great. I'm a criminal justice major, it's great for my resume and I love the position. I was just thinking of ways saving money for the City because nobody in the City uses the service. That's all.

Frank Mayborg, 4327 Greenlee Ave., Downtown St. Bernard – Greetings! I want to know if anything was said or decided about our lawsuit that we brought against the City. I was one of them. I admit it, I'm proud of it. Have you decided what they're going to do. Mr. Geiser, is there any comment?

Mr. Geiser – We had a meeting tonight, Executive Session, and the Finance Committee met with the attorney and discussed a lot of issues. We are going to move with some additional meetings and try to decide what we're going to do.

Frank Mayborg, 4327 Greenlee Ave. – Did you advise them that if you appeal this decision that once the appeal starts, interests on that money starts at that time and did you also advise them that it takes a year and a half to two years for the Appellate Court of the United States to hear it? Now look at all that money you're involved in. You know right now you may look at four or five million dollars. But think about interest, you're looking at eight or nine million. Isn't that right Mr. St. Clair? Roughly?

Mr. St. Clair – That's a little high, Mr. Mayborg.

Frank Mayborg, 4327 Greenlee Ave. – OK, seven million. I'll take it. But you know, this should have been settled. Now it's going on, it's going on, it's going on, frankly, I could care less because we won. But if you people want to appeal it it's going to cost you more money. I just heard Mr. Zix say tonight that we're strapped. Now how can we be strapped, let's go ahead, we can beat them. How are you going to beat them? You thought we were going to roll over and play dead three years ago. Everybody up there would say that, and I'm not lying, I'm one of them, you thought we would play dead, but guess what, we didn't. Now I think you people better look over your head and say, hey, I think this thing should be over and get it over with right now. I'm done with that, another thing I want to say. If you're going to buy all these houses up, you think they're blighted or something like that, why don't you start by Kentucky Fried Chicken, head North, tear everything down except St. Clement, St. Clement School, that new police station, I mean tear it down. You got more open stores in St. Bernard that's in Avondale. Now, why, nobody's coming in here and buy a house when Vine St. looks like a (expletive deleted) nut house. We've got to put the business section in the town first.

Mr. Walden – We would appreciate it if you would watch your language.

Frank Mayborg, 4327 Greenlee Ave. – OK but you've got to put the business in the town first. Nobody is going to come in here and buy houses. Nobody, you've got to put that business in here. Down there in the square, you got a Chinese joint down there, where is it? It's gone. What else is gone? Now you've got to put the infrastructure in here, you got to wake up because if you don't, you're dead.

Mrs. Brickweg – I just want to comment to the part on the blighted property and buying up property where there is nobody there, and this is one point and it is just one idea that I had and we have been told this that we should a central business district, not house, business, house, business, and my personal feeling is, I would like to see all the businesses be down in the IGA and the Chinese, down in that main heart and I'd like to see us actually buy some of the property on Vine St., tear it down and put up town houses or condos overlooking the park and just get a fresh new start. That's just my personal opinion and it will take money and it will take a lot of work. But I do agree that we need to have a vision and what we need is, we need plans and we need, I don't want to say a planning dept., we do have a planning dept. but, people that work for the City that are hired to make these plans come true. You can call it a city manager, you can call it whatever you want, all different municipalities get different titles to it and Gerry Wiedmann has said he's more than happy to work with people and help make these plans come through once we get them but we need to have a vision and we need to see it and I agree with you 100%, there's a lot of buildings even on Vine St. that are leaning. I would think we could probably condemn them because they are not safe. But I do agree with you, we've got to get the businesses in one area and figure out what we are going to do with the other area.

Gerry Wiedmann, 4546 Park Pl. – I for one would just like to commend this Council for the purchase of the Schlanser property, 4300 Sullivan Ave. I think from start to finish that was a very difficult decision to do, I think people in the neighborhood up there are elated with what they see up there at this particular time and then to follow it up and get the building razed and taken care of and not too long from now to be seeded and strawed. I know you guys take a lot of abuse at times but I for one thank you for making that investment and getting that job done.

Mrs. Brickweg – At the same time Gerry should be thanked also because he did a lot of the work to get that done so while he's thanking us we should thank him.

Norm Miller, 219 Washington Ave. – I just want to elaborate on something Peggy said a short time ago. When you asked the Auditor, do we not have four million dollars surplus, I'd like to remind you, it was not too many years ago and I don't know whether I correct in this, we might have been ten or eleven million dollars in surplus and it all went down the tubes. When we had the tax levy passed so just because we might have four million in dollars you can have it three times that and all of a sudden it's gone. So four million dollars, you're running a multi million dollar City it don't last very long it's not something I'd like to have the four million in my budget too but I'm not running an eleven million dollar City. Just because we got a little money don't let it go to our head and blow it just because it's there.

Mrs. Brickweg – Mr. Miller, the point I was trying to make is people are telling you and telling other citizens that we do not have any money and that is not the truth. And I'm not saying to go spend all the money but when I sit up here and hear people say we're not bringing in revenues and we're only going to be bringing in revenues in eight and nine and we bring in eleven

and a half million dollars and when I hear we're in a really crunch time and I'm talking back a few years ago and I know we want to let the past go, that's fine but I just, it bothers me when people keep saying we no money. We shouldn't borrow any money to make our City better and we have five million dollars in the bank. I think the citizens deserve to know the truth. No money and five million dollars is a big difference, that doesn't mean I think we should go spend it, but I think the true facts should be out there and that's just why I asked Walt so people know when they hear there's no money that that's not the truth.

Sarah Spradlin, 324 E. Ross – I'm sorry, all I wanted to say was when I came up before I said Judicial Revue Committee. I work for UC, it's not the Judicial Revue Committee, that's for UC that I work for. It was the Juvenile Referee Court. That's all I wanted to say.

Mr. Geiser – I just want to respond, Sarah, when you are talking about your concerned about the committee or the juvenile court. I did bring up with Steve Moeller, we talked about it, no one ever said that you were against getting rid of it. Explain exactly what your point was, was there a need for it and what happened was Chief Moeller was here the other night and he explained to Council and it was discussed and he said it's like any other tool, it's there if we need it, if we don't use it, it's nice to have it if it's available. Unfortunately, you're right, they don't use it as much as they probably should but he had his reasoning and Council discussed it and they just made a motion to keep it going.

Sarah Spradlin, 324 E. Ross – My understanding was that Chief Moeller said and I wasn't here so don't quote me, but he said that if I or it seems to me the I didn't want the position and if I didn't want the position that they would just hire somebody else to do it. I just wanted to make it clear that if that was anybody's representation of that, that that wasn't true. I like the position, it's just, I don't think it's utilized the way it should be. I mean those kids caught smoking down town wasting Hamilton County's court time when they could be sent to me and I could take care of them within an hour. You know what I mean. That's what I was talking about, you know. That's what I was referring to.

Mr. Geiser – I don't remember exactly what was said about that but that is what was brought up that you were not trying to stop doing the job, you just wanted to make sure it was utilized or

Sarah Spradlin, 324 E. Ross – If it's not going to be utilized, then get rid of it. I mean there's no sense of having it, I mean it seems like a waste of time and money and I mean I had one case this year. One. It seemed kind of like, I know there's other kids that are getting in trouble that it could be utilized by.

Mr. Geiser – Council discussed it and we all agreed but again they decided to let it go on and hopefully the police will start using it, but that's their decision.

Sarah Spradlin, 324 E. Ross – Right, but that is all I was saying.

Mrs. Brickweg – Sarah, yes I did bring that up at the meeting when there was a little bit of confusion if you wanted the job or not and I did explain that you do want it. You were just trying to save the City some money and I don't know if this is possible, maybe if Sarah could meet with the Chief or meet with somebody and maybe come up with ways or maybe we can use it better, utilize it better since you're a part of it and maybe that's just an idea, you can have a meeting and you can maybe make some suggestions and you can talk to you about maybe we can use it better.

Mr. Estep – I'd like to find out more about that program, Eddie, you know being involved with some of the thing that happen in school, there maybe a way that we may be able to use it a little bit more effectively.

Mr. Zix – I guess as the evening ends, I would just like to say a few things, we talked about budget, we talked about various other spendings. I really agree with Mr. Miller. We have to work forward with some really serious fiscal responsibility because, yes, there might be a couple million there, we owe a couple million, there's money there but we just have to continue down that road we've been going down this last year and watching how we spend the money so we do it in a responsible manner.

Norm Miller, 219 Washington Ave. – Getting back to the same topic, Peggy mentioned before that she would like the public to know that we got four million dollar surplus. That's all great but let the public know too that we begged the public to pass this tax levy, so lets protect it not just say, well we got four million dollars, let the people know we had a lot more than that. We let the people know that too and it all went down the tubes and like Greg said, he's a watch dog and I like the way he votes, if somebody over spends, he lets you know. Everybody else sits there and nobody says nothing. So the tax payer did you a big favor, so lets just don't say well we got four million dollars, fine lets let them know but lets also let them know that we're protecting that four million.

Mrs. Brickweg – Just in response to Mr. Miller. Once again I am not saying to spend all the money, the four or five million in the bank is not from the tax levy, the tax levy you will see in the revenues where we are bringing in more money and I don't know how to say it better. We did vote on the tax increase and the tax increase was voted on because we were supposed to be in such dire straights. When I looked at the money we brought in over the past few years I don't see a dire straight. The numbers weren't there so I'm sorry, it frustrates me to no end that we asked the citizens to vote on a tax increase based on that we weren't going to be bringing in a whole lot of money and we brought the money in. So all I'm saying is, I see the future of our City is, we need to take care of the blighted property and the run down property because if we don't take care of it and we continue to let the properties go down hill it's going to get a lot worse and I know you've spoken many times about the quality of life and the quality of people in this City. If we continue to let the houses run down and more rental property come in, it can get to the point that there's no return and that's all I'm trying to do. I am not saying go out and spend tons of money but we need to start investing in our future and that is what all other communities are doing. They're taking the junky houses and part of the plan that we discussed is, if

the City can put some money in the line item and you buy a house and we pay someone to fix it up and we sell it and we make thirty thousand dollars on that house even after paying off everything, that thirty thousand dollars goes right back into that line item for the next property. A lot of municipalities are doing this, they call it a land bank and they actually start making money but you need some start up money to start it and I mean I can drive around and you can see it and I go to many meeting where this is the main topic and I've explained that there's a legislation in the State of Ohio just on this, on buying up property and hopefully if the cities have the money that they're trying to change legislation where if something goes into foreclosure or sheriff's sale, before any outside who buys ugly houses can buy it, the City has the first right to buy it. So the state legislators, they're looking at the same problem, they see the problem we have so I'm not saying and everybody keeps sitting here saying I'm saying go blow tons of money, I'm talking six hundred thousand dollars to invest in our City. I'm not saying go out and spend the six hundred thousand dollars immediately, but if you have a line item with that money in it and we have an avenue to get the money and we can invest some of the money or use it, just in my opinion, I think we need to do it. I see it as the future of our City and I'm not going to back down on that one because I really think this is what we need instead of letting our town keep deteriorating.

Mr. Meier – Norm, I'm pretty conservative when it comes to money but I know as far as acquiring property, I've been working with an agency in my regular job, what they do is, they have grants where they actually acquire properties and they completely renovate them or sometimes they will tear them down and they'll build from scratch. They use some of the carpenter classes from Scarlet Oaks to do some of that work. The one thought that I had is if you utilize somebody like that where the City would, before we'd acquire any individual property we would have a plan with a partner that we would know who was going to do the renovations, to bring it up to a high quality place to live, they in turn would sell that property and from the sale of that property the City would recoup the money that they had invested in it. Probably the best vehicle to do this would be the way the CIC is set up is that they could do that, we could probably even get back the interest that we paid on it. I would not be in favor of laying out any money to buy a piece of property and have them just sit there. At that point then we're wasting our money. But if we can invest the money in the properties, get it back and turn around and do it again with somebody that's going to put owner occupied people in there, these people that are with the grants that this agency has, if the people live in the home for ten years then the grant that they are given for the improvement cost for that property is forgiven, they don't have to pay it back. They've got a vested interest in living in that property for a minimum of ten years. If you look at some of the really run down rental properties, if we can get any owner occupied person to move in there, have that property built up to where it's virtually brand new, I mean really nice inside, I've spent time going through the properties they have on the market, they're really nice, have somebody commit to it giving it a minimum of ten years and we could get our money back, I think it's a good deal for the City. If we buy a piece of property and let it sit there for ten years and do nothing, that's a bad deal. Like I was saying earlier, as long as we've got an exit strategy, we know exactly what we're going to do, how

long we're going to be in it, when we're going to get our money back then I think it's a worthwhile thing for us to do.

Norm Miller, 219 Washington – I guess I got lost somewhere, I'm just talking about one thing and all of a sudden we're talking about buying blighted property and I don't know I guess I missed something going down the road. All I was trying to do is to protect our money and all of a sudden we're talking about tearing buildings down and blighted property. I missed something, I guess my brain isn't working too good tonight.

Mr. Zix – Again, I just would like to say that I think we all agree that the property is there, I think the instrument we have in front of us tonight, Ordinance No 40, 2006, the budget ordinance, had money in there, we had three hundred thousand dollars in there for that purpose, to go after things. There is no plan right now of how we're going to go about this. It's funded, it just isn't funded I guess apparently because it didn't pass, because it wasn't funded to the level of satisfaction to everybody that we didn't get it passed. I think everybody wants that, there was six hundred thousand dollars in there for the Quint, there's a plan, the Chief wants to buy it. There's no plan yet in the money funded, I just can't figure out why we didn't pass that budget tonight, it just strikes me funny.

Ms. Hausfeld – Mr. Zix, just to let you know, I wasn't sure how I was voting on it tonight, you said we discussed it last week 7-0 but I wasn't there last week, I didn't get to discuss it so it just gives me a little bit of an opportunity to talk to people and see what their feelings are and stuff like that. It wasn't that I was unhappy with, I'm thrilled that the Finance Committee took my suggestion from two weeks ago and I didn't even know that the dept. heads had discussed this but you guys actually funded it, I wasn't expecting that, right away from you guys to tell you the God's honest truth and it wasn't that I didn't pass this because of that, I like the idea, it wasn't until Eddie told us that we could what is it the second and go with the third, that's when I made my decision is just to hear if the public has anything else to say about it and for me to look it over a little better so that I know what's going on with it. That's the only reason I didn't pass it tonight.

Mrs. Brickweg – Mr. Zix, at that same meeting, I know I voiced my opinion that I was very unhappy, I tried to get us to discuss it and what I said before you politely told me that this was not the place and time. So I did try to discuss it and you told me to trust, people might change their minds and I actually said, I didn't trust you so I'm sorry I did say that at the meeting so I think people knew how I felt that I really wanted to discuss it, I know Mr. Burkhardt and Mr. Meier realized that because they commented about how we could maybe change it so I don't think that you should be so surprised that I felt this way and on top of that I don't think it's a good idea to pass ordinances as fast as we do and this is a huge ordinance. This is showing what we're going to spend money on and the public has every right to have a chance to review this. The first time I got a copy of the actual ordinance is when I sat down tonight. I did have the sheet with the numbers and everything but I think it's a good thing that the citizens get a chance to look at this. There is no major rush to pass it like Walt said so I think it's a good thing to let the citizens look at it but I know and I really think you

understood how I felt last week and I really tried to get us to discuss it and to come up with a conclusion.

Mr. Zix – I think to go back as far as the Finance Committee, when we gave you the proposal that the Finance committee was going to give to Council which was a couple of weeks ago, two, three weeks ago, that was the proposal we gave last week. We gave you the proposal last week, the same thing was going to be on the ordinance, we knew that. I think it's a good instrument, an instrument is an adjusting piece of scheduled expenses and that's about all I've got to say.

Mr. Burkhardt – The next COW meeting will be Thursday, Dec. 14 at 7:30.

Motion by Mr. Zix, seconded by Ms. Hausfeld to adjourn. Motion passed 7-0.