

**ST. BERNARD VILLAGE COUNCIL MEETING
NOVEMBER 17, 2016**

The regular meeting of the St. Bernard Village Council was held Thursday, November 17, 2016 in Council Chambers.

President of Council, Ms. Valerie Van Valkenberg-Walden – The meeting was opened with a prayer followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

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

Mrs. Bedinghaus made a motion to dispense with the reading of the minutes. Mr. Kalb seconded the motion. Council agreed 6-0.

REPORTS OF VILLAGE OFFICIALS

MAYOR, Mr. Estep – Just a couple of things. We had a CIC meeting, it went fairly well the other night and we're meeting with the Reds tomorrow at 4:30, Paul Schildmeyer and myself, Kelly Franklin from the Reds, to talk about some funding for the Ross Park area and Vine St. Park area. There has been some talk about Dept. Heads coming to the meetings and I know we've discussed this before but I'd just like to ask Council, what is your take? I'd like maybe just for a hand vote. Do you want the Dept. Heads to attend the Council meetings? I know you're going to say this is Administrative call, and that's fine if you do, but I just wanted to, I know Patty is in favor of having the Dept. Heads at every Council meeting. Any opinion from any other Council members?

Ms. Hausfeld - I'll be the first one since he already said my opinion, but I was going to say, no I'm not going to say what you just said, John, but yeah I do believe that the Dept. Heads should be at the meetings. Those different Dept. Heads, at least once a month you can be at COW, you can be at Council meetings. COW most probably would be better because that's when we do our working committees and things and we discuss a lot of things and if there's questions or answers that need to be answered then they're there to answer it. I know I've been told several times by you Jonathan and others that Jonathan is in charge of the Building Dept., he's in charge of the Police and Firemen. He's their boss and they answer to him. I understand that but there was a meeting, I think it was two or three meetings ago, where there was a lot of discussion about the Fire Dept. and the letter you were sending out, every time you were asked a question you said, I don't know, I'll have to talk to the Chief. And Chief this is not a dig on you I'm telling you now because Chief Meyer is here almost every meeting and he answers any questions that we do have. Almost at every meeting. It just so happened it was one meeting that he missed. So yeah, I do believe, especially since we're meeting just twice a month now, we're not meeting four times a month like we have in the past and okay, in the past we met every week, when you said or somebody would say, I'll have to get back with that Dept. Head and I'll come back to you next week and then we can discuss it further. Now when you say, I'll have to check with the Dept. Heads and I'll get back with you, it's a month later. So to me it seems ridiculous to get stuff accomplished that we have to wait a whole month to get the answers that we need in order for us to put something on the table to vote on it or not vote on it or whatever. So yeah I still 100% stand behind my thoughts and my actions in, for

years now I've said this, I believe that the Dept. Heads should be, and I'll say one meeting a month, because we're only meeting twice a month now but I believe that they should be here.

Mayor Estep – Well maybe in lieu of a vote, I'd like to reach out to Council because you were kind enough or courteous enough to me when I brought the two meetings a month to the table and we voted on it. We all well a bunch of people, almost unanimously wanted to go to two meetings a month and it's worked out pretty well. Why don't I send a directive to the Dept. Heads that they should attend COW for the next three months. Let's look at December, January and February. And if they're called upon for questions and answers at those meetings we'll continue and if not we'll look at it again at the end of three months. I think that would be a fair way to do it for everybody if that's okay with Council.

Mrs. Schildmeyer - I would like to respond a little bit on this. I think that when you are in charge you are in charge. When you're the boss, you're the boss. I'm in charge of dinner at my house. I can make dinner happen at my house. If I don't make dinner happen, it doesn't happen. I just don't think it's fair, Jonathan you're in charge of Safety, are you okay with this?

Mr. Stuchell - (inaudible)

Mrs. Schildmeyer – Mayor, you're in charge of the Village right now, you're the Mayor.

Mayor Estep – And I do the laundry at our house and everything else.

Mrs. Schildmeyer – You do dinner and you do everything and you drive a school bus like nobody's business. So I just think that when you're the boss you are accountable and that is your job. Peggy, we don't look at Nick and say, Nick, you should be here. Peggy you're accountable. You do your job, right. You do your job. Okay so I disagree with Patty a little bit there and saying that when you're the boss, you are in charge.

Ms. Hausfeld – And I'm going to disagree with Mrs. Schildmeyer. First of all, we're not making dinner at a house. We're running a city for the citizens of St. Bernard that pay taxes and the difference between Peggy and Nick is Peggy you're the boss. So she is here. So Nick doesn't have to be here. This is a prime example; I was at the CIC meeting and there were residents at the CIC meeting that said that they would like to be informed more. Well I got news for you, if Paul was at a meeting once a month and informed the residents of exactly what his department is doing and working on or whatever then I think that not only us as Council members would be informed better but so would the citizens. So I 100% disagree with you because I believe that there should be accountability and I believe by coming before Council and explaining their selves or different things that they're working on or whatever, I think that is accountability. I'm not saying that the Mayor is not doing his job. But, sorry John, but the Mayor doesn't know 100% everything that's going on and as a prime example when I asked questions a couple of weeks ago and Chief Meyer wasn't here the Mayor had to get back with me a few times on questions that were answered that night not only by me but other people that asked questions that night. So and like I said there is no dig on Kerry Meyer because Kerry Meyer is here all of the times. But I have five, I have been on Council for ten years, I have fought for this for ten years and most of the time it

was yeah they should be at least at one meeting a month and that was when we were having four meetings a month. We're only having two meetings a month so I do believe that they should be at one of those meetings. And Jonathan this is nothing against you because I do believe that you take care of your departments. Sorry, you don't know everything either. And I believe that there are times when there are questions that need to be answered by the Department Heads. And I will stick by my guns until I'm blue in the face. I might be blue in the face right now but I firmly believe that.

Mr. Culbertson – You're red. I like the Mayor's idea. Let's like we did with the meetings. Let's give it a shot for three months. I think maybe anything that could make us more efficient, let's give it a shot and see what happens. It could speed up some of the process and delays on Ordinances and getting back to people and it might even encourage some more audience participation if those people here are to be directly questioned and brought to the table. I don't see why it wouldn't be worth giving it a shot.

Mrs. Bedinghaus - I agree John. I think that's a great idea to do this for a three month period. I think what we should ask them to do though is have a report for them that they could provide rather than just sit here and not do nothing. There is some things that Paul could report out or whoever it is. I just think they should have something that they should report at.

Mrs. Brickweg - I just want to throw something out there. I think the one part that is kind of missing is yes Jonathan is in charge of his department but he is part time. So there is a bit of a difference with the full time Department Heads. So I do agree, I have attended, Rick attends, Tommy attends and Kerry attends, you know I do agree that they should at least attend one. I totally believe the full time employees should attend both like the majority of Department Heads do but just to say they're out there do you also want your Recreation and your Civil Service, other committees. They might not have anything to report. They might, but I'm just saying that might be something you want to think about if you just want to say the full time department heads. And when you're working full time, John and I even discussed it today, it's a lot different than working all day, most of the time you know what's going on. But I think that's something you might want to think about I don't know if you really need your part time department heads here. But maybe you do. I just wanted to throw that out there.

Mr. Tobergte - I agree John. Just bring them in for three months and see what happens. The only thing on like that is if they have an issue with the budget or they want something else, I think they should come and ask for it. That way we could question them. I'm down talking to Paul every day but I don't know what all is going on down there.

Mrs. Shildmeyer – This is a qualifying statement. We need to say who has to be here and who doesn't have to be here. I don't think it's fair to say to Steve Moeller, he has to be here all the time. He is a great Chief. We all have relationships with him. If we need to ask him something he has those answers but you're saying now Donnie that we are saying some people and not others. So who are we saying and who are we not. The full time people like Peggy said, Recreation and stuff like that, Civil Service would only come if they need something. That would be my impression.

Mr. Culbertson – How about we say her and Mayor Estep putting a list together of key departments heads or whoever and we can open it up. Besides the people here, now we're talking just a couple of other people, right? So lets just include, I'm in favor of just one COW for the next three months. That's where the bulk of the questions and answers typically happen so I don't think we need them here twice a month but maybe we'll realize that we do. And we can change that accordingly but I like giving it a shot of at least asking them to come to COW meetings for the next three months and seeing how it goes.

Mr. Kalb - I'll be the last person to kind of reiterate everything. I agree, lets try it out for three months and then I would say that after those three months we could look at it as maybe, there's a lot of questions for the Building Dept. And we need Paul Myers here but maybe we never have a question for the Police Dept. And we say well he doesn't have to be here and do individual basis and not group them all together but lets just ask every department as a whole over these three months and then maybe there's some departments that always have questions and they should be here and maybe others would become more of a waste of time and maybe we can kind of like nit pick it at the end and figure out which department heads need to be here after the trial period.

AUDITOR, Mrs. Brickweg – The Auditor's office prepared Ordinance 24, 2016 for tonight's meeting. There were some e-mails going around since the COW and I would like to explain the need for additional appropriations instead of moving between Departments. Many years ago it was decided to not move appropriations between Departments to ensure accurate history reports, which the Auditor's office uses often. It was suggested to move money from the Fire Department to the Police Department. As I explained in the e-mails this would a wash when it comes to the balance of what was actually spent at the end of the year. I have prepared the Ordinance providing additional and moving appropriations for the Police line items.

Ordinance 24 transfers \$851,000.00 from 01-5-A-19 General Fund Transfer Out to Cash Accounts:

05-1000 Master Plan Cash Account \$175,000.00
31-1000 General Bond Retirement Cash Account \$500,000.00
51-1000 Employee Health Plan Cash Account \$176,000.00

It also provides additional appropriations to the following:

01-6-A-1 Police \$5,000.00
01-6-A-1A Police Overtime/Comp Time \$40,000.00
01-2-O-18 Landfill and Composting \$35,000.00
31-50 Bond Principal \$25,000.00

It moves the following appropriations from:

FROM GENERAL FUND:

01-6-A Police Chief \$3,000.00
01-6-A-6 Crossing Guards \$6,000.00
01-6-A-11 Police Clothing \$3,000.00

01-6-A-13 Police Equipment Outlay \$10,000.00

01-6-A-14 Police Training and Tuition \$5,000.00

TO GENERAL FUND:

01-6-A-1 Police \$27,000.00

The transfers place money into the correct fund so invoices can be paid out of the correct fund. The Police regular pay is running low because of negotiated pay increases and benefits. The overtime is running low because of an increase due to department injuries and officer in charge pay. The Police Chief was able to move \$27,000.00 from other Police Department line items to lower the amount needed for additional appropriations.

The additional appropriation for landfill and composting is needed because of the additional garbage going to the landfill from the August flood. The increase in the bond principal is for the increase in the December payment. We have not received the amount yet, but I am hoping this is enough to cover the expenses.

The Auditor's office provided Council and the Administration with the October, 2016 revenue and expense spreadsheets. The spendable revenues year to date are \$10,463,939.29. The revenues compared to 2015 are down \$833,383.70. The expenses year to date with bond and grant money removed are \$10,706,380.99. Compared to 2015 the expenses are up \$662,671.92. The Village closed on the purchase of Long John Silver's last Thursday so in November an additional \$250,000.00 will be added to the expenses.

DIRECTOR OF LAW, Mr. Peck – We did have a Laws, Contracts and Claims Committee meeting this evening and Mrs. Bedinghaus will report on that. I just had one additional thing. With regards to the Grass Ordinance. I spoke with Mr. Paul and he indicated he is fine, he is satisfied along with Robert Evans with the Ordinance as is. The only change that I would suggest, and Tom agrees with me, is to delete having to publish this in two weeks. I'm going to go ahead and forward that for an Ordinance if that's okay for next week unless you wanted to check it now? I'll put that on the table for the next Council meeting. Is that okay with you guys?

Other than that, I went to a general meeting at the Ohio Municipal League last night and they discussed something and it caught my ear. I know used TIF funding for the development in St. Bernard and there's a new House Bill rather a Senate Bill 235 that I think they're trying to pass before the end of the year which could affect, well it will affect many communities, it could affect our community and I'll just read a paragraph because it's rather complicated. I'll forward this to Mr. Paul Myers, but he understands this TIF business more than I do. I'll just read a paragraph, I'll forward this to him. Many of Ohio current economic development tools rely on property values and real estate taxes to encourage development. Tax increment financing tips; for example a lot of the taxes that would be generated from increase property values fund infrastructure development. Because Senate Bill 235 would freeze the value of real property placed for commercial development it appears that it wouldn't render TIF's ineffective in the future. So that's a real problem. That's a problem that I'll update you on. That's a problem that I'll forward on to the appropriate people. I just want you to be made aware of that and that's something that will probably have to lobby on and hopefully it doesn't

pass. But it is something to be concerned about given the amount of development that's going on inside St. Bernard.

TREASURER, Mr. Ungruhe – (read by Mrs. Brickweg) Mr. Ungruhe apologizes, he had a family commitment but said he will try to make the meeting if he can but his report is this, the Fifth Third Memorial Fund shows a balance of \$5,632.91.

SAFETY DIRECTOR, Mr. Stuchell – I would like to give you all an update on a newly formed committee and the potential restructuring of a Safety Services position in the Village of St. Bernard. At the request of the Mayor, I have taken the responsibility of researching the possibility of combining the duties of the Police and Fire Chief. We are in a pivotal point here in the Village where we have the retirement of our Police Chief in the upcoming year and I feel that there is no better time to take on this task. The City of St. Bernard and now the Village of St. Bernard has always had independently led Police and Fire Departments because that was the way that it was always done. I am of the belief that to properly sustain both departments and to continue offering the level of service that the community has become accustomed to that we need to be more creative in our management approach.

I believe that one skilled Chief could manage the personnel with the assistance of an administrative officer from each respective department. In doing that we will have an immediate savings and the opportunity to look at potential overlapping resources and future savings with the management of each budget. This could then segue into future collaborative efforts within both departments and potential cross training opportunities.

I have sought the advice from a friend and well respected Police/Fire Chief in the Greater Cincinnati Area, Richard Wallace from Amberly Village. I had a meeting with him yesterday and this really feels like the right thing to do for the Village. It may not be a popular decision for personnel because it will eliminate a promotional opportunity but we need to start being more forward thinking. He has agreed to assist me in this project and I have asked three members of Council to serve on my newly formed committee. Throughout this process we will be working with the Law Director and Civil Service for guidance.

I gave some thought as to who ask because there needs to be equal representation and also individuals who have particular responsibilities on Council. The three members that have agreed are; Don Tobergte, Chairman of the Finance Committee and a true independent, Ray Culbertson, Chairman of the Safety Committee and a member of the Progressive Citizens and Andy Kalb, a professional firefighter by trade and a member of the Independent Party. I look forward to updating everyone on our progress and I will be open to comments/suggestions.

Lastly, I have the monthly report for the Fire Dept. For October. As far as total EMS details, there were 53 EMS details with 30 patients transported. Mutual Aid Given for EMS, believe it or not we had 0 runs in October for Elmwood, 1 to Norwood. Mutual Aid received, once from Golf Manor and details of interest there were 4 psychiatric emergencies, 3 unconscious patients and 2 auto accidents. Fire runs, fire details for the month of October were 53, mutual aid given once to Elmwood, Mutual Aid received, once from Elmwood and once from Norwood and details of interest was one structure fire.

SERVICE DIRECTOR, Mr. Paul – You have probably noticed that your leaves are now being picked up. Our leaf vac has been repaired. You may still bag and can them. We will pick them up.

Yes, Christmas décor is on the rise as we gobble our way through Thanksgiving. Mind your waist lines. Oh! And also the days you put your waste out. Monday, Thursday for south of Church St. Thursday being recycle day. Tuesday, Friday for north of Church St. Friday being your recycle day. You may place your trash out to the curb after 4:00pm the day before your pickup. Thank you.

Just a reminder for the holiday trash pickup: Monday, South of Church St. Tuesday, North of Church St. And Wednesday everyone's recyclables. Nothing out on Thursday or Friday.

Johnson Alley is a hot topic and we will commence repair as soon as all the supplies have arrived. We are waiting on the steel for the retaining wall.

To My Community:

Time Spent! One minute to an hour. From a hello to a goodbye. Your birth to your death. These are all examples of time spent. We hear spend it wisely. But how do we earn what we spend? By giving, by sharing, not of material things but things of a spiritual nature. Giving a hug, sharing a smile or simply listening. The more you do these things the more bottomless your well of wealth becomes. Ah! But mind you, you cannot save and expect interest. Oh no, it diminishes if not given readily. You need to work on it to keep it replenishing. Remember the age old saying. "It is in giving that we receive". Beware of the takers, they impose negativity. Anything negative is a deduction. Help others to feel good about themselves and you will find that you'll feel better about yourself. Have a fulfilling Thanksgiving. Peace and love to all of you.

TAX COMMISSIONER, Mr. Moore – Why do I feel that I'm following Rodney Dangerfield. I put the October figures in everyone's box earlier this week. I hope you all have had a chance to at least glance at them. We were up a little bit in October over last year in October so that's a good sign. But again any questions, if I can answer anything for you, I'd be glad to do so.

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

FINANCE, Mr. Tobergte – First I would like to thank Heidi Culbertson for coming to our Special Council Meeting two weeks ago and preparing the Ordinance for Johnson Alley.

Mayor Estep, Tom Paul and I did meet to work on the 2017 budget. John is going to send the budget back to the Department Heads so they can take another look to see where more cuts can be made. We are still \$398,915.00 over budget. Thanks to Peggy for plugging in the numbers we came up with. We are suggesting that the Moeller Ave. Project be taken from the reserves so we can proceed with the project next year and don't lose the grant money.

We had a CIC meeting Tuesday. The purchase of Long John Silver's has been completed. The PO was written for \$231,658.00. There was a discussion of possibly leasing the space until we get the old firehouse property back from the State.

We agreed to sell the lot at Tower and Franklin once the parcel is expanded by 8 ft. Pending the passage of tonight's Ordinance. The agreed on price is \$10,000.00. The town homes on Tower should be starting weather permitting soon. They will construct 1-2 unit buildings at a time. We will only sell the lots as they are ready to build.

The developer of the shopping center has started marketing the project. He has the proper permit for the sign he erected on the property. Patty is planning a meeting with John and the residents of West Ross concerning the connection of East and West Ross.

On the Inwalle property Mr. Newberry has all the financing in place. He is finalizing the drawings and is hoping to get started this winter. Port Authority is moving forward with the demolition of 115 Church St. And 4594 Park Place.

There was a major discussion about the Old Ellerbusch property on Vine. John did discuss the situation with Paul Myers and was given a verbal reprimand.

I passed on to Tommy a resident's concern about the conditions at Ross Park and the new sidewalks on Vine St. He is looking into the issues. The timer at the shopping center will be adjusted so the lights will come on earlier now since the time change has taken place.

The lot on Vine St. Next to the Blue Pearl will be consolidated with the Blue Pearl's lot since there is a driveway that services the garage on that property.

I am working with Heidi on updating the CIC page on the Village's website. It does currently list the board members, meeting dates and the meeting minutes.

The next CIC meeting will be February 14 at 5:30. I am looking at moving the meeting to a different place besides the conference room. So when that gets settled I will let everybody know.

SAFETY, Mr. Culbertson – I have the police report for the month of October. During the month of October, police were involved in 805 calls for service. Of those calls, they responded to 26 accident reports and took 31 offense reports, clearing 16 offenses. They made 92 misdemeanor arrests and 8 felony arrests, responded to 77 parking complaints and issued 16 citations. Officers issued 43 traffic citations, made 5 DUI arrests and issued 37 warnings. Police responded to 57 calls for suspicious activity, vehicles or persons.

I was going to save this part for old business but it might be fitting now. I'd like to wish Kurt Brickweg a happy birthday and I'm glad he decided to spend his birthday down here with us tonight.

SERVICE, Mr. Asbach – Absent. (report was read by Mr. Paul) The Service Department report for October 2016. There were 36 trucks placed at residences, 31 dumpsters placed at residences, 148 special pick-ups at residences, 194.07 tons of garbage taken to the landfill.

There were 31.70 tons of recycling material, 95 pounds of scrap aluminum, 18 pounds of brass, 9 pounds of copper, 6443 pounds of scrap metal and 3 pounds of stainless steel.

PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS, Ms. Hausfeld – Tonight I have the Planning and Development report; Administrative Duties: For the month of October the Building Department answered or returned over 630 phone calls. These calls are requests for Zoning Classification, information for building permits, available housing, guidance on building projects, neighbor disputes, property maintenance violations, and fence and property line issues.

Building Permit Issuance: For the month of October the department issued the following building permits: 1 residential fence, 6 residential roof replacement and gutter replacement.

Plan Review: 7 plan reviews

Inspections: 14 inspections for the building permits.

Request for Zoning Approval:

1 request for zoning approval. 0 board of zoning appeals case.

HIP: The HIP program has had 100 inspections on Ross and Jackson Ave. 46 follow-up inspection on Bank and West Ross.

Court Cases: The department currently has 5 cases in the court system

PMC

This is the code we use for "Property Maintenance Referrals"

We have issued 1 PMC order.

Rental Program: The department has mailed out 10 new request forms for compliance with the registration. The department has issued 12 orders with over 20 photos of individual violations. And the department has completed 20 inspections.

LAWS, CONTRACTS AND CLAIMS, Mrs. Bedinghaus – The Laws, Contracts & Claims Committee did meet tonight. We discussed three pending Ordinances. Two that were current that we already have and one that we were considering. The first one that we talked about was what Mr. Peck talked about and that has to do with the Grass Ordinance. Basically that was to insure that we have Tommy follow through on getting the grass cut and being able to reap back the cost of getting it the grass cut if they don't comply. I think we've got that all worked out. Mike will bring up the Ordinance. We will have it for COW and then it will be discussed there and go on to Council for approval. The next Ordinance we discussed was, St. Bernard does have a recreational vehicle storage parking in residential districts which is basically for boats and campers and trailers and so forth. We discussed that and at the current time we are going to leave the Ordinance stand as it is and we will look at that again if need be in the future. But for right now that is going to be left as it is. The next Ordinance brought to us with a variety of things that would be included in this Ordinance but it wouldn't be inclusive of any park within our Village. After a lot of discussion, because it has to do with openings, times it open and things like that, so it's going to be looked at with the two Chiefs and Mike will look at it and we'll come back with a combined Ordinance and then it will come back to the committee and we'll present it to COW and then we'll move forward there. We all agreed that we liked the consolidated piece of all of this, having everything combined into it because there's a lot of things that they need to look at because we have other Ordinance out there that they have to make sure it matches or its not duplicating or overlapping something. More to come on that but thanks Chief Moeller for doing that, that was great.

BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY, Mr. Kalb – I would like to encourage members of Council to pass Ordinance No. 25 this evening to help Wiedmann Brewery get their feet off the ground and get that project started. I think it will be a great asset to Vine St. there and obviously they need that part of the property to move forward.

HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION, Mrs. Schildmeyer – No report.

Mrs. Bedinghaus – The COW report has been submitted to the Clerk.

Committee of the Whole

Nov. 3, 2016

1. Council approved the minutes of the Oct 6th Special Council meeting and the Oct 20th Council meeting.
2. Council discussed the proposed updates to the Codified Ordinances and voted 7-0 to place an ordinance on the table for the updates.
3. Council discussed the proposed changes to the lot at Franklin and Tower to make it 8 feet wider. Council voted 7-0 to place the Ordinance on the table.

4. Council discussed the changes to two parcels on Vine St. at the old Imwalle property and voted 7-0 to place an Ordinance on the table to transfer those parcels to the CIC.

5. Mayor, John Estep

a. Said that he put the packet of info, for the part time firefighter, in each Councilperson's mailbox.

b. Reported that there was a marketing meeting last night and a lot of people said what a nice area St. Bernard is and we need to get the word out to others.

6. Auditor, Peggy Brickweg

a. Reported that she is working on the revenue and expense reports for October.

b. Said that all of the properties that she submitted to be tax exempt, since they were recorded wrong, have been approved and she received a check for \$176,028.64.

c. Reported that we received the 2nd half property tax payment.

d. Said that Workers Comp is going to a monthly payment process. The Village can save 2% if paid in full by January 3, 2017.

e. Asked Council for an Ordinance to transfer money from the general fund to certain line items. Council voted 7-0 to place the Ordinance on the table.

7. Law Director, Mike Peck

a. Reported that he is working on various items.

8. Safety Director, Jonathan Stuchell

a. Said that the new life squad and power cot system will be on display after the meeting tonight.

9. Service Director, Tom Paul

a. Discussed the need for emergency work to repair Johnson Alley since it was heavily damaged during the recent flood. Council will have a Special Meeting to vote on an Ordinance for the repairs. Mr. Tobergte made a motion, seconded by Mr. Asbach and there was a 7-0 vote to place the Ordinance on the table for that special meeting.

b. Reported that the water leak at the corner of Bertus and Albert has been repaired. This was the resident's issue not the Village.

10. Tax Commissioner/Administrator, Rick Moore

a. Said the he will have the October numbers at the next Council meeting.

11. Treasurer, John Ungrhue

a. Gave the 5/3rd Securities and Star Ohio account totals and the total is \$2,732,287.76.

12. Finance, Don Tobergte

a. Reported that the Finance Committee met this evening to discuss employee compensation for the police and fire chief. The recommendation from the

committee was a 4% increase. There was a motion and a second to place the Ordinance on the table. Council voted 6-1, Ms. Schildmeyer voting no, to place the Ordinance on the table.

b. He thanked everyone who helped at this year's Haunted House/pumpkin painting. Special thanks to Melissa and Dylan along with the students from Roger Bacon, St. Bernard and St. Clement schools. Also WesBanco for the face tattoos and Scherpies for help with the pumpkins.

c. Reported that at his town hall meeting questions were asked about our income taxes so he met with Mr. Moore and he informed him that the people working on I-75 in St. Bernard are paying their income taxes, but people that don't work in St. Bernard for more than 20 days do not pay income taxes. There were no income taxes collected from the people that shot the film at Roger Bacon.

d. Said that he met with Mayor Estep and Mr. Paul yesterday on the 2017 budget. More work needs to be done to balance it.

e. Said that there is a zoning board meeting on Monday November 7th at 5pm for the townhomes on Tower Ave. This will deal with the setback requirements. The construction plans have been approved pending the outcome of the zoning board meeting.

f. Reported that the next CIC meeting will be on Tuesday November 15th at 5:30 in the lower level conference room here at City Hall.

g. Wished Ms. Bedinghaus a happy birthday.

13. Safety, Ray Culbertson

a. Reported that the next Block Watch meeting will be Tuesday Nov. 15th at 6:30 in the lower level of City Hall.

b. Thanked everyone that helped with the haunted house event.

14. Laws, Contracts & Claims, Cindi Bedinghaus

a. Reported that her committee will meet on Thursday Nov. 17th at 6pm to discuss the park Ordinance, storage of vehicles and the grass Ordinance. Reported that Greenlee Garage has re-opened after the flood. Please support this local business.

16. Highways & Transportation, Diana Schildmeyer

a. Reported that the Dial-a-Ride numbers were 1,110 hours for October and 10,266 for the year.

17. Marge Niesen, with the Historical Society, asked Council about buying some of the 100 year history "St. Bernard, Ohio 1878-1978" books. She said there were only a handful of them left. The cost would be \$7,500.00 for 500 and \$11,500 for 1000. This will be discussed more at the Dec. 1st COW meeting.

18. A resident had some concerns about the slope on the driveway in front of his mother's house after the Jackson Ave project. He said the slope was more than was allowed by the Americans with Disabilities Act. The Mayor will meet with him along with Mr. Paul and the Village engineer. Another resident had questions about the following: the old Imwalle property and when it would open, the old Moon Tavern property and the Cleveland Ave houses, the CIC properties at

Franklin and Tower, the Village and the CIC selling property without going out for bids, and the old Ellerbusch building being given to a person to open a bakery. The Mayor explained

what happened with the building and stated that he asked that person for the keys back and said she couldn't use the building.

Respectfully submitted

Steve Asbach

President of Council, Pro-Tem

COMMUNICATIONS

None.

RESOLUTIONS AND ORDINANCES

Motion by Mrs. Bedinghaus, seconded by Mr. Culbertson to read tonight's Resolutions and Ordinances by title only. Motion passed 6-0.

ORDINANCE NO. 23, 2016. AN ORDINANCE APPROVING THE EDITING AND INCLUSION OF CERTAIN ORDINANCES AS PARTS OF THE VARIOUS COMPONENT CODES OF THE CODIFIED ORDINANCES OF ST. BERNARD, OHIO, REVISING THE TRAFFIC AND GENERAL OFFENSES CODES TO COMPLY WITH STATE LAW, AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY

Motion by Mrs. Bedinghaus, seconded by Ms. Hausfeld to suspend with the second and third reading of Ordinance No. 23, 2016.

REMARKS

Mrs. Bedinghaus – Everybody knows that this Ordinance is something that we do on a routine basis for the Codified Ordinance Code. It's nothing that we haven't done before. That's why we can pass it by emergency.

The motion to suspend passed 6-0.

Motion by Mrs. Bedinghaus, seconded by Mr. Culbertson to adopt Ordinance No. 23, 2016 as read. Motion passed 6-0.

ORDINANCE NO. 24, 2016. AUTHORIZING AND DIRECTING THE AUDITOR TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS, MOVE AND TRANSFER FUND AND ESTABLISHING NEW LINE ITEMS AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY.

Motion by Mrs. Bedinghaus, seconded by Mr. Kalb to suspend with the second and third reading of Ordinance No. 24, 2016.

REMARKS

Mrs. Bedinghaus – This is the Ordinance that Peggy explained very well. It's transferring all of the money.

The motion to suspend passed 6-0.

Motion by Mrs. Bedinghaus, seconded by Mr. Culbertson to adopt Ordinance No. 24, 2016 as read. Motion passed 6-0.

ORDINANCE NO. 25, 2016. AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE VILLAGE OF ST. BERNARD TO CONVEY PARCELS 582-0007-0021-90, 582-0007-0019-90 AND A 90 FOOT BY 22 FOOT SECTION OF 582-0007-0010-90 (SEE EXHIBIT A) TO THE ST. BERNARD COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT CORPORATION PURSUANT TO ARTICLE III SECTION 1 OF THE AGREEMENT AND PLAN BETWEEN THE VILLAGE OF ST. BERNARD, OHIO AND THE ST. BERNARD COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT CORPORATION AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY

Motion by Mrs. Bedinghaus, seconded by Mr. Kalb to suspend with the second and third reading of Ordinance No. 25, 2016.

REMARKS

Mrs. Bedinghaus – And again, just to reiterate what Andy said. This is the Imwalle property and I think it would be a great asset to the Village.

Ms. Hausfeld – Where I don't disagree that this is when this takes place and from what I understand finances and stuff are pretty much in place for this, correct Donnie?

Mr. Tobergte – Correct.

Ms. Hausfeld – My only problem with this is we ask our residents or people that want to build homes here that they have to purchase the property. Either \$10,000.00 or \$25,000.00 and here we are again giving the property away for nothing. Now I know people are going to disagree with me on this because it is an asset I believe and I'm kind of teetering back and forth on this one just because one week we're again using tax payers money to buy a piece of property which was prime real estate but we're not getting any dollar amount in return for the actual piece of property. I'm not saying that we eventually won't get returns but I'm talking as a general purpose when normally we buy a piece of property, we sell it even if it's for a cheaper amount than what we purchased it for so I'm just throwing it out there that I'm teetering back and forth because it, on one aspect it is a good thing and I would like to see it come to fruition and all that, one the other aspect I can see residents being upset that we're giving another piece of property away that we used their money to purchase for free and that's where I'm having an issue with it.

Mrs. Brickweg – Just so the residents understand, this is not the building. We've already given the building away. I'm not agreeing or disagreeing with you Patty, just the way it kind of read, the residents might think it's Imwalle. The Imwalle property has already been given to the CIC. This is the additional area that they're going to use for a beer garden. I just wanted to explain that.

Mr. Tobergte – To clarify further, the parking lot where the canal bed is. Off to the side.

Mrs. Schildmeyer - I just think that we need to invest in our future, this Village and to make this place a better place and only this kind of stuff like we're building here, the plans are from Wiedmann and is only going to attract people to come to St. Bernard.

Ms. Hausfeld – Where I don't disagree with you Diana, believe it or not I don't disagree with you, because we have been investing in St. Bernard, that's kind of where we got, I want to say something obnoxious but I'm not allowed to say it, that's kind of where we got our foot in a jam financially because we have been investing a lot into St. Bernard and where I don't disagree with you but there comes a time where we have to I mean how many dollars are we going to be down this year. Honestly financially it's, we keep giving property away. We keep buying it, what did we buy Imwalle for, \$1,000,000.00 and we gave it away which I understand that to a degree but for future and I most probably will vote for this tonight just because he's already got the Imwalle property so for him to continue to do what he needs to do he kind of needs this piece of property. But I'm just saying for future reference for all of us including Administration, we gotta watch it spending the money and getting ourselves financially deeper in debt.

Mrs. Schildmeyer – Patty, I don't disagree with you at all but I think that this is a great investment in the future of St. Bernard and this is where we become more like Oakley and Hyde Park. This is not where you draw the line.

Mr. Kalb – Don I'm going to kind of put you on the spot. What was the value or the requirement of how much money you have to put back into it. I know it was upper, like 1 million, 1.6, 1.7 million he has to invest in the property.

Mr. Tobergte – The building was quote "sold to him for \$750,000.00". Now out of that \$750,000.00 projected into \$2 million investment. So out of that \$2 million investment that covers the \$750,000.00 purchase of the property. He's estimating \$2 million investment in the whole process.

Mr. Kalb – Just to be clear, we didn't sell him the property we valued the property at \$750,000.00 when we gave him the property.

Mr. Tobergte – The \$750,000.00 was the sold price. But he invested (inaudible) that's like the property the Blue Pearl we sold it for \$100,000.00 and whatever they put in is deducted from that. The same with (inaudible).

Mr. Kalb - I do agree with some words of Patty. If you went back to when the property was actually being purchased which was before I got on Council I probably wouldn't have purchased the property. At the same time it has been hard to give the property away for free and that bugs me a lot too. Then I was saying they are investing a bunch of money in the property which will increase the value of the property which will return on property taxes. They're bringing new jobs to the City which will all be paid 2-1. Now granted it's going to take many, many, many, many moons for that building to ever pay off. That property, but if that's a catalyst to bring other businesses to us and then all of a sudden the shopping center might take off because you have that and then you have to start using it and then part of those jobs come in here and paying taxes and stuff you know can kind of be

brought back to the Imwalle. Again, it's hard to give away a property but he obviously already has the property and this is just a small additional portion of it but I do feel it's a move in the right direction for the Village even though it is, you know it hurts the pocket books. But the only way to get residents to stay, residents to move back in and hopefully they'll attract many new businesses to this town we need to give, unfortunately, bite the bullet some times and be a catalyst for this type of thing.

Tom Rolfsen, 30 Clay St. - I'd like to ask Don, what are they being taxed. Do they have a tax abatement for that building?

Mr. Tobergte – Not that I'm aware of. As far as I know, no.

Tom Rolfsen – What is the address of the funeral home. 4811?

Mr. Tobergte - I've got no clue.

Tom Rolfsen – Well I looked it up on the Auditor's page today and its valued at \$2.5 that's what is being paid taxes on. That was going to be paid while he's in there fixing the building up?

Mr. Tobergte - I don't know. You'll have to ask the County Auditor. I have no clue.

Tom Rolfsen – The second thing is in previous meetings you guys brought up that in order for him to get financing you had to give him this property. It's recorded okay so don't deny it, he's already got it and now you're voting on giving him more property. This was a big CIC amphitheater design that was going to go there so I don't understand why you're giving him this property when he's got five years to complete what he's doing in the building. He's not going to be doing the whole project at the same time so I would suggest that you already give him the building, you wait and see what he does and then give him the additional lot to expand. But I don't know if there's a tax abatement and you guys should know that because that affects our school system a lot here. The deed should be straightened out with the Auditor because when I looked it up the picture for that address is the shopping center so the whole things a mess okay so I just want to make sure that he doesn't have a 15 year tax abatement where the city will get nothing toward that building.

Mr. Kalb – Correct me if I'm wrong Mr. Peck but I believe any tax abatements and reduction in taxes has to come before Council and be voted on for an Ordinance and there have been no Ordinances to give any taxes, property taxes, income tax abatements to that property. Until Council would pass an Ordinance to reduce his taxes some how, he will be paying whatever the County and the City require him to pay.

Tom Rolfsen - I've boughten property before and what they take for the first three years is what you paid for the property so if he goes down for a revision and says he paid 0 for it I don't think you have anything to do with that, okay?

Mrs. Brickweg - I think Mike was going to defer to me on multiple questions. He'll have any property taxes until he gets improvements in there. Second of all, 4811 has always been Imwalle property. I do agree with you. I think it's Hamilton County that has it messed up. I've been dealing with that today because I need to give you a number later on in my report and in the past I've always used 4811 as

Imwalle but it is showing the shopping center. It's showing nothing for the shopping center and I think part of the issue is consolidated so many pieces of property at some point its getting messed up. I would say that's exactly what Mr. Myers will have to get with them and fix it but you are right. That County website is wrong and yes if we would have had a tax abatement it would have to go before Council. It would also have to go to the school. I do not recall anything coming to Council or the school so they do not have a tax abatement

Mr. Culbertson – Peggy why wouldn't the minimum be on the property or to tax the \$750,000.00? We're not giving the property so why wouldn't it be taxed at least for that amount?

Mrs. Brickweg – Well, and I just said that I'm not privy to the contract so I have no idea, but I do think we need to look legally that kind of bothers me a little bit when we say, kind of what you said, kind of sounds like a little bit of shelving and that bothers me a little bit but, however its worded, but if its worded correctly in that contract, it's going to show 0. so even though they might have a contract where it says I'm going to put \$2 million in and we'll take the \$750,000.00 off if he doesn't borrow \$750,000.00 it's going to show 0 on that.

Ms. Hausfeld – Which means he pays 0 for at least three years, from what I'm hearing, and if he does want a tax abatement it would be after that three years?

Mrs. Brickweg – If he was going to get a tax abatement on the property I would assume that that would be, as I said, I'm not privy to any of this because it's CIC, but I would assume that's worked out in negotiation. Maybe I can find a copy of the contract and look it over and Mike should have a copy of it also.

Ms. Hausfeld – So where I got confused, and I'm just being honest up here, one person said we sold it for \$750,000.00 and somebody else said we're taking it off what he's investing in the project. So to me, we didn't sell it for \$750,00.00. If we gave a piece of property away we gave it away and that's the way I remembered it being voted on.

Mrs. Brickweg - I'm sorry Don, you as the president, do you know the real attorney that looked over all these. I mean I would think.....

Mr. Tobergte – Fletcher's name comes to mind. He did the title work and everything. The value of the contract from the property was \$750,000.00 is what Paul said today. He has done zero work on this \$750,000.00. But if he does \$750,000.00 worth of work he owes us 0. What Paul is saying the property value is listed at the sum of \$750,000.00 because that's what the actual sale, value, however you want to say it was.

Ms. Hausfeld – I'm going to confuse it just a little bit more because I'm just a general person, but correct me if I'm wrong, you guys said that we are second to the bank so if he doesn't invest how are we going to get anything back if it's valued at \$750,000.00. I mean if the bank is going to get what.....maybe I'm confused.

Mrs. Brickweg – That's a good point, so basically we're the second lien.

Mr. Tobergte - Correct

Mrs. Brickweg – So if he doesn't fix up that building the bank gets the building. You are correct.

Tom Rolfsen – Can I say something before I'm kicked out for my five minute thing because I see you looking at me. One question who sitting up there on that Council has even seen the contract and read it thoroughly and has Mike Peck actually gone through the whole thing representing the city? Just give me a yes or no.

Mr. Kalb - I'll answer that, no I have not seen the contract. But we are also talking about.....the property vote, no. He already owns the building. You keep bringing up the building and the \$750,000.00 and that's already been done. Tonight's Ordinance is just the additional lot.

Tom Rolfsen – You haven't seen the contract and you want to give him more property and you don't even know what's going on. St. Bernard is not going to get the taxes for the next five years or three years because its going down to 0 and now you want to give him this when he doesn't need because he already has the bank loan so why don't you let him show he's going to do something, spend the money and then give it to him.

The motion to suspend did not pass 5-1.

Mrs. Schildmeyer - I would like to see this go it's regular course. I agree with Mr. Rolfsen. I think we should see the contract. How are we going to get this contract.

Mr. Tobergte - I have a note to get the contract and I'll fax it.

ORDINANCE NO. 26, 2016. AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE VILLAGE OF ST. BERNARD TO CONVEY A PORTION (SEE EXHIBIT A) OF REAL PROPERTY KNOWN FRANKLIN PARK ON THE CORNER OF FRANKLIN AND TOWER TO THE ST. BERNARD COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT CORPORATION PURSUANT TO ARTICLE III SECTION ONE OF THE AGREEMENT AND PLAN BETWEEN THE VILLAGE OF ST. BERNARD, OHIO AND THE ST. BERNARD COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT CORPORATION AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY.

Motion by Mrs. Bedinghaus, seconded by Mr. Culbertson to suspend with the second and third reading of Ordinance No. 26, 2016.

REMARKS

Mr. Kalb – At last week's meeting we did add a provision to it in Section III that the Village will be receiving \$1,000.00 back for the purchase of that property. So the additional eight feet that we're giving them, we are going to be receiving from the CIC or from the purchase of property \$1,000.00 back to the Village.

Ms. Hausfeld – Sorry guys. Where, first of all its across the street from my house or right close across the street from my house where I welcome the new home I welcome a life long resident to purchase this and build a new home and that aspect of it but the one aspect I'm not good with because after I attended the CIC meeting the other night and I know that they set the price at \$10,000.00 and it was said that this piece of it had been advertised for a long time and no takers were taken on it. I have since talked to a few people and they said that when it was advertised it was

advertised at \$25,000.00 and they had also said that, heck, if they were going to sell that cheap, I would have bought it. So what's good for the goose is good for the gander and I believe that it should have went out to everybody to build on it and who knows we might have got \$12,000.00 for this piece of property instead of just \$10,000.00. Do you understand where I'm coming from? Other residents here in town when they build homes want a lot of people want to build new homes, some people don't, they like to fix up homes. But most of the other properties has went for roughly \$25,000.00. It was stated at the CIC meeting the other night so the only thing I'm saying, I'm good for building a new home, I'm thankful that the people who are building there are lifelong residents and they want to move up into that area because we all need good people in our neighborhoods but my only suggestion is if we're going to sell a piece of property we need to advertise it to everybody. We asked the other night if there was any kind of advertising going on on these properties and if there is there is very slim advertising and I think that if it went out to general public, you can make it St. Bernard residents, you can make it general public outside of St. Bernard you know, attract new people whatever the circumstances. My thing is if you're going to sell it to one resident for \$10,000.00 it should have went up for everybody for \$10,000.00 or an open bid. You know a closed thing whatever you want to call it, I'm not sure of the right terminology there. But my only concern, when we're one giving away pieces of property or two we're selling it you know to one person for \$10,000.00 and other people were interested in the piece of property for \$10,000.00

Mr. Tobergte - I know the property was listed at \$25,000.00 and there was a For Sale sign for a while but I think John were you involved with the negotiations on this? I was not so I don't know how we came to \$10,000.00. Do you want to expand if you can?

Mayor Estep – We just talked with Mr. Wilking and we negotiated a price. We talked about what was available in St. Bernard and how long it sat here and we talked the other night about when there is greater demand you're going to get that price. There was not much demand for this and it sat there for a few years. I don't know how Paul markets all the properties in St. Bernard, I don't know all the "ins and the outs" but we came up with the price of \$10,000.00 and he said I would like to build a house there for that so I'm happy, like Patty, I'm happy to see a new home up there.

Mr. Kalb – Last week I also heard, two weeks ago I also brought up some issues with the, not knowing the price or value of the property because we heard rumors that it was listed for \$25,000.00 but there was no rumors or set price that we were going to sell it for. I do agree with a lot of points that Patty had, the \$10,000.00 mark, that's a huge drop from what we initially asked. I'm not there during the negotiations and things like that but for us to, from my understanding the individual post us and said that he would buy it for xyz amount of money, that we didn't know if we gave him the extra eight feet because he wanted a ranch house which required a larger foot print than a normal two family or a two story house which we're currently marketing the property for. So I was wishy washy coming into this Ordinance tonight already because of the value of the property and now that we know the value of the property or the sale price is only \$10,000.00 I don't know if I'm going to be in favor of giving the additional eight feet without going out and letting, as she said, raising the property to somebody that wanted a single family, a ranch style house couldn't do it on that property and we're making a special exception for one individual when we didn't allow anybody else to come

back to maybe build a ranch house on that property. We were advertising it as a two story and a certain plot size. So I do, its I'm probably not going to be voting for this Ordinance this evening.

Mrs. Brickweg - I apologize ahead of time because I'm probably going to say this twice from my report because its real simple, it's called the MLS. It's called you get a realtor, you get a realtor to come in, the realtor appraises the parcel, I'm sorry, and then you list it. What we are doing, we are going to get into trouble. We are discriminating. We all know it. It's a problem set. You can't say okay I'll give you this for \$10,000.00 and to say we're marketing I don't know where we are marketing this because the last time this property was ever marketed was when the Maronda Homes did it years ago. And like you said it was a two story \$25,000.00. Nothing has been done in the mean time. So its MLS, not real hard to figure out. So that's just my two cents.

Mrs. Schildmeyer – Mr. Peck, what do you suggest we do with this at this point?

Mr. Peck – I'll be happy to look at it if you want to provide a

Mrs. Schildmeyer - I think we should table this Ordinance, I don't know what?

Mr. Peck - I'm not going to give legal advice on the fly so.....

Mrs. Schildmeyer – Of course not. I would like to make a motion that we table this Ordinance until we figure out if this is legal and we go about it the right way.

Mr. Kalb - I will second that but we need to vote on the first one first and then we can make up a motion or if they want to withdraw their motion or doing procedure with it, get a withdrawal with the current motion from the table or vote on the current motion, I believe.

Mrs. Bedinghaus - I withdraw my motion to have Ordinance No. 26, 2016 suspend with the second and third reading.

Mrs. Valerie Van Valkenberg-Walden – Okay, the motion to is withdrawn to suspend with the second and third reading of Ordinance No. 26, 2016. Now there was another motion I believe.

Mrs. Schildmeyer - I don't know what to do at this point. I don't want to take this away from a lifelong resident but I don't want to get into trouble and get sued.

Too many people talking at once.

Mrs. Brickweg – First of all, what I'm saying has nothing to do with this Ordinance. I'm just saying we need to face facts. My other question is, he just walked in, Mr. Tobergte, do we have an agreement for this at this price? Do we have an agreement at this price or are we selling this for \$10,000.00? Is there a contract?

Mr. Tobergte – Not that I'm aware of.

Mrs. Schildmeyer – So if we go regular course, Mr. Peck, is there a legal opinion on the Council floor? What if I make a motion that we, I make a motion to put

Ordinance No. 26 on the table and we go regular course and we figure it out the right way to go about it?

Mrs. Brickweg – That's fine. But basically what I've been saying especially in the future that we go about this the right way.

Mrs. Schildmeyer – Okay we need to figure this

Mrs. Brickweg - (inaudible) decisions that you guys are going to have to make. I'm sorry I'm talking to fast.

Motion by Mrs. Schildmeyer, seconded by Mr. Culbertson to have Ordinance No. 26, 2016 take it's regular course.

REMARKS

Tom Rolfsen, 30 Clay St. - I figured the square foot on this lot, the average lot in St. Bernard is 25x100 which is 2500 feet. This one is 189x60 which is 11,340 which is equal to about five lots. And you want to go and sell this for \$10,000.00, okay? This is ridiculous. I don't know where you're going to find a lot that's 11,000 sq. Feet in St. Bernard for \$10,000.00. So I think you need to make this take its regular course. I mean its fine they're going to build a house and also there is a tax abatement on new houses in St. Bernard. Are you sure, you're saying yes and you're saying no. You guys don't get things straight. Is there or isn't there? Abatement or no taxes right?

Mrs. Brickweg – There is a tax abatement. I'm not sure if itsoff the top of my head.

Tom Rolfsen – So that's why I want to make sure that everybody up there agrees Okay? You got one guy saying yes and one guy saying no and nobody questions that. So that's what I'm doing. I'm questioning all this stuff so there's no way you can pass this tonight okay because you all are not informed on anything and you're giving away five times a lot at \$10,000.00 with no taxes in 15 years.

Mr. Culbertson – The property is in CIC's hands right to negotiate the price. The purchase price, so I mean our input on the purchase price only effects the piece that we're trying to transfer so I don't know I'm just.....

Bob Wilking, 5132 Broerman Ave. - I'm the one they're talking about buying that lot. He doesn't know what he's talking about. The lot is not that big. It's 60x135. So he doesn't know the other lot is behind it. He is just, he raises hell about everything and he doesn't know what he is talking about half of the time. I'm retired and we're talking about either building in St. Bernard or moving out and getting a Landominium. Sue found us this property. So all we're doing is trying to do that. I can show you the house we're going to build. Should be around a \$165,000.00 home. If you'd rather have that empty lot, fine. I wasn't born and raised in St. Bernard. My wife was.

Tom Rolfsen – Okay, you know, what I base my figure on your paper here says proposed lot 60 x 189. So I know what I'm talking about. The City put it out. It's up in your faces right now. What does it say? Proposal lot 60x189. Does it not say that? 60 x 189 it says.

Mr. Culbertson – The whole lot is 60 x 189.

Tom Rolfsen – No it says proposed lot 60 x 189 on your papers and its showing the arrow.

(inaudible)

Tom Rolfsen – That's not what this says. The proposed lot is what you're going to be selling okay so....

Mrs. Brickweg – What it is is two different things. As Ray said. Council already gave the property to the CIC so what they're voting on tonight is the addition. So what you have there is not what they're voting on. That might be why you don't see it.

Tom Rolfsen – It's attached to the Ordinance.

Mrs. Brickweg – What Ordinance No. Is it?

Tom Rolfsen – 26. That's what they're voting on.

Mrs. Brickweg – That's not the 26 I have.

Mr.. Tobergte – Peggy it shows an 8ft section but the whole lot is 60 x 189. It's attached to the Ordinance.

Tom Rolfsen – So was I right or was he right?

Mr. Tobergte – A little over 11,000 square feet.

Tom Rolfsen – 11,346 square feet.

Mr. Tobergte – That's the entire lot. His is separate.

Tom Rolfsen - I'm reading it off your paper okay. It's your Ordinance 26 its on the back of 26. Alright? You guys figure it out, have your lawyer look at it, I'm saying its 60 x 189 based on your attachment okay.

Mrs. Schildmeyer - I would love to have lifelong residents here and I understand you're an outsider like I am, like my father-in-law calls me. I am a foreigner, outlander. We want you to stay here. My concern is that we do this legally and that we do this right. If it affects you building here if we wait one month or do we need to have an extra meeting to.....

Bob Wilking – It doesn't bother me that much (inaudible)

Mrs. Schildmeyer - I encourage you to stay here and

Bob Wilking – I've lived here 51 years so (inaudible)

Mrs. Schildmeyer - I am, I'm an outlander, 8 years so I'm not against this, I just want to make sure legally we do things the right way because Mrs. Brickweg brought up some points that we have to be careful of.

Mrs. Bedinghaus – So can I just get something clear. The contract for this house has already been signed with the CIC?

Mr. Tobergte – No, no contract signed. The discussion Tuesday was the price.

Mrs. Bedinghaus – Okay.

Mr. Culbertson – Giving Mr. Wilking the extra eight feet.

Mrs. Brickweg – Once again, what I brought up because this is like done. I'm saying for the future. It was not done correctly but its done. I'm just saying that in the future we need to do it correctly is what I'm saying.

Motion by Mrs. Schildmeyer, seconded by Mr. Culbertson to allow Ordinance No. 26, 2016 to take its regular course. Motion passed 6-0.

ORDINANCE NO. 28, 2016. FIXING THE COMPENSATION OF POLICE CHIEF AND FIRE CHIEF OF ST. BERNARD AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY.

Motion by Mrs. Bedinghaus, seconded by Mr. Kalb to suspend with the second and third reading of Ordinance No. 28, 2016.

REMARKS

Mrs. Schildmeyer - I am so extremely offended for our Police and Fire Chief for this raise. It's a 4% increase. It is less than \$8,000.00. Tonight we just said we're going to give a property away for \$10,000.00, which I'm happy you're going to stay here, it's not a shot against you but it's \$851,000.00 being transferred into the General Fund. I am offended for these men but something is better than nothing. They have done a great job for this Village and I would challenge anybody up here or in the audience or in this Village to say anything different. So I will vote for the raise tonight because something is better than nothing but I think that everybody needs to take a good hard look at almost a million dollars and we have to fight over \$8,000.00. They deserve more than this, they deserve more respect than this.

Mrs. Brickweg – Can I just correct something. All you're doing is moving money that was already appropriated. It's not an additional appropriation. No its not Diana. It's when you take money from.....okay you have a fund forokay you appropriate the money to spend. This is putting the money in the fund that the check actually comes out. Its not an additional appropriation of \$851,000.00.

Mrs. Schildmeyer – Peggy, I'm not ignorant here. I know that.

Mrs. Brickweg – But you just said we just had

Mrs. Schildmeyer – All I said was \$851,000.00 was okay. Right? I get it's not an additional appropriation.

Mrs. Brickweg - Its not an additional appropriation.

Mrs. Schildmeyer – No I'm saying, I'm sorry, we're transferring the money from General Funds. I get it out to the

Mrs. Brickweg – All you're doing is moving it from one bank account to another.

Mrs. Schildmeyer – I get that.

Mrs. Brickweg – Then don't say we're spending an additional \$851,000.00.

Mrs. Schildmeyer – Nobody blinks about anything like that. These guys should have more than

Mrs. Brickweg – I understand that but I don't think you understand it. We're not spending an additional \$851,000.00.

Mrs. Schildmeyer - Don't say I don't understand it. I do understand it. This is personal for you and you know it. I'm not getting into this at all. They deserve better than \$8,000.00.

Mrs. Brickweg - I don't know how this is personal, I'm just trying to explain a transfer is moving money to even try to explain it to somebody.

Mrs. Schildmeyer – I know that.

Mrs. Brickweg – Then don't say we're spending an additional \$851,000.00. Okay I'm just saying we're not and that's what you said and I don't want the public to think that.

Mrs. Schildmeyer – I'm done.

Ms. Hausfeld – To where Mrs. Schildmeyer is only saying it's only an \$8,000.00 raise, which she's right, for the Police Chief it would be an extra \$3,429.14 and for the Fire Chief it would be an extra \$3,387.14 but what she fails to tell everybody is as of right now they are both making decent salaries. One is making, this is base salary, this is before all their perks and all their added little bonuses and whatever. This is \$85,728.62 for the Police Chief and \$84,678.63 for the Fire Chief and yes it would raise them both a little over \$3,000.00. Which for general people might just be a blink of an eye. But again like I said before we have two different people that are telling us our finances keep going down, down, down but we keep raising, raising, raising and yes I do have an issue, you know, Dianna I understand where you're very upset about this because you pushed for astronomical raises for especially the Fire Chief.

Mrs. Schildmeyer – I pushed for market rate.

Ms. Hausfeld – You pushed for extremely high rate.

Mr. Kalb – Point of order. One at a time.

Ms. Hausfeld – And I have never, ever said that the Police Chief, Fire Chief aren't doing their jobs. I have never, ever said that they were not allowed to get a raise, I'm just saying, I'm sorry I talk loud, I don't need a microphone, I'm just saying that they make decent salaries as it is and to give a 4% raise I think is a little bit high personally and I, you know what if you would've asked for 2.5 or 3% I most probably would have gone along with it. But you kept pushing for more and more

and more and I'm sorry I'm just not for it, I'm not there yet. And unless you can prove to me within the next few minutes or few seconds but we've been messing around with this for almost a year now. You've been pushing for these huge raises for a year now and you know I'm just letting you know that I'm still voting no on this and I just want the general public to know these amounts that I gave you. Peggy might be able to give you better numbers because it includes longevity pay, it includes other things besides just this. I just gave base salaries and I'm sorry I firmly believe the salaries that our Police and Fire Chiefs makes are decent salaries.

Mrs. Schildmeyer – This is not what the market dictates. It's not even close. We will lose two really good Chiefs to somewhere better if we don't pay them what they deserve. This is an insult and I'm going to pay them this because its better than nothing. This is an insult.

Mrs. Brickweg - I really wasn't prepared for this but I can tell you I have my spreadsheet. What is budgeted for the Police Chief finishes \$99,000.00 and what is budgeted for the Fire Chief is \$93,146.00. There may be a little bit of money left over but that is what is budgeted for them.

Mrs. Scihldmeyer – My last thing I'm going to say. Patty you're saying that your pay, if you vote no to this, you vote no to this, people underneath the Police and Fire Chief will make more that the Chiefs. And you're okay with that. Who is going to take this job next? When we lose these two great Chiefs? Who is going to take it next? You're okay with that?

Ms. Hausfeld – Dianna, you keep, this is no, I am looking at them, I have no problem looking at them. This is nothing against me not wanting you guys because she keeps saying that if we don't give you these big raises you guys are going to leave. I'm sorry, she's saying that you're irreplaceable. I beg to differ for you. I think everybody is replaceable and yeah you might not like who maybe the new Chief but it is a possibility that we could have even a better Chief. Not saying we will I'm just throwing that out there. But I'm just saying and I will respectfully disagree with you. That is all I'm saying. I don't want to fight with you. I respectfully honor your wish and I hope you do the same for me. And that's all that I'm saying.

Mr. Kalb - I don't want to drag this out any longer but we did start this over a year ago and it seems 4% may seem like a high number if you just look at what's directly in front of you. Over the past couple of years we have negotiated a contract with Police, Fire and Service under times everybody could say were better. So we had money in the bank therefore it makes negotiating easier. I'm not saying they should deserve more, the fireman or the policeman or deserve less. We gave raises to other departments so that the line guys were getting 2% or 3% or whatever it was for the past couple of years. Then by the time we got around to dealing with this the bottom fell out. So I get it, its harder to give a raise when we're looking at a deficit. But at the same time we have to look at the a slightly bigger picture. I do look at \$390,000.00 and that's why I kind of backed away my initial plan. My plan was kind of, it wasn't as big as hers but it was a different set of numbers that was higher than then 4% to try to get the Chiefs back to a decent amount above the line guys so you don't have Captains and Lieutenants in both the police and fire making their base salary on a couple of thousand dollars less than the Chief. Now arguably there are differences in the job responsibilities, hours

worked and everything else and there are different perks between being a line guy and on departments as far as your leader. But it, for lack of a better word, stinks at the fact that we had to go to negotiate or give these or look at the numbers for the Chiefs at a time when we're looking at a \$800,000.00 deficit. But we can't allow a Department Head to make the same as a person underneath them, or less at the end of certain contracts. So as much as I, I agree with the 4% because we are, because I don't want to see this raise inadvertently effect other, we're still looking at almost \$400,000.00 that we have to cut from the budget next year to balance, so it would be nice to give the Chiefs what, I'll say what they deserve, but at the same time any additional money has to be cut from somewhere and we're still cutting from next year's budget. So I feel bad for the Chiefs that they're stuck in this limbo but I think 4% is good,, I mean, it's a good start. I hope that the Chiefs look at that as an offering, you know, that we're not forgetting them but at the same time, you know, we have to be conservative at this point because any additional money that we spend does come out of is going to have to come out of somewhere. We've sent budgets back to every department two, three times already and we're still not at our mark yet. so I am in favor of the 4%, I mean a snapshot, it seems like a lot but we'll say a policeman's made over the last four or five years they've gotten to be conservative. We'll say the got a 6% raise. The firemen probably got about a 6% raise for the last five years. The Police Chief has gotten 0% raise over that same amount of time or 2 or 3 %. So they have gotten, the line guys have caught the Chiefs. If we were giving the Chiefs a 2% raise and the line guys got a 2% raise we wouldn't be in this position where we have to give a large number that looks bad.

Tom Rolfsen, 30 Clay – This is probably going to make more enemies for me but you gotta realize St. Bernard is less than 1.5 square miles, okay? You can't compare it to all the other communities and stuff. And the second thing is the Police Chief, from what I know is retiring anyway so you're only talking about one person and that person doesn't even live in St. Bernard, okay? Another thing is you have people up on Council that are really good friends with some of these people, okay, so I think that shouldn't be taken to account, okay? It's like you should be abstaining, okay? If you're a real good friend of one of the people that you're giving raises to, okay? You can't be fair. I'm on Social Security, I didn't get a 4% raise. So

The motion to suspend passed 6-0.

Motion by Mrs. Bedinghaus, seconded by Mr. Culbertson to adopt Ordinance No. 28, 2016 as read. Motion passed 5-1 Ms. Hausfeld voted no.

OLD BUSINESS

None.

NEW BUSINESS

Mrs. Bedinghaus – Peggy you gave us something tonight and I'm not quite sure what it is.

Ms. Hausfeld – First of all I want to thank Tom Paul again. Talked to him again tonight and he is going to talk to the Post Office again because their properties over there look terrible, shabby. And I'm sorry a government building I believe should look outstanding and promising. And you are going to talk to them tomorrow and

take care of the issue again. Also it was reported to me along with I'm sure several other people including Tommy about the bridge going to the library, the old library property how it's falling apart. And Tommy explained to me tonight it was because of the kids that were messing around with the railings and they knocked them all loose so he is got a person looking at getting some bids for that getting it fixed or seeing what we can do to repair that property and I want to thank him for taking care of that as well.

Mrs. Brickweg – Now I'll read my report. I know it's been a long night but I think it's really important to Council and the residents.

After the last COW and CIC meeting I would like to share a few thoughts I have as the Auditor a CIC member and a tax paying resident.

After Wednesday's CIC meeting I walked away very disappointed. I believe everyone needs to be held accountable. If you do something wrong or lie you need to be held accountable. Quite a few times I knew I was being lied to so I thought I would do some research. I am asking Council, the CIC and the administration to hold people accountable. There is a huge problem when some employees are held to a high standard of accountability and others are not. Before you question why this is a Council issue, I will explain that throughout my report. First of all many residents have spoken to Council and administrations to no avail. It seems like the only way to get people to listen is to let all the residents know what is really going on. The items I am reporting were all discussed at a public CIC meeting so there should be no conflict to discuss them publicly again tonight.

At Wednesday's CIC meeting Paul Myers stated over and over that the CIC is 100% funded with Village money. This is tax payer money. Council appropriates the money. When I discussed the role of the Village and the CIC with the State Auditor I was informed that because the CIC is 100% funded by the Village and the CIC Financial Statements run through the Village's Audited Financial Statements they should be treated the same. Some believe that the CIC does not follow Ohio Sunshine Laws and that is not true. So many times I have heard Council say "that is a CIC issue" and the CIC say "that is a Council issue". When 100% of the funding comes from the Village through Council's Appropriation they are one in the same. The shell game needs to stop. When individuals ask questions at Council meetings they should be answered. If you don't know the answer then say you will find the answer, but don't turn them away to another meeting or give them no answer at all.

Secondly the main reason the CIC was established was for liability issues. After talking to our State Auditor and the Accountant for the CIC and the Village, the CIC has over \$5,000,000 in fixed assets. So when Paul made the statement that the CIC has nothing to lose that is not accurate.

At the CIC meeting the cost of property taxes the CIC pays was discussed. I asked Paul if he filed tax exempt applications for all the CIC properties so the CIC would not have to pay property taxes. He said he filed well over 42 tax-exempt applications. Just to make sure I heard correctly I asked again, and he said yes I filed them. I filed 6 tax-exempt applications on behalf of the Village when the Building Department did not notify the state that the new buildings were to be used for a municipal purpose, and this was a lot of work. I talked to the Hamilton County Auditor's office via phone calls and e-mails and I made a call to the State

of Ohio Tax Department of Equalization and was informed Zero tax exempt applications have been filed by the CIC. I provided Council and the Administration an e-mail backing this up. Also, at a few Council meetings I asked if the LaRosa parking lot tax exempt applications were filed and Paul replied yes on multiple occasions. I even provided him all the applications and directions on how to prepare them. Can someone explain to me how an employee is allowed to lie to other employees, Council, the CIC board and the residents? For your knowledge the CIC is currently spending \$139,760.60 a year on property taxes that it does not need to spend.

The discussion of how the CIC sells the property it owns was a very long discussion. Paul Myers informed the board it is done by word of mouth or people calling him and asking. He was asked if the CIC uses an appraiser to come up with prices for property, they do not. As stated “they just kind of come up with a price”. I believe this practice could get us in a lot of trouble, in regards to discriminating who we want to sell to. I suggested the CIC get a realtor, have the realtor appraise the properties and list them for the appropriate price on the MLS. For the properties the CIC wants to keep for future development, do not list them. This would bring in revenue and reduce the workload of the Service Department employees who have to maintain these properties. Since there was no definite answer, time will tell.

The Shopping Center was discussed in regards to what the developer plans for the location, in particular what types of businesses and the plan to connect West Ross and East Ross together. Residents from West Ross who attend the meeting stated their voice should be heard on this issue. Patty Hausfeld plans on having a meeting with them. Many people were not pleased with the new sign the development company put up at the shopping center. It does not look very professional. They were told there is nothing that can be done about it because development

signs follow the same rules as political signs. Many residents stated they are extremely worried that current projects being negotiated and under contract with, such as the Shopping Center and Tower Avenue Townhomes do not include a start or finish date in the contract. This worried a lot of people since the Village has been burned in the past on deals like this.

At the conclusion of the CIC meeting the proposed bakery in the old Ellerbush building was discussed. It got rather heated with he said – she said. In the end Paul Myers admitted to giving out the key a week before she moved in because she told him she needed somewhere to live. CIC members were upset that they were not informed about this arrangement until after she moved in and that it was not Paul Myers decision to make. They were upset that she worked out an agreement with Paul to live there for five years free of charge as long as she improved the building and opened a bakery. There was concern that a formal business plan was never presented. Paul stated no one else had shown any interest in the building so he thought it would be a good fit. The Mayor stated he gave Paul a verbal reprimand and that Paul should not do his again.

As Auditor, I have to account for all of the Villages assets and make sure they are all accounted for and that none have been taken or given away, I am not sure how this is any different. I was asked by a resident how do others find out how to get

free buildings to fix up for a business. Again, another area where I see a major legal issue when the CIC executive board picks and chooses who they want to give buildings to.

If this Village is to run efficiently and fairly we need to all be held to accountable to the same high standards, and each be treated with respect and professionalism. I for one think it is very sad that all of this has come down to this, but someone tell me where else do you go to make things right. Many employees and residents have been trying to rectify these issues for years but no one listens or does anything. The only way it seems to make a difference is to let the citizens of St. Bernard know what is really going on. I pray all of you will help rectify these issues.

Ms. Hausfeld - I was at that same CIC meeting and Peggy you just said something that taxes were \$139,000.00 per year. Well we got their finances and they have a little over \$122,000.00 in the bank and I can remember a board member of the CIC asking, are you telling me Paul that half of this money is going to be spent on taxes and actually she referred to \$63,000.00 of it and he said yes. That only \$63,000.00 was going to be for taxes so there's a difference between what he says and what you're saying which I don't doubt what you're saying and that's kind of John what I told you. Accountability is huge here. You can't do one and that's what I was saying about the different properties and stuff. You can't do one and not do it for all because he or any of us are going to open the city up for liability issues and I know you said the other night you don't like to get written ones and you don't want to fire somebody but if there's not a paper trail on somebody then you can't fire them. And something has to be accounted for because this is tax payers money that we're using. That's where I have a problem with just a verbal reprimand. This has nothing to do with just you because I also believe the previous administration was wrong on not taking care of a few issues with certain people back when they were in power too. So if the people that are in charge, Dianna you say all the time, Mayor you are in charge, if the people that are in charge aren't going to take care of it then what do we do? I mean I'm sorry I, you know, there's just been so many things that have happened and like I said it's not just you John it's been previous administrations and I know you can't answer for the previous administration. But when is enough, enough. When does something start happening. If this was a policeman, a fireman or a service department employee that are under contracts they, not only do they get their verbal warnings but then they still get written warnings and they start getting days off or let go or whatever. So it just has to be the same not only disciplinary somebody but also the way we sell properties, the way we give properties away. There's got to be it's a fine line here.

Mayor Estep - I've been here less than a year, was appointed Vice President of the Board and I've been to several meetings and there has been some stuff and I appreciate Patty saying it didn't all start with me. The only situation I was aware of so far was the Ellerbusch situation and I met with Peggy and I told her I'm a firm believer that the punishment should fit the crime. There's no money stolen here, nobody injured it wasn't done vindictively. It was a bad decision on Paul's part so I verbally reprimanded him. I don't have any else. I didn't have anything else in front of me with paper on it. You don't fire somebody because you don't like their attitude or they're arrogant. I met with Paul and I talked to him and told him about this. About his attitude. It's hard to change somebody's attitude. It's like going to bed tonight and saying tomorrow I'm going to wake up and I'm going to write with my opposite hand and it will be perfectly legible. Things don't happen over night.

Now I have a something in my hand from Peggy and I will meet with him and that's the most I'll say on Council floor about a personnel issue but I will follow through and that was one of my campaign promises. I wanted to do something with the CIC and make it more professionally run. I think we're headed in that direction a little bit. We've done some good things. We had three ribbon cuttings, we got Wiedmann Brewery here. We're trying to get a house up on Tower Ave. But geez I didn't know it was going to be this tough for eight feet. But we're making progress and we'll continue to make progress but I'll deal with this but not on Council floor.

Mrs. Brickweg – And I'm sorry I had to bring this on Council floor but things don't get done if you don't. I'm sorry. It's the truth and everybody pretty much knows that. And Patty you are darn right we had the same issues with the Administration. I'm not asking for anybody to be fired but I'm asking for people not to lie to me. It is not comfortable to sit in a meeting when you know people are lying about things. And in all honesty he said nobody was interested in that building. Well I got two phone calls from people that were interested in putting a business in that same building and they were told that we didn't have an interest in those businesses so it is just very frustrating and why we're all talking about this but everybody at City Hall, we respect each other, we have professionalism and we're honest but I don't appreciate to sit at a meeting if I know I'm getting lied to. I just don't think that's okay. And I've seen it in the past and the only way to get things done is this way.

Mrs. Schildmeyer - I'm just going to remind the public at this point that Council's job is to appropriate money and to legislate. A lot of this is not, that's what we're elected to do.

Mrs. Brickweg – As I told you the State Auditor said when you are 100% funded this it is your responsibility. You might want to say it's not but it is. It would be different if the CIC was self sufficient but when you give them 100% of the tax payers money and their financial statement comes through the city's financial statement it does become your job.

Mrs. Schildmeyer - I was just reminding everyone that our job is.....

Mrs. Brickweg – The CIC is part of your job is what I'm saying when you appropriate the money.

Mrs. Schildmeyer – Firing Paul Meyer is not our job.

Mrs. Brickweg - I don't remember asking anyone to fire anybody. I don't remember, I don't remember anything about a fight. I remember saying that a lot of untruths. I'm sorry I'm speaking. I remember saying a lot of untruths were said that costs the city a lot of money. I'm going to tell you if it was me saying I filed all these reports and the city had to pay \$140,000.00 in property tax I think it just might be a little bit different.

Mayor Estep – Not to change the subject but I do want to remind everybody that Christmas in St. Bernard is Saturday, November 26 from 6:00 until 8:00. We're going to have carolers out here about 5:45. We're going to light the Christmas tree. So join us in front of the administration building and the municipal building. We're going to have horse wagon rides, petting zoo, pictures with Santa and Mrs. Claus, cookies, hot chocolate, train display and earlier in the day Mrs. Claus will be

coming around escorting the Village on Gator passing out candy to the kids. I didn't want to interrupt that discussion so I tried to put a positive spin on it.

Mr. Tobergte – John I know Cheryl hasn't been in but I am picking up the tree Saturday morning.

Mayor Estep – Thank you and I did want to say I hope Ms. Abrams has a speedy recovery. She should be returning soon and again thanks to Heidi for covering and doing everything that she can to help.

Mr. Culbertson - I would just give a shout out there, Paul Schildmeyer and the rest of the Recreation Department, it wasn't packed and it was cold but it was a start. Monday night down at the Bengal game probably not the turnout we wanted to see but it was a spirited crowd and hopefully it is something we can build upon. There was very little or any cost to the Village for something like this and it was just a good community event and hopefully we can continue that theme on and bring people together to have a good time.

Mr. Tobergte – Peggy can I have a copy of your speech?

Mrs. Brickweg – Yes.

Mayor Estep – Just one thing to add Madam President. Monday night, every time we have an event you see Ed Kahlmeyer. We have a meeting for Easter, Ed Kahlmeyer is there. And I really appreciate that and I hope everybody appreciates everything that Ed does behind the scene. He does all the electrical, the speakers, the lights, he does an excellent job and I want to thank him.

Ms. Hausfeld - I just want to, on behalf of Council and the Administration, I want to wish all the residents a very Happy Thanksgiving and a safe one too.

AUDIENCE WISHING TO ADDRESS COUNCIL

Kevin Strotman, Ross Ave. - On behalf of the citizens we would like to say to all thanks for all your property tax dollars that you donate to the school and you all are friends and some of you have been here for eighty years and we should just grow up and respect one another.

While I'm not a resident I will give you my address and I still have direct contact within the city here. My name is Ken Davis and I live in Florence, Kentucky. The reason why I came here tonight was to back up what Peggy was saying that there is a lack of transparency regarding CIC and City Council. Several months ago and Peggy will back me up on this, I brought a bakers name to the City of St. Bernard because I wanted to see St. Bernard get a bakery. It was proposed to Paul Myers. He came back and he said we don't need a bakery. We got one. I said well what's the bakery? I asked Peggy. She said he said JuJus, the coffee shop. So at that point I hear being the latest story regarding the bakery, I'm a little upset because I feel like for a long time I felt the CIC was a boys club. I felt like it was being run like a boys club. It lacked transparency. Like if it wasn't their idea it was a bad idea. It gets old. I'm not blaming John. I'm not blaming him, this has been going on for a long time. I've had people get off CIC because they thought it was a one man show. It can't be that way. And Peggy's right. It's Council's responsibility up there that every one of you should be able to see reports that come out of that CIC

because it's the city's money. They are one in the same. She's absolutely right. but the bottom line is that I think it deserves to be answered. Answers to at least the fact that \$139,000.00 don't ask me what I would do because I'll tell you I'll fire the guy. If he cost me \$139,000.00 he's gone. I've seen employees get fired for lying. Isn't he an employee? Under Civil Service, if you lie you get fired. So no I'm tired of the excuses and I know for a fact that the person that told me it was a one man band in CIC I highly respect. That's why he's not on there any more. So I think there has to be better transparency between CIC and City Council. and I still love this city even though I don't live here. I still directly get myself involved in community as far as St. Clement Church is concerned, I still take my business, thanks Andy, I still take, I hope you did good this year, good, I donate money, Andy will back me up on that to different charities here, so I love this city still and I only want what's best for this city, just as you people do. But we can't have it if we're not able to gain transparency from one to the next. Tonight I saw for a fact, he contracted eight feet okay and the price, that should have been a long communicated to City Council long before tonight. I don't think it should have came up to a matter where we see Council having to argue with each other over the fact that they weren't aware of the fact that they weren't selling that property for \$10,000.00. I think there has to be better communications in between the two organizations because It's your money, like Diane said. We're here to legislate and we provide the money for the CIC. That's absolutely 100% correct. But it's also correct on Peggy's part, City Council has to provide CIC guidance along with the Administration. And to tell them they're not operating by themselves. They're going to have to operate through you.

Mr. Tobergte – Kenny just so you know the price for the property is not set until Tuesday at the CIC meeting. That's why I reported it tonight.

Ken Davis - (inaudible)

Chief Meyer - I was approached by a citizen this evening right before Council who wanted me to pass along a compliment to firefighter Joe Meister for the job he did for putting in the car seat. But he also mentioned that he almost didn't go to the fire house to have the car seat done because he really wasn't aware of the program until finally someone told him. So I just wanted to remind all the residents that the Fire Department does install car seats for children free of charge but you do need to make an appointment so if you'd like to have that service done just call 242-9555 and ask for the officer in charge and they'll be able to set you up.

Motion by Mrs. Bedinghaus, seconded by Mr. Culbertson to excuse the absent member. Motion passed 6-0.

Mrs. Bedinghaus – The next COW meeting will be Thursday, December 1st, at 7:00.

Motion by Mr. Kalb seconded by Ms. Hausfeld to adjourn. Motion passed 6-0.

