

**ST. BERNARD VILLAGE COUNCIL MEETING  
AUGUST 3, 2015**

The Special Meeting of the St. Bernard Village Council was held August 3, 2015 in Council Chambers.

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

Roll call showed that all members were present: Mr. Tobergte, Ms. Hausfeld, Mr. Kalb, Mr. Asbach, Mrs. Schildmeyer, Mr. Culbertson and Mrs. Bedinghaus.

Motion by Mr. Tobergte, seconded by Mrs. Schildmeyer to include in tonight's agenda Resolution No. 8, 2015 for the renewal of the tax levy. Motion passed 7-0.

Mr. Tobergte – I talked to Curtis today, in case the election fails tomorrow for the tax levy, we need to have the final paperwork to the Board of Elections on Wednesday. So this Resolution tonight will go to the County tomorrow and be certified and sent back and we can do another vote tomorrow night to be able to put it on the ballot. Curtis said that since this is an election, our special emergency situation, that we could include this on the agenda.

Mr. Tobergte – Also I need to make a motion to have a Special Council Meeting tomorrow night at 8:00 to pass the Resolution that goes to the Board of Elections. It may not be needed if the tax levy passes tomorrow we won't have to have it but we need to schedule it so I make a motion.

Mr. Asbach – I'll second that.

The motion passed 7-0.

Motion by Mr. Asbach, seconded by Mrs. Bedinghaus to read this evenings Resolution and Ordinance by title only. Motion passed 7-0.

**RESOLUTION NO. 8, 2015. A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING A RENEWAL SEVEN (7) MIL TAX LEVY ON THE CURRENT REAL PROPERTY TAX RATE FOR THE REAL PROPERTY LOCATED WITHIN THE VILLAGE OF ST. BERNARD, CERTIFYING SAID RESOLUTION TO THE HAMILTON COUNTY AUDITOR, AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY.**

Motion by Mr. Asbach, seconded by Mr. Tobergte to suspend with the second and third reading of Resolution No. 8, 2015. Motion passed 7-0.

Motion by Mr. Asbach, seconded by Ms. Hausfeld to adopt Resolution No. 8, 2015 as read. Motion passed 7-0.

**ORDINANCE NO. 44, 2015. REMOVING THE TAX CLERK FROM ORDINANCE NO. 37, 2015 AND FIXING COMPENSATION FOR THAT POSITION AS OF 12/31/2015, AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY**

Motion by Mr. Asbach, seconded by Mr. Culbertson to suspend with the second and third reading of Ordinance No. 44, 2015.

**REMARKS**

Mrs. Bedinghaus – Since this is the first time I’m seeing this I need a little bit of time to really look at this. To understand the percentages and what the hourly is. I’ve started to do that but what it looks like to me is that hired before 12/31/15 then if a person stays in that position it will be their fifth year, going into their fifth year next year. So then that person will be, will go to 39,024.18. Is that correct? This is all based on 2%. Not the one going from the second 26 weeks to the third 26weeks. That’s half, right, OK.

Mayor Burkhardt – Inaudible.

Mrs. Bedinghaus – So that’s all based on 2% those hired after 12/31/15?

Mayor Burkhardt – Inaudible.

Ms. Hausfeld – On top of this?

Mayor Burkhardt – Yes. Those numbers are .....inaudible.

Mr. Culbertson – This Ordinance was presented to us on the recommendation of the Mayor?

Ms. Hausfeld – You mean the Tax Commissioner?

Mayor Burkhardt – Yes, on top of .....inaudible.

Ms. Hausfeld – I’m just surprised because when he left last week he gave us this other recommendation and he said 100% he was going to stick to the terms.

Mayor Burkhardt – Inaudible.

Ms. Hausfeld – Wow, can I ask why a 2% just there when we gave others a, anywhere from a 4.35 to a 3.3?

Mayor Burkhardt – If it was up to me Patty everybody would have gotten 2%.

Ms. Hausfeld – I don’t really want to do this out here but you fought for your secretary to get these other big raises.....

Mayor Burkhardt – Yes because you were giving out raises and you ask me what my opinion was and this is what I recommend. I recommended it January 1<sup>st</sup>. Actually, December of last year. 2% increases. It’s got to stop somewhere because if that levy doesn’t pass tomorrow, my recommendation is to kill all Ordinances going into raises next year. My recommendation will be that nobody gets a raise starting next year if that levy does not pass because you’re taking a million dollars out of the budget right there and there will be no money for raises.

Ms. Hausfeld – I understand what you're saying if the levy doesn't pass tomorrow, but this is before the levy and it, this is just my opinion, I could be dead wrong but it kind of seems weird that you fight for 5% raise for one and not for someone else.

Mayor Burkhardt – Like I said, kill those three Ordinances and give them all 2% increases. I'm happy, I'm happy.

Ms. Hausfeld – Ok.

Mrs. Bedinghaus – So the sixth year, six, seven, I know it's all based on 2%, but the sixth, seventh and eighth year of anybody hired after 12/31/ is lower than hired before. I know you went strictly 2% but .....

Mayor Burkhardt – It's because the numbers.....yes it might be easier for you to explain.

Mrs. Brickweg – The problem was .....

Mrs. Bedinghaus – I get it, it get it but when.....

Mrs. Brickweg – This might help. When I saw it I told them, whoever gave the numbers they had all the wrong numbers first of all. So I added in the correct numbers and when you look at the correct Ordinance from when the Tax Commissioner started that position made the same amount of money.....

Mrs. Bedinghaus – You mean Tax Clerk?

Mrs. Brickweg – I'm sorry, yes. That position made the same amount of money as three and four. So as I explained, I said you could either make those the same but it was thought that that would be confusing, so that might be some of the confusion. I just gave the numbers of where they started, the correct numbers.

Mayor Burkhardt – Inaudible.....

Mrs. Brickweg – And to add to that Cindi if it helps, like the Tax Clerk, her first year she made \$35,570.08. Now where somebody came up with the \$35,859.00 I don't know. But the numbers at the top and not the where there's a difference of hired before and hired after, those are the actual numbers, currently, the Tax Clerk is making \$38,259.00 a year right now. So if it's approved the raise will go up to \$39, 824.00. Does that help?

Mrs. Bedinghaus – Yes.

Laura Schmitt – I would just like to say that when I hear Mayor speak of, you know, he's going to suggest 2% for everybody and otherwise if not you can just take them all away. He doesn't care. It's very insulting to me as an employee. Especially when you see that what gets you a raise here is temper tantrums. This is a business. This Ordinance was not about anybody, anybody but the person in question with her raise. How it became about somebody else and them being pissed because they're not, somebody else might be paid as much as they do is beyond me. And the decision you guys have made reflects the fact that you're not willing to step up and do what's right. Because I think it's a slap in the face and Bill I am sorry but you know what as one of your employees for eight years here,

it's offensive to me to hear you say, I don't care, take it, give it to them, give it back, you don't care. It's obvious you care better for some than others. It doesn't matter based on your job performance or not. I would really like an answer as I asked the other day, and that's all I'm going to ask and then I'm done. Is what are the raises based on? I would like to know so that I know when my time comes I know what I need to do. What are these raises being based on? That is a simple enough question.

Mayor Burkhardt – In my opinion it's based on all kinds of stuff evidently. My original recommendation was 2% and then everybody started coming on their own and Council just pretty much took over from there.

Laura Schmitt – At what point do you stand up as a leader? Do you stand up for all of your employees equally?

Mayor Burkhardt – I do. 2% increase across the board. That's what I believe in.

Laura Schmitt – Some just happen to get \$5,000.00, \$6,000.00?

Mayor Burkhardt – Some get more than that.

Mrs. Bedinghaus – Laura, I want to answer a couple of questions. The 2% raise, this is my understanding, was brought forth to the Finance Committee for across the board was before we passed the budget. At that point in time 2% across the board was well over, I don't even know what it was anymore, way over a million dollars. That did not fit into the budget as you can well imagine. So we thought best, as a Finance Committee, that we could look at everybody on a more individual basis based on their position and their evaluation, if you will, from their, which at this time is only their Dept. Director. It should go further than that. There should be some peer evaluation and that should all come together. This structure in my opinion, this structure will never change until we have job descriptions, we have a job title and we have range, a mid, a minimal and a max. Because if you look at this, you could say, if you could bring somebody in at this Tax Clerk between let's say \$35,000.00 as the minimum and up to \$38,000.00 you could determine, say they have experience, and based on some of their other information you may get from a former employer, you could base it on that and not just say somebody is coming in for the first time is going to be making \$35,859.00. It might be a person with experience. They should be starting a little higher. I know that that's what we did when we went down Paul Myers route. We said he was an experienced person in his job and we had thought to come in at his minimum was not based on his experience. So we went up higher and that's what it should be based on.

Laura Schmitt – You're right and I agree with you. However it's not because that's not how my job, that's not how my pay was determined when I started here. It was not based on my experience at all. It still is not based on my experience or my years of service or my job that I do. It isn't based on that at all. It's whether somebody decides to fight for you or not. Unfortunately we don't have that. Only select few do and I am sorry but I am tired of getting walked on over and over again and watching your good employees leave because of this. I don't, and I know some Council question that, whether it be brought to Council floor, and you said, bring in this Ordinance, this was not our decision to do each of these in separate Ordinances but when you come to Council and you question them people

are telling you that it shouldn't be brought to Council. Where do you go? Where to we go from here? That's what I would like to know because I would like to know where the next step is. Who do you go to if you can't come to Council floor and present it and you're not getting support from your Administration, where do we go? This is sad. When you, you, you, you do realize that with the cost of living and you look at the figures of the cost of living over the last five to ten years and the next five to ten years, you do realize that that Tax Clerk would still be taking, she'd be losing money. She will still be losing money, especially if our insurance continues to change. And I don't know for you to sit, and, and for somebody to say to me, well you know, they just happen, Council just happened to approve this. That's not very professional. It's just not. Not when you're dealing with a situation like this where you have people that are being separated out, one you could do them individually, some get higher than others, some get 2%, 2% is what we want for everybody, yet we're going to go ahead and give 5, or 6 thousand but yet we have no money to do that, it doesn't make any sense. Makes no sense to me.

Mr. Kalb – I agree with you on a lot of different points. One of the things I've been looking into and have been asking questions about, I think a lot of this could be solved if we had a Village Manager or somehow changed the structure. It's no offense to Bill but he's a part time Mayor and too many appointed positions. This wouldn't be rushed if it wasn't an appointed position. I do apologize for missing last week because a lot of this could be changed if it was more professionally run and that's not any kick to anybody's position at all but we need to look at the whole Village as a whole and I think a lot of the issues would be solved by that because you wouldn't have somebody fighting for a friend of theirs or a neighbor of theirs, maybe or something like that. You'd have a Village Manager that would hopefully look at the whole Village as a whole and the finances as a whole and have more experience in those matters and be able to go off job descriptions, go off personnel evaluations and not so much off of, you know, cost of living, or whatever, have somebody that's more suitable for that position and I think that's something that we need to keep looking into and every month that I come here to Council I find one more reason to push harder and harder for that exact same thing.

Laura Schmitt – I agree with you and I appreciate that. I really do.

Mrs. Bedinghaus – I have one more thing. The other thing I think it should be based off on, myself, is that you need to do some kind of a regional look and see and compare apples to apples. You can't compare somebody who is, you have to compare your Tax Clerk or your Clerk in that job description across the board. Look at other peoples experience and look at what they're making and do a really good comparison. It's just not about those other things, there's other things that the Dept. Head, the Administration should do that.

Laura Schmitt – When you come from the Health Dept. and I am it, I am the Dept. Head and when I go to my higher ups, where do I go? That's all I'm asking, where do I go and what do I do next to ensure that when my time comes, I can at least fight for my 2% if need be and you know we put these evaluations all about what is going to happen. Bill had us do our evaluations. We did all that, we turned all that in, it went nowhere. We've heard this, we've heard this, we've been there, we've done that, we've done this time after time after time. Now it depends on who you are, you might get lucky, you might get 5 or 6 thousand dollar raises. If not, you get \$700.00 a year. Doesn't make any sense to me. I've never, and you know as

well as I do, I've never worked for a business that operates under this manner. I just haven't and I just don't think it's very plausible for this to be the way that we do business here, especially with our employees. I've been here for eight years as the Director of Public Health Nurse. I am one of the lowest paid employees. I don't come here every week and rant and rave about a raise for me when we are in a budget crisis I'm willing to take the hit just like everybody else. I stood up here and said that before. I am willing to do what we need to do to move our Village forward but when this stuff is happening it is very, very monotonous to do this day after day after day, it really does.

Mrs. Brickweg – I wasn't going to talk tonight because I'm just, after last Friday, I'm worn out. Worn out from everything around this place except my job. But I am going to say it is frustrating to see really good employees, and this has nothing to do with this, the employees that got a raise whose work is being thrown at me that I caused all this, I haven't caused anything. I just tried to stand up for a person that I thought deserved to make a little more money, that's all I did. It was not a shot at any other employee, I never mentioned any other employee, and that's all I'm going to mention tonight. But I would like to throw out to Council that if by any chance she does happen to leave you're going to have to amend that benefit, that Ordinance, because we're going to have one less Clerk that is experienced at the front desk. That really worries me. I expressed it last week and it's going to fall on deaf ears, there are times when both of our main clerks are out. I don't know how to do building permits. I shouldn't have to know how to do permits or rent halls or stuff like that. I really think that might need to be addressed, if this happens, I'm not saying it's going to happen but it does need to be addressed. I will say when I saw this I was extremely disappointed, very disappointed how it all went down and what it turned out to do.

Ms. Hausfeld – I do have a comment. Sorry. My only thing is, ok, I voted no, let's face it, on the Mayor's secretary Ordinance anyway because I thought it was too much. I don't disagree with that. I still think it's too much, that's my belief, and I'm sticking to it. Although, as of let's just say her fifth year, she's making, and I'm only doing fifth year because that is what I'm comparing the Tax Clerk to, in the Mayor's secretary she's making \$43,809.00, in the Tax Clerk she's only making \$39,024.18 and I'm sorry what's fair is fair. If we're going to do a higher percent for one, I'm not saying that this necessarily a, I'm not saying the Mayor's secretary thing is the best place to go for because I wasn't for that anyway. I actually wanted it lower but at the same way I still think this one needs to be a little higher. So I'm just giving you fair warning I don't know what I'm going to do tonight because I do want to see her get a raise, but on the other hand, I don't want to slight her either and I think by voting for this just at 2% is slighting. That's my personal feeling. I just wanted to give everybody a heads up.

The motion to suspend passed 7-0.

Motion by Mr. Asbach, seconded by Mr. Culbertson to adopt Ordinance No. 44, 2015 as read. Motion passed 6-1. Ms. Hausfeld voted no.

Ms. Hausfeld – I just personally want to say something here. I cannot believe the seven members of Council and when this all went down for the Mayor's secretary every single one of you voted yes for it and now we have another person that works just as hard, if not, harder and I'm not going to say harder because I'm not going to compare the two and how hard they work but I am personally

flabbergasted up here that not one other person stood up and went the other way.  
That's just my personal feeling.

Motion by Mr. Asbach, seconded by Mrs. Schildmeyer to adjourn. Motion passed  
7-0.