

# CIC Meeting

Tue, Mar 25, 2025 6:01PM • 43:07

## SUMMARY KEYWORDS

Bank account closure, demolition bid, legal counsel, tenant lease, grant funding, demolition cost, mowing bids, property purchase, tax appeal, beautification, executive session, property sale, grant extension, demolition timeline, legal retention.

## SPEAKERS

Ray Culbertson, Ali Palmer, Speaker 1, Chris Sauer, Amy Yosmali, Bob Culbertson, Speaker 3, Kelly Valvrius, Johnathan Stuchell, Jeff Edwards, Shiho Yahagawa, Christopher Schildmeyer, Speaker 2, Tim Werdmann, ALL, Meredith Hughes

### Johnathan Stuchell 00:05

So as of right now, is there a motion to accept the minutes as printed,

### Ali Palmer 00:13

make that motion

### Christopher Schildmeyer 00:14

Motion by Ali Palmer, seconded by Ray Culbertson, all those in favor.

### ALL 00:27

Aye

### Bob Culbertson 00:33

the bank balance in the third account as of today is \$179,348.61 cent the First State Bank is \$5,328.87 on the First State Bank. Since they've closed the St. Bernard location, we're going to have to go out and get some statements from them. So I'm recommending the board that we go ahead and close the first state bank account and move everything in the Fifth Third. There's no need to continue to have that that bank account. So I'll put that motion on, and I don't know if we get them put a motion on to vote to close down that first state bank account and move in the Fifth Third or not. Okay, so I'll make that motion.

### Ray Culbertson 01:23

Second

### Christopher Schildmeyer 01:25

Motion to close that bank account by Bob Culbertson, seconded by Ray Culbertson, is that an uptown vote, all those in favor.

**ALL** 01:37

Aye.

**Johnathan Stuchell** 01:42

after the fact that we no longer are required to have any kind of relationship with them, there was a requirement that we did have an account strictly because we did have a loan for the building. But, yeah. Okay. As far as action items, update on existing tenant legal counsel that's been retained. There really is not a lot of an update as at this point. So basically, there's still progress communication, but there isn't anything drastic to report yet, so there will hopefully have something for by the next meeting, kind of carries in, again, into the status of the demolition bid contract and scheduling. A lot of this, again, is dependent upon whether or not it's a matter than just starting on the bank building, whether immediately moving on to what we've then been given as an estimate for the separation of the, you know, the three unit retail structure from that of the remaining portion of the shopping center. So as far as, as of right now, we still have a contract that needs to be refined based upon an actual cost. So in within this bid. Again, we already approved the few 100, and we have 266000 that was bid, the original amount, plus additional amounts that we have in the three parts that would need to be added to the contract itself. But we need to determine whether or not it's we continue pursuing relocation efforts, or whether we go forward with actually the separation of the building to retain the tenant through the duration of their lease. So I guess that still has to be addressed, so we can whether or not that's a open discussion, but that that is something that we need to think about. And I think quickly, because ultimately, you know, the it then falls back on the village. I mean, this isn't, it's a CIC decision as to how we proceed with the demolition, because it's the CIC property, but the village itself, because they were awarded the bid, needs to be able to move forward with necessary legislation to actually go under contract with O'rourke Wrecking.

**Bob Culbertson** 04:06

mr. President

**Speaker 2** 04:08

on that, if we go into splitting it up, how much additional cost does that incur to kind of put in a meeting?  
I

**Speaker 1** 04:20

it so, yeah, we what? We're just under 82,000 81,800

**Christopher Schildmeyer** 04:27

Yeah, that's O'rourke has sent in. Tim, I assume you've taken a look at this, O'rourke sent in a revised number that includes separation of cash, ACE Cash Express, according to the devising wall and cutting and capping of utilities. It totals an additional 81,800 they will be plus the 81 so \$347, 800

**Speaker 1** 05:07

so the so the grant, that particular grant, was, again, what was ordered from hail, accounting was 339,000 so we, you know, that's not a bad amount, but I guess that we'd have to look At, if indeed they did the more careful demolition that that, again, is a little more labor intensive on that structure, there still would be funds needed to make some necessary renovations, at least to make that, say, for example, the boost mobile location, whether or not we go and start looking with the potential new property owner itself in making it a white box ready so that the two other units can be rented. But we can't obviously lead it in the current condition with boards of windows so but at least we would have the ability to keep the current tenant in place without having to worry about a further delay.

**Meredith Hughes** 06:02

What is the status of the other grant we recieved?

**Johnathan Stuchell** 06:09

So, we have not in this case, there is some overlapping cost we would have to determine for the funds available for the being the reward to us through the state as to whether or not there is anything specific about that type of demolition, we have to look at that as far as whether they can pick up that cost, because there's some costs that are involved, that are outside of demolition, that are more on the restorative efforts and also, you know, stabilizing as to whether or not that would be covered. We can. We need to look at that.

**Speaker 1** 06:49

That's really more Taylor's probably so we'll probably ask Taylor to look into that and see what qualifying funds are available in that

**Meredith Hughes** 06:57

the additional grant money has officially been awarded. Was awarded to the village of the CIC?

**Speaker 1** 07:05

the second grant for the 458,000 and roughly, was awarded to the CIC. So as far as any any decisions being made on that, I mean, that's something that we need to actually look at and and move on which direction we choose to go, so that then the village can still go under the appropriate contract with respect to legislation. I mean, whether or not this is you need, we need a period of time to think about it, whether we need to get additional information on the secondary grant that the CIC was awarded. But this really is something that waiting another 30 days is just, you know, we can't keep doing that.

**Meredith Hughes** 07:58

So, I mean, so I guess I applied the opportunity that committee make sure that our next steps are kind of blocks up their review of the ????? and situation.

**Speaker 1** 08:32

Agree, I'd like to put a 60 day cap on that, because basically we awarded an extension on this grant, and it has to be completed by the end of August. For the demolition cost is at least it would be

08:43

**Christopher Schildmeyer** 08:50

Would it be an option to go ahead and issue them a contract for the 266,000 and put these three as alternates that we can select if needed, that we have a contract in their hands, and they can start with EPA notification and the permit and doing those things

**Meredith Hughes** 09:38

that is outside my area of expertise. I don't know. I imagine there's a fair amount of intricacy involved in applying for demo permits, and I don't know how flexible the process is. If you try to change it that way, it could be a question

**Speaker 1** 09:55

to me. And again, obviously, I'm no expert on this, but the fact that the 266,000 itself, whether that can be itemized and broken down however we do it, but said at least the bank building could come down, because that carries into another, another future agenda item. If we're going to be looking at the retention of legal counsel and appraiser, the appeal process would be a perfect timing or am I wrong, as far as for the having that one the next, the one building down? I mean, there would be a reappraisal any

**Meredith Hughes** 10:28

so the appeals process is strictly for back to 2024 guys. So whatever we do in 2025 will impact the 2025 valuation. So actually 2025 payable 26 the appeal would be for tax year, 24 payable 25 so we would be appealing when they got into that last year at the bill that we've got this year. So they're

**Tim Werdmann** 10:56

so you'll recall, When the bids came in, we asked for a big alternate for basically three, three scenarios. One was both bank building and strip mall combined, and I recall correctly the award bid. The total bid was basically the sum of bank separately from the strip. So to Chris's point, I think that from a O'rourke standpoint, long as the utilities are done, we can move forward with the bank building first, and then we figure out what's going on with strip mall as a whole. I don't think that that would be an issue necessarily, based on everything that I've seen a limited conversation specifically with him about that scenario, but based on how it fitted, I don't think it will be an issue. Only issue that I would be concerned about is talking to the county making sure that there's no impact on the grant funding. We replicated that fashion. Thank you.

**Speaker 3** 12:27

K in that fashion. As far as the given is that building down money spent, just money spent.

**Johnathan Stuchell** 12:37

So that's a good question. But as far as involves the completion of the project the way I read it. So when I say completion of the project building down, and whether or not, then again, the prospective contractors pay, but I'll verify that, but that. I'd still like to think we could get this done without

**Meredith Hughes** 12:55

Sure, when the village that is at the time of the village and percent that is at the time of the village pays O'Rourke. I imagine they're going to .....

**Johnathan Stuchell** 13:05

So, right? So what? ... I have do have a little experience in that side, because, again, for the previous grants that we've been awarded, basically we have to invoice. So basically the invoicing of the county for funds that have been spent for this particular purpose. So that being we the village had written checks and paid for said process. So when we paid off the bank building, same thing, we had to get the issue an invoice showing what was paid, and then the bill, or then the county basically issued reimbursement.

**Meredith Hughes** 13:44

The grant has to be pulling this first,

**Speaker 1** 13:51

I think it by the end of August. We need to have it paid for and an invoice submitted to them. I we have no control over when the county writes checks, so that would be just Yeah, checks written

**Meredith Hughes** 14:02

The goal is to hhave the checks written by the end of August? The goal is that ability down and as long as right?

**Christopher Schildmeyer** 14:21

So do we? So do we need to do a vote in order to issue O'Rourke a contract as we described?

**Meredith Hughes** 14:30

No, we voted last time we did, I think you authorized the village to execute the contract. Are specifically

**Tim Werdmann** 14:49

Council already authorized. As far as the nuts and bolts and procedural things that 266,000 gets spent, there's flexibility.

**Johnathan Stuchell** 15:14

The full amount that we actually did appropriate the full 339,000 so that, again, the full amount of the grant could be spent for the additional So, yeah, a while

**Tim Werdmann** 15:29

back, so he's there. It's all my perspective. Council already approved the \$260,000 I think,

**Meredith Hughes** 15:32

so given the full amount of the grant was appropriated, we decided to separate that, Council, need to approve the additional

**Tim Werdmann 16:04**

yes, because, because council approved the entering into the agreement with \$266k, there need to be additional Council action to enter into some What are You going to call it with the additional work to the total amount that's already

**Amy Yosmali 16:24**

I guess I'm mostly concerned about the timing, because last, in our last session, We had a role here, and I specifically asked about timing. And one of the things, I mean, sure on paper, when you're talking about actual days, it's one thing, but we have also factor in. And, you know, four months, I think, is minimum. What were they really, not just the three weeks, three months on paper, I think they really need to factor in four, which puts it at the beginning of April, that we need to have something in place. And that's a week away.

**Meredith Hughes 17:11**

So the process is going to just Start.

**Tim Werdmann 17:57**

So, they started, there's some prep work that'll need to take place as well.

**Speaker 1 18:29**

unless anyone else has anything. Next item would be the CIC mowing bids for 2025 and we had a record number of contractors and submitted bids five, which is that's never happened. The most we've had since I've been involved was two, sometimes just one. So anyhow, basically the bid that was submitted was by JMS landscaping for \$440 per mowing cycle, which is basically Sunday period. The next closest bid would have been stripes landscaping at 485 we had early birds, lawn care at 540 we had flourish lawn and landscape at 550 and then we had bear lawn care at 680 again, the low bidder being JMS landscaping and 440 so I would like to ask for a motion to accept the bid from JMS landscaping, to allow them to go under contract with us for the 2025 mowing season.

**Ray Culbertson 18:48**

Mr. president, make that mothion.

**Jeff Edwards 19:23**

Second !

**Christopher Schildmeyer 19:46**

motion by Ray Culbertson, seconded by Jeff Edwards, .... is this an up down vote? Okay, yes, then President Stuchell, yes. Bob Culbertson, yes. Chris Schildmeyer votes, yes. Joe Brickler, yes, Ray Culbertson, yes. Jeff Edwards, yes. Ali Palmer,, yes, Chris Sauer, yes. Amy Yosmale, yes, all, yeas, no. Nays

**Johnathan Stuchell 20:38**

okay. Next, I'm going to basically turn this one over to Meredith for the retention of legal counsel appraiser for the tax appeal process.

**Amy Yosmali** 20:47

you said that the Strauss Troy is, and his was 25% and the last one was between Three and four.

**Meredith Hughes** 20:47

So, the acted on the shopping center last year were \$30,000, which to me is quite a lot of money. There is a way to appeal that valuation. The auditor currently has \$2.1 million that we got, I doubt we can get 2.1 more on market today. So I propose that we challenge that getting a reduction. We can, if we choose, include the First State parcel as well, the taxes on it are lower than 9000 but I think our burden is much higher on the that building than the will be on the shopping center, I've gotten a couple different proposals from offer that very right to be able to handle the appeal for us, the attorney fee would be one thing to go out and appraise it. The deadline by which to file the appeal is March 31 so this is something we need to decide today. However, only the appeal has to be submitted by March 31 we select Time to get the appraisal and have that submitted. So the three proposals were from Straums Troy, who's the freedom against law firm, who contingent fee to 25% so more than the final one was directly venture, 2000 for their time. All of these would be plus the cost of appraisal about 3500 more. I think it would be worth it because, I feel very confident that really some production. And I don't know that we're not all of a sudden, it's all of our money back. But \$60,000 a year is a lot of money. I think it's worth it to pay, you know, five to six, and then even we save, oh, 15, \$20,000 we're still pretty, still ahead in the game. Like I said, we could talk about including the First State Bank building, the auditor has that at about 690. So, We may look at some savings. That's not part of the original proposal that I asked the attorneys to get maybe some additional cost if we designed there's likely to be a site appraisal, so your cost is up there, and there may be additional rare keys. And because I think the length of success is a little bit lower, because they're all their recent sale. When we bought it in 2019 it's gonna be harder to challenge that value in the shopping center. He said, .... I mean, the other option is, I would prefer to have somebody who is experienced do it.

**Amy Yosmali** 25:40

I know I've heard good things about Strauss Troy and their price being similar to the third, third group that you mentioned with your experience and as well. Who do you have a prefer? I mean, if their pricing or so similar, would you have a preference?

**Meredith Hughes** 26:00

Yeah, they're both really well respected law firms transfer, I think Strauss is bigger, but that's not necessarily good or bad thing. And I think a lot of the \$3,000 a lot of fee, is going to be for the attorney questions at the hearing. Which is where I think most of the value form itself is fairly straightforward, but as far as understanding that, I think that's

**Johnathan Stuchell** 26:50

Do you? I guess the next thing is, obviously you are, even though this, that part may not be your area of expertise, but at least obviously being an attorney experience in process is similar to this that we deal with all the time with closings and all I would put all my faith in you to personally make this selection, unless you feel at this point you're based on what you have right in front of you, If you're prepared to go

ahead and select somebody now, or whether or not we give you the freedom to represent the CIC in contracting with someone

**Meredith Hughes** 27:31

Either works for me, if the board is comfortable with it.

**Christopher Schildmeyer** 27:42

we need to do an up down vote allowing that Motion by Ray Culbertson, second by Joe Brickler, all those in favor.

**ALL** 29:17

Aye

**Johnathan Stuchell** 29:17

As far as the I am going to be asking, but not yet for a motion to go to executive session to discuss the sale of property. At the conclusion of Executive Session, the CIC will be reconvening and with the potential of actually voting on a purchase and sale agreement, but that is a possibility. So what I'd like to do is open this up as far as to the open discussion, additional agenda items, first starting with any board members, and then we'll open it up to the public participation. Is there anyone on the board that has anything under open discussion? Additional agenda items,

**Chris Sauer** 29:56

yeah. Gained club would like to ask about planing.

**Johnathan Stuchell** 30:04

At our expense, they live with our expense, with their expertise in the planting.

**Meredith Hughes** 30:08

I don't think we'd want that while the demolition is going on.

**Johnathan Stuchell** 30:23

So, I may actually dispute that. So the demolition itself would not affect the area in which the flowers would be planted, at least in offering some beautification of pretty disturbing area, I would actually like to make the motion that we approve the expenditure for the planting of flowers. The Village still assists with the mulch side, so we're good there. But I'm trying to remember, honestly, what we reimbursed

**Jeff Edwards** 31:03

It was two or \$3,000 last year.

**Johnathan Stuchell** 31:05

It was not that we didn't spend, I think I asked for, but we didn't spend that. It was a it was, I can't remember if it was five, 600 bucks. I don't remember,

**Ali Palmer** 31:19

where are these flowers going?

**Johnathan Stuchell** 31:22

There is elevated, elevated areas that they actually decorated. So one being around the bus, then there's some the next set where there's some seating, and then on down being actually being north. There's three different areas that they planted, and it did look nice, made a difference on on that area. It doesn't mean that the village couldn't do some planting on their own, but I don't believe that, regardless of any demolition, that the flowers will be disturbed, period. I don't because, again, that is just, we're on the vine street frontage. We're not going to be disturbing the parking lot immediately. So again, I mean, I'm not fighting for the flowers, but the it does look nice, and the village does water them. So we have somebody that's actually volunteering to plant, and we have the continued watering of them. So I would be in I would like to actually make the motion that we authorize up to what, what do you think is an appropriate amount? Chris, we make a motion of up to \$600 for the beautification of Vine Street by the garden club. Yeah, flowers. I would see the flowers. Yet we don't have to worry about mulch. Is there somebody other than myself? I don't mind being the one.

**Christopher Schildmeyer** 33:04

I'll make a motion that we appropriate \$600 for the beautification via flowers. I made the motion seconded by Amy Yosmalli, all those in favor.

**ALL** 33:17

Aye.

**Johnathan Stuchell** 33:24

anything else, while we are here?

**Meredith Hughes** 33:37

It may be worth evaluating out after the list of available properties, and whether should continue to list the application process since we seem to have reached savings as far as available, and what properties have garnered any interest.

**Johnathan Stuchell** 33:58

So I agree with all of the above that we do need to change. What is there. I do also think that once we get to a point where we are moving forward under contract, that we could then give some news updates, at least on progress, we should probably remove the identified process that we have for the purchase of property until the next available properties come about. But again, we do have, I think there are a couple that we're looking at the potentially being available, one being on clay street, but as far as the others were not, have not been listed for sale. I actually would also probably until we know for sure what we need, as far as parking. Probably wouldn't look at the other clay property until we know for sure what might need to be addressed there. But I think we do need to update board members, obviously, for sure, I will talk tomorrow with Heidi, and then we'll update them, and it's what Chris has, what I have, and you have, will be current.

**Ali Palmer** 35:08

One question Is there plans when the fencing go up, before the for the demo, to incorporate some kind of like a banner or something, to attach the fencing announcing to the public is, this is a great project, and we're making progress. General public said, Yes, things are happening. What's happening?

**Johnathan Stuchell** 35:34

So basically, what you're asking for is the purchase of a banner. I think that's something we could probably do. I say we can an estimate on what that might be whether one banners adequate. But I guess I'm not saying that it's self explanatory when there's a couple big pieces of equipment there. I mean, that's pretty much kind of like free advertising. But maybe we can, maybe we can.

**Tim Werdmann** 36:01

Might be an opportunity for Civitas

**Amy Yosmali** 36:18

I think, it's an opportunity that that would be beneficial.

**Johnathan Stuchell** 36:33

I think would be beneficial. Big flowers, yeah, all right, the good idea, does anyone else under the on the board have anything under open discussion? Additional agenda items, does anyone in the audience have anything under when discussion? Additional agenda items, you have to actually make your nknownway to the mic.

**Kelly Valvruius** 37:02

I just have a concern with you going through an interview in the second round of lawyers that we've made the march 31 deadline to submit the complaint for appeal on property value. Interview is

**Meredith Hughes** 37:24

I'm going to call them tomorrow, that because the first step is not form, as long as the form is into the board revision by March 1 reserve your right to take the appeal, and then that gives you an additional couple weeks and months My understanding.

**Shiho Yahagawa** 38:03

I have a question about the property at 4416 Greenlee Ave, Cincinnati, OH 45217. I'd like to know if there is anyway to purchase that property.

**Christopher Schildmeyer** 38:30

So that that is not that property does not belong to the CIC, that property is technically now owned by the village of St Bernard. Full documentation is not arrived as of yet, but we were assured that it is ours. We were, I mean, it's not something that we we fought basically for this because, based they were, we purchased a tack lane on a home that there was a fire village, then took the position to move forward for safety purposes, to have the property then demoed. The Village assumed that along with the assignment of the existing link that we basically purchased from a company that had purchased an attack itself, it then went through the full process, went through two rounds of share sale, and nobody bid on it, because we were able to get the full expense that was for the basically assignment demolition

and all that consolidated. So the there were no bids at roughly 65,000 I think it was maybe there was a double check on the exact figure of what they had in it, but nobody bid on it. So it's coming back to the village. The village itself will need to come up with the plan as to how to disperse that property. But again, what has always been the concern of the village, and, of course, the CIC but has been, you know, being able to make buildable properties available for, you know, single family use. So we need to come up with a planned village itself as to how they wish to go about the process, whether or not they desire to make an agreement with the CIC and turn the property or the CIC to put in their same process. I'll tell you the difference. I The difference in what the village would do is, if we put it up for sale, it's just going to go to the highest bidder. If it goes through the CIC process, the process would be critiqued. The plans would be critiqued. And you know, it could be something where you could put specifics. That would be something that would have to architecturally be fitting for the neighborhood and so forth. So we don't have an instant response as to a time frame yet, but that's something that we probably need to address once we have, you know, official notice on paper that everything has been processed, and then we can come up with a timeline and how that would go forward, and what the villages desire based on council, if they desire to turn it over to the CIC to put to make available, but it wouldn't be something, and there's really no need if it does come back to the CIC, as far as to go into their portfolio to Say that means there needs to be any delay in making it available. I don't see any reason. It doesn't fall into any future group development of any other properties, because it is a random and I think that, based on the desire here for St Bernard and our desire to also, at the same time, increased density, need to look up a way to make it available for someone that wants to build a new home, so there will be something that would be properly advertised, and, you know, I'll bring that up to council that we need to move on that and come up with a plan as to how they wish To disperse that property, and we'll make it available.

**Johnathan Stuchell** 38:31

So we'll make sure that it's appropriately advertised on the village website. We'll make it available village newsletter. We'll make it available on the village Facebook page, and then, you know, we'll make sure that it's properly announced. And there'll be a period of time that, you know, once we come up with a plan that you can submit for what your desired use would be.

**Shiho Yahagawa** 41:37

Thank you very much ... I appreciate it.

**Johnathan Stuchell** 41:38

So at this point, I am actually going to ask for a motion to go into Executive Session for the sale of property,

**Amy Yosmali** 42:34

I second

**Christopher Schildmeyer** 42:39

OK, let's do an uptown vote. Jonathan stStuchell, yes. Bob Culbertson, yes., Joe Brickler, yes. Ray Culbertson, yes. Jeff Edwards, yes. Ali Palmer, yes, Chris Sauer, yes. Amy Yosmali, yes, all yesses ....., we are in executive session