

**ST. BERNARD CITY COUNCIL MEETING
FEBRUARY 1, 2007**

The regular meeting of the St. Bernard City Council was held Thursday, February 01, 2007 in Council Chambers.

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

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

Mr. Walden – I would like to make known that City Council has placed signs at the entrance to Council Chambers tonight asking everyone who has a cell phone to please either turn your cell phone off during the meeting place it on vibrate.

Mr. Walden – Before we go on with the regular order of business we would like to have two new St. Bernard Officers sworn in tonight. We will turn the meeting over to Safety Director, Jonathan Stuchell to introduce those officers.

Mr. Stuchell – This is a great night here in St. Bernard as we welcome our two newest members of our police department, Officer Derek Setters and Officer Thomas “Sean” McCreanor. To start I would like to welcome these two gentleman and their families to our community. This has been a long process and I can’t express my true appreciation for their patience. Both of these officers have been previously associated with other departments but still bring a fresh outlook to the St. Bernard Police Department. I encourage you to get to know these two new officers as they will help keep our community safe.

We also have two new field training officers who will be paired with the new members of our department and I am truly pleased with this new leadership. Officer Setters will be paired with FTO Shane Moore and Officer McCreanor will be paired with FTO Keith Ingram. I have to acknowledge that we have a great group of officers who will all partner in the training of our new hires.

At this time, I would ask that both Derek and Sean please come forward where Mayor John Estep will officially swear you in as Patrol Officers of the St. Bernard Police Dept.

Officers Derek Setters and Thomas McCreanor were then sworn in by Mayor Estep

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

REPORTS OF CITY OFFICIALS

MAYOR, Mr. Estep – The Administration has had an open forum at a COW Meeting, discussion with Council, and a public meeting with area residents concerning the development of Bertus Park. Feedback concerning the

project has been significantly positive. Therefore, I am asking Vice Mayor, Curtis Walden, to poll Council Members tonight concerning their desire to proceed to the next step to bring this project to fruition. With approval from Council, Gerry and Joe are ready to move forward with the next step to site development, and environmental study of the area.

Council was polled with six members voting aye. Mr. Meier arrived after the poll was taken.

Thanks again Council its very uplifting to see us all together and moving forward on this project.

I am requesting Council to go into Executive Session this evening to discuss additional property development.

The Council Meeting on February 15 will be Scout Night. Upon conclusion of regular business I will be giving my annual State of the City Address. In addition, please expect to receive a short report from each of our Department Heads highlighting their accomplishments in 2006 and their goals for 2007.

AUDITOR, Mr. St. Clair – The January Auditor’s reports are prepared for tonight’s meeting. The receipts report and the report showing year-to-date revenue and expenses by fund are derived from the Auditor’s report and they are given to Council and the Administration.

Payroll for the month of January: \$449,438.57

Other expenditures for the month of January: \$190,339.29

Total expenditures through the end of January: \$639,777.86

DIRECTOR OF LAW, Mr. Geiser – (read by Mr. Kathman) Before Council tonight are two new ordinances as requested at the COW:

Ordinance No. 4, 2007 repeals St. Bernard employee residency requirement. The Ohio Legislature recently passed Ohio Senate Bill 82 whereby section 9.481 of the Revised Code was enacted to generally prohibit political subdivisions from imposing residency requirements on certain employees. The new law set a statewide residency standard for city police and firefighters and allows them to live outside municipal jurisdictions yet still qualify for service with the city.

Ordinance No. 5, 2007 amends the Property Maintenance Code to increase the penalty from \$500.00 per violation to \$1,000.00 per violation. This makes the penalty equivalent to a misdemeanor level 1 as set forth under the Ohio Revised Code.

On a personal note, I would like to thank Greg Lipp and Bob Hausfeld of the Fire Department for their quick and professional response to a family emergency this past week.. Their care, professionalism, compassion and service was outstanding and my family is very, very grateful. In time of a crisis, it is very comforting to know that the firefighters who respond are not simply paramedics but they are your friends who really care.

Because of this family medical emergency I am unable to be with you at the start of the meeting this evening but I am hopeful to be able to join with you later in the meeting

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

Receipts for the month of January:

\$990,975.96

SAFETY DIRECTOR, Mr. Stuchell – No report tonight other than my introduction of our two new officers.

SERVICE DIRECTOR, Mr. Kempe – No report.

TAX COMMISSIONER, Mrs. Williams – I just wanted to report that we did get the individual returns mailed out today and I just wanted to give a special thanks to a few people. The Service Dept., because we did our returns ourselves this year it saves the City a few extra thousand dollars and doing it in house took a lot of extra man power and the Service Dept. came up and helped us to get everything mailed out so I want to thank them and John helped by getting a folding machine for us which helped tremendously. Walt Moeller had helped us with trying to get some files converted and he's very good with the computer, so he was tremendously helpful and he's very quick so he didn't take a lot of time away from his department. I don't want anybody to get the wrong idea and then Elaine and Bonnie, they worked late hours and ate in at lunch time and stuff so I'm very grateful to have them. But I would like everybody to know that the IRS did go out today.

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

FINANCE, Mr. Zix – At the proper time I will be asking to table Ordinance No. 1 in light of some new information I'd like to discuss at the next COW meeting a recommendation from the Recreation Director.

SAFETY, Mr. Burkhardt – The Police Report for December 2006: With the return of cold weather, the police have seen a dramatic increase of car owners starting their cars to warm up then going back into the house. This is an open invitation for someone to steal your vehicle, and against the law. Unless you have a remote start system that will shut off if an unauthorized person enters your vehicle, please do not leave your vehicles unattended. It only takes a second for your car to be stolen. The police department would also like to thank all of the citizens that phone police when they observed unusual activity. These calls have assisted us with arrests as well as preventing crime.

SERVICE, Mr. Meier – First of all I would like to be put on the agenda for the next COW meeting so that we can discuss Council appointments to the Property Tax Abatement Council. We've had several peoples names submitted, I think its time we need to go ahead and get all our appointees, so we could maybe do that next Thursday.

Also, the Service Department Report for January, 2007; there were 18 trucks placed at residences, 4 dumpsters, 234 special pick-ups, and 231 tons of garbage taken to the landfill. The City received \$774.65 for recycling in December of 2006.

Also, I would like to recommend passages of Ordinances No. 4, 2007, repealing the residency requirement in the City and also I would like to urge that we pass Ordinance No. 5, 2007, that is strengthening the Property Maintenance Code.

PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS, Mr. Asbach – At last weeks COW we discussed the Vine St. improvement project and it was decided that we would be in contact with different developers and meet with the CIC as well as Council and go through those developers one at a time. A future date will be announced for those meetings.

LAWS, CONTRACTS AND CLAIMS, Ms. Hausfeld – My Committee recommends passing Ordinance No. 4, 2007, repealing residency and also Ordinance No. 5, 2007 for property maintenance code.

BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY, Mr. Schildmeyer – I had the opportunity to talk with the Hamilton County Library recently after last weeks meeting and the Library was brought up on the floor. I ask about the timing involved in the New Governor's Budget and how long does it take. They informed me that the Governor's Executive Budget would be presented first, then the State and the House presents their budgets. This all takes place at the end of May or June with the final budget being discussed or developed in July and the public would be notified by then. Hamilton County Library will be sending a representative out to address Council at the time after the budget has been put in place. With the results of just what might happen with the Governor's budget. We should know a little bet by then. The City has been very patient on this and working hard, this new budget regarding the new Library building will be known in July and the outcome of the Hamilton County Library decision should be addressed then. Again, we appreciate the interest from the citizens and we will keep in touch if anything development or if there are any new developments within the Library area.

HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION, Mrs. Brickweg – I would like to inform everyone that Implementation Committee Members for the I-75 expansion project will be meeting Monday, Feb. 26th, 2007 in St. Bernard. We will be discussing the outcome of the Sept. 28th, 2006 public involvement meeting. We will also be discussing the coordination with the communities and neighborhoods and the current recommendations that have resulted from that input.

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

**Committee of the Whole
Jan. 25, 2007**

1. Council approved the minutes of the Jan. 18th Council meeting, 6-0. Mr. Zix was absent.

2. After some discussion on a full time Mayor, Council will come back at the next COW meeting with recommendations.

3. Mayor John Estep

A. Informed Council that he attended the 1st Suburbs meeting and shared his views on the Bertus St. Park town meeting.

4. Auditor, Walter St. Clair

A. Walt informed Council that the hearing on the C-9 lawsuit was postponed until Feb. 15, 2007.

6. Safety Director, Jonathan Stuchell

A. Jonathan informed Council that the two new police officers would be sworn in at the next Council meeting.

7. Service Director, Joe Kempe

A. Joe informed Council that the remaining Cinti. Bell pay phones in the city limits would be removed due to the lack of use. This was Cinti. Bell's decision. To keep them would have cost the City.

8. Tax Commissioner, Sheri Williams, absent.

9. Laws, Contracts, & Claims, Patty Hausfeld

A. Council voted 6-0 to put an ord. on the table up dating the property maintenance code. It would increase the fines from \$500.00 to \$1,000.00.

B. Council voted 6-0 to put an ord. on the table to repeal the City's residency law.

C. Patty gave Council a copy of the changes to the Solicitor's ord. and it will be discussed at the next COW meeting.

10. Public Improvements, Steve Asbach

A. Steve asked that signs be put up and it be announced before meetings that everyone turn off their cell phones to keep from interrupting the meetings.

11. Business & Industry, Mike Schildmeyer

A. Mike informed Council that Cognis had been fined for safety violations and that the fine money would be put into a fund that could be applied for by schools to clean up the exhaust systems on their buses.

12. Safety, Bill Burkhardt, no report.

13. Highways & Transportation, Peggy Brickweg

A. Peggy brought Council up to date on the CAP & 1st Suburbs meetings that she attended. Also it was discussed that the Administration looks into developers for the revitalization of Vine St.

14. Service, Kevin Meier

A. Candidates for the Tax Abatement Council were given to Kevin. Also, Kevin has set up a meeting with CHP to tour some of the properties they have rehabbed out in the Carthage area. The meeting is set up for Feb. 3rd at 11:30.

15. Finance, Greg Zix, absent.

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

COMMUNICATIONS

Dear Council,

I would like to take this opportunity to extend my appreciation to the dedicated City workers in our Service Department. They recently removed a very large root from my yard that was growing in from a tree in the park. They also trimmed back some of these trees away from my property and did an excellent job. I am truly grateful that we have such wonderful and helpful people working for our City. Thank you again!

Sincerely,

Shirley Gurley
14 Church Street
St. Bernard, Ohio

Motion by Mr. Burkhardt, seconded by Mr. Schildmeyer to receive and file and send a copy of the communication to the Service Dept. Motion passed 7-0.

RESOLUTIONS AND ORDINANCES

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

Mr. Walden – I believe the first Ordinance on our agenda tonight was continued until tonight from the last Council Meeting and that is Ordinance No. 1, 2007.

Motion by Mr. Zix, seconded by Mr. Asbach to table Ordinance No. 1, 2007. Motion passed 7-0.

ORDINANCE NO. 4, 2007, REPEALING SECTION 159.14 OF THE ST. BERNARD CODIFIED ORDINANCES KNOWN AS THE RESIDENCY ORDINANCE AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY.

Motion by Mr. Burkhardt, seconded by Mrs. Brickweg to let Ordinance No. 4, 2007 take it's regular course.

REMARKS

Mr. Zix – I will be voting against this Ordinance. It's always been my belief and the citizens that I've spoke to on having people who work for the City live in the City. They're good people, they make good citizens and they keep their property nice and they're close in case of emergency. I think that House Bill, we should let it ride its course, it's now being protested and it's still not law.

Ms. Hausfeld – I would like to take this opportunity to tell the citizens of St. Bernard my views regarding residence: I personally don't want any citizen of St. Bernard to move out of our community, employee or not. The new residency law that was passed last year at the State level nullifies all current municipal ordinances regarding residency. Basically, that pretty much says

that residency ordinances are out-dated. As we have seen first hand, any residency ordinance has difficulty sustaining court challenges. The Laws, Contracts, and Claims Committee met and discussed this issue with employees and residents. Based on those conversations, it is the recommendation of the Committee that we should repeal our residency ordinance. By repealing this ordinance, it is my hope that more applicants will test for positions in the police and fire, as well as service department. Lastly, it is my opinion that our community faces many critical challenges that require the full attention of Council and Administration, more so than residency.

Some of these challenges are:

- 1) Developing our business district.
- 2) Improving our residential district.
- 3) Developing the already existing pieces of property around town that the City owns such as, Numaid and others.

We need to concentrate on all areas of the City as a whole. Now! We cannot put things off any longer. We need to get things done! I hope we can get passed this residency issue tonight so that we can start concentrating on more important issues in our City.

Mr. Asbach – While I'll agree that the present will not be enforced, I still think that we as Council need to pass an ordinance, either to reflect the State ordinance or to do one of our own. As of now the State Ordinance is still being contested in the Courts, which is another reason I wanted to wait to pass this Ordinance now.

Mrs. Brickweg – The issue of residency has been a very controversial issue for St. Bernard and every municipality in Ohio. It has been debated for many years in the State of Ohio Senate and House of Representatives. For those that have not followed the residency issue before Ohio I will give you a short summary; on January 18th, 2006 Senate Bill 82 passed that Ohio House by a vote of 68 to 28. Because the House did not amend the Bill, State Bill 82 did not have to be considered by the Senate. The Governor signed the Bill on January 27th and therefore it did become law on May 1st of 2006. This Bill generally prohibits any political subdivision from requiring an employee as a condition of employment to reside in any specific area of the State. It states that political subdivision generally have the right to reside anywhere they desire. It states in Article II of the Ohio Constitution, it specifies that laws may be passed providing for the comfort, health, safety and general welfare of all employees and that no other provision of the Ohio Constitution, including the Home Rule provision impairs or limits this power. The General Assembly found that it is a state wide concern. Some municipalities, such as Cleveland, have filed suits against it because they are claiming that residency requirement for municipal employees will most likely be a matter of local self government and not a statewide concern. None of these suits has been settled in court as to this date. Because of the State ruling the issue of residency has once again been brought up to this City Council for us to vote on. I will be ruling to revoke the residency ordinance of St. Bernard. I have gone over this issue many times in my mind. Being married to a firefighter, I have heard many views from many different fire and police depts. throughout Cincinnati. Most of these depts. had a requirement to live in Hamilton County but they are also reviewing their ordinances to have them up to date. St. Bernard has spent a lot of

money trying to enforce the residency issue only to lose in court. I do not feel it is wise to spend additional tax payers money trying to force residency when it has already been ruled on at a State level. Our City is also having a hard time finding employees. We have an extremely low number of people taking our tests and then most of them we have to go out and train. If we take out residency then hopefully this will increase the number of candidates to choose from and open up the possibility of hiring already trained employees. Currently it can take one to two years to train a paramedic and the cost is well over \$200,000.00. If we can hire somebody already trained, we will have that employee working right away and save our City money. My heartfelt feeling on getting rid of residency and for those employees that may move out of St. Bernard is that I want to work as hard as I can to make this City a place that they wish they had never left.

Motion to have Ordinance No. 4, 2007 take it's regular course passed 6-1.
Mr. Zix voting no.

ORDINANCE NO. 5, 2007, AMENDING ST. BERNARD CODIFIED ORDINANCE, SECTION 1335.10, THE PROPERTY MAINTENANCE CODE SECTION, TO STRENGTHEN THE PENALTIES AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY.

Motion by Mr. Burkhardt, seconded by Ms. Hausfeld to suspend with the second and third reading of Ordinance No. 4, 2007.

REMARKS

Ms. Hausfeld – Basically this Ordinance is staying pretty much the same, the one thing that we did change in here is there was a maximum fine of \$500.00 which has increased to \$1,000.00 and that is something that we were already doing, but we had to change the Ordinance to match what we were doing. Just to let the citizens know.

Mrs. Brickweg – Just to add to that we also, it is in here that, for those who are repeat offenders that the City does have the ability to fine the repeat offenders, they could do it \$1,000.00 a week for a violation, even a \$1,000.00 a day for a violation. Basically we worked on this Ordinance because Mr. Wiedman needed more teeth and so did Mr. Moeller to make people fix up their homes, so hopefully they'll start listening otherwise they're going to be paying a lot of money if they don't fix up their home and as Mr. Wiedman has said, it's not that our City wants the money, we want them to fix up their homes. Hopefully this will give them the teeth that we can get more action out of this.

5010 Kemper Ave. – You guys only enforce that law to certain people, I mean, you don't enforce that to the whole realm of the City. You only enforce that to certain people, because I live at 5010 Kemper Ave. and I've been complaining about cars, junk cars that are across the street from me and you guys only take that to certain people. I don't know, maybe you can give me feedback but I've complained about it and you guys do nothing about it.

Mrs. Brickweg – This is the first I've heard of this, so I'm just curious.

5010 Kemper Ave. – Well there's a house right across the street from me, I've been complaining about a car, right across the street from me. It's been sitting there for three years. You've done nothing. The Police Dept.

Mrs. Brickweg – OK so you complained to the Police Dept.?

5010 Kemper Ave. – Yes, yes, I mean the car is still there. It's still there today, I complained about it 2 years ago.

Mrs. Brickweg – You live at 5010 Kemper?

5010 Kemper Ave. – And the house is on Ross Ave. and a fireman owns it. I'm assuming that's the reason why that that car hasn't been dealt with. It's been sitting in the driveway for over two years.

Mrs. Brickweg – Sir, I'll do my best to look into this for you.

5010 Kemper Ave. – It's been there for two years, I mean, I complained about it.

Mr. Walden – Sir we didn't catch your name and we need it for the minutes.

Greg Pfierman.

Motion to suspend the second and third reading of Ordinance No. 5, 2007 passed 7-0.

Motion by Mr. Burkhardt, seconded by Ms. Hausfeld to adopt Ordinance No. 5, 2007 as read. Motion passed 7-0.

OLD BUSINESS

None.

NEW BUSINESS

Motion by Mr. Zix, seconded by Mr. Asbach to go into Executive Session at the request of the Mayor. Motion passed 7-0.

Mr. Meier – This should probably go under old business but I'm going to go ahead with it. As many of you know, in my job I deal with mortgages and the purchases of property and real estate and that's just what we do. Doing that I have access to a lot of tools and things that most people might not be aware of. I went on the National Association of Home Builders web site and they have a model that, when you input the characteristics of a home and it's location they go back through a statistical mile using a government data base of housing units. This model, what it does, it takes the various features and it comes up with the effect of a change of a feature on a home or on the location and what that does to the value of the home. So I plugged in some information and this is, I was trying to model something that would be in the Bertus St. Park. So I selected the Midwest region and I'm going to have copies of this that I'll put up here if anybody would like them. But basically for a typical type of St. Bernard home and I know a lot of our homes are

older than this but this was built between 1980 and 1989. It has about 1850 sq. ft., three bedrooms, three baths, with central air and off street parking. The value of that home, estimated is \$130,337 which is pretty typical to the real estate data that I presented to you two weeks ago. Now, if you take that exact same property and one of the features of this, if there is a park or other open space within a half a block, if I change that from a no to a yes, that increases the value of those homes by \$8,528.00. So if you take the exact same model and the one difference is, instead of having the asphalt that we have at Bertus St., if that was green space or a park the average value of the homes within a half block or 300ft. rises to \$138,865.00. Now one of the other things that is on this model if I go back to the original home, and you don't put the green space in there and I think this part is really key, but if I change, there is a question there, if there is an abandoned building within a half block, if there's a vacant building within a half block, if I change that no to a yes and rerun it, that same house that was worth \$130,000.00 is now worth \$115,733.00. There is a loss of value of approximately \$14,600.00 merely by having an empty house within a half a block of your home. We've had a lot of conversation, and a lot of people have talked about Bertus St. Park and some of the problems that we have down there, even though I have personal opinions I have the mindset that I was going to listen to people and listen to what they have say. After running through this I think we have a couple things; one of the things, when we talk about as far as taking the use of a park is that it can't be used by anybody, well obviously that park is being used. It's being used by the school and it's being used by children after that school and I think that there is some very well spoken young ladies came to the town meeting and expressed their opinions on that. The issue was brought up, I think we've got two issues; one is, do we need new housing? Yes, I guess we would need it at some point. There other is the question of the language and the activity that was going on down there. Based on the information I have from this model, I think that we should seriously think about taking that park and the asphalt and making that a green space. If we do that we can eliminate the issue of the language and the people congregating on that asphalt. Again, we can still use the park area there for the schools and the school is a huge benefit for the City. Again, we could still have plenty of play space for kids and we could also make it attractive for people in the neighborhood using it. I think if we can do that and eliminate the issue of the people using that area in causing disturbances and at the same time increase the value of the homes around that area by \$8,500.00 I think that's a win win situation. That's not to say that if we needed to at some point in the future to put houses on there that we couldn't still do it. I think it's important that we take logical first steps and try to resolve that issue with the least amount of impact to the area. Secondly the other point that I made of the impact of the abandoned houses. I think that if you look at the number of vacant homes that we have in the City, that our time and energy would be better spent in getting those homes fixed and people living in them. And by doing that we can spread the value to the City amongst a lot more people. When I think about putting new homes on Bertus St. Park, I was thinking, we have other issues that are probably more important and the image came to mind of the emperor Nero fiddling while Rome burned and I kind of got the image of the City of St. Bernard falling into disrepair all around one central area of new homes. So in my own mind is the idea of putting new homes in there could be the Fiddler Project. I think there are other things that we should do that would have a greater

impact on the City and I think that we should make it a priority to take care of these vacant houses, get them fixed up, get them livable, get people in them and I'd like very much is we would consider at Bertus St. Park, before we go to the extreme step of putting homes there, to seriously consider making that green space.

Mrs. Brickweg – First Kevin that was very informative and thank you very much. I like his idea a lot about the vacant properties, I was shocked that a housing value went down that much. To add to what he was saying there, I agree 100% that we need to start fixing up the abandoned and the run down property and I was actually studying a plan that Blue Ash is doing and I really think it is something the City of St. Bernard should look into and we can tweak it however we want. To make it simple you either hire a company; hire a person who fixes up houses. The City would hire that person and the City would buy the house and then when the house gets fixed up we sell it, the profit therefore goes back into an account to buy the next house. It just keeps going on and granted the City is going to have an initial investment in the houses we buy and to pay either the person or the company but as this keeps moving on the houses start looking better and it increases the whole City and I really think that is something we should look into like Blue Ash. That's exactly what they do, they have a group of electricians they hire, they have a group of plumbers, they fix up the house, they sell it, they take the profit, they buy the next house. It's like a win win situation and I'm sure there's a lot of things that need to be worked out but I think that's something that we really need to look into. And that way instead of sitting up here saying, we need to fix these up, we need to do this, we'd actually be doing it. That was one suggestion I had to add to that.

Mr. Estep – Those sound like good ideas. I hope we don't get too deep into the real estate business and start buying homes and fixing them up, that's going to cost some money. If we leave that Bertus St. Park green space we're still back to the same problem and the kids are able to play there now on black top but we're not taking anything away. They are going to have another site, they're going to have access to the Vine St. Park, the Pavilion and the longer you turn your head and you think that thing is going to get better up there, the longer, I'm just amazed that people could think that because it's continually gone down for several years. It's nobody's fault and as long as it's a park you're not going to keep the people out of there who you want out of there. If you think tearing up all the black top and make it a nice green area and put park benches in there, if you don't think that that is going to attract what we just got rid of, we have to have a talk.

Mrs. Brickweg – John I totally disagree with you about buying it up, I'm sorry it's not new and we need to invest in this City, we need to spend money and we need to fix it up. We can all sit back and go, I don't want to spend the money but if we keep having all these abandoned houses and people keep moving out we might have money in the bank but we're not going to have a City to fall back on. It's amazing that you see all the other communities doing that and they're making it and we sit back and go, Well we better not do that, well there must be a reason all the other communities are doing it. That's just my two cents on that.

Mr. Estep – Peggy, I don't disagree with that, I think we should invest in our City. Again, I'd like to see a plan, what this is going to cost, who is going to do this and maybe this is one of the things that we'll get out of this developer. I hope we get a developer on board soon. I think we need a professional who can work in different aspects of whether it's putting homes up there, remodeling some of the dilapidated properties we have to increase their value to do away with all vacant property. As Kevin said, I agree with that, it's got to bring down the value of the houses in the adjacent areas, so I'm for that, I'm not against that. I just see that we're starting to go off on these three different roads again and I hope that doesn't self destruct.

Mrs. Williams – Just a comment about the green space, just having three kids that have gone to St. Clement I know that one of the benefits of the Bertus St. Park was that it was black top area and when they had rain or snow or something they could actually, you know, when it was wet like mud and things like that, they could actually use the blacktop. If you have green space, they can't use it so they actually like to have blacktop, the green space, they can't use that as much so I don't know that that's really too much of a benefit to them.

Ms. Hausfeld – John, like I said in my report, we need to concentrate on all City as a whole. You're talking about how we have a difference of opinion, we should have differences of opinion. We should be working on every part of this City that needs to be worked on as a whole, not just one little area. To make this City the City that I grew up in and that I love and that I want to spend the rest of my life in, we need to make this City just the best it can be. That's not just developing Bertus St. That's developing the business district. That's developing NuMaid property, that's developing, sorry guys, the library property. We need to develop. If it's going to cost money to do that, then we need to put the money there and we need to start investing and we need to start doing it now. We can't let this City go another year or two years, three years, four years down the road because we're just going to keep going down hill. We need to go up hill and we need to make a positive change throughout the City and that's not just your department, that's not just, it's all of us, all of us need to start working together and get things done. Not just talk about it, get things done.

Mr. Estep – Patty, I agree with you, again, it takes money and we should invest in our City and you know, everybody, not everybody, there's a general feeling that it's been left alone and that's true to a degree. If we look back on the past three years, three years ago we face a \$2.4 million dollar deficit. Thanks to the citizens and Council working together as we mentioned we passed two levies, we balanced three budgets, we're not coming to where we're seeing over \$2,000,000.00 this year that we've been able to put in reserves. We not have some money to do it. We're now able to do it. You people up there control the purse strings. You put it in there, we'll get it done, we'll get a developer hired, but I'm not here to blame anybody, and I'm not going to take the blame, we do need to work together, we do need to invest, we need the money in those line items to get something done.

Mr. Meier – John, I appreciate your comments but the one thing that it doesn't address, if we put houses there, that's not going to keep the people

that coming into the City out of the City, if that's the issue. They can go down to Vine St. Park, it's only a block away. What are we going to do there? Are we going to develop that as well? When I ran this model I also went back and ran it as if we were putting a new home in there. If I changed the date to after 2003, which is the model as if you're putting new construction in there for that exact same house, the estimated price is \$139,785.00 which falls right into line with the information I presented to you two weeks ago that 70% of the homes sold in St. Bernard in the last year were sold for \$139,999.00 or less. Along with that the, and I know you don't want to make this into real estate but that's my business, that's what I do and this comment is from Donald Combs who is the Vice President of the Federal Reserve in a recent speech that he made; "Housing starts may be close to the trough of their peak." Any overbuilding in 2004 and 2005 worked off in common quarters, assuming the current level of housing starts. What that translates into is that into according to David Rosenberg who is a chief economist for North American Merrill Lynch. His contention is if you take a close look at homes for sale, including those being completed and those under construction and the glut of supply, it seems like things get worse, not get better. If you look around the City of Cincinnati, you can look at Butler County, Warren County, and all the surrounding Counties, there is a glut of homes on the market. Adding another home is not the right thing to do right now. We don't need another vacant lot. I haven't seen anybody lining up to buy the lot at Schlanser's, I haven't seen anybody lining up to buy the lot at 618 E. Ross. Bringing another home for sale that's not being occupied isn't going to help the City. We can help the City more by doing something with the homes that are currently vacant and unoccupied and getting those together and getting them going. If we take Bertus St. Park out of there and we put homes in there, the people that are causing problems in there are just going to be shifted into somebody else's neighborhood. I think we need to address that problem as a separate issue from needing the houses and we think we need to keep them separate.

Mr. Schildmeyer – This is good talk, the comments are really good, it's sounds like at least we thinking and heading in the direction that's needed for the City. I believe what Peggy mentioned tonight is also a good idea, it sounded similar to what Kevin presented two weeks ago for CIC.

Mrs. Brickweg – I would like the City to handle and to sell the homes. Secondly, to John, I know we don't like to go down that path and I'll make this short and sweet, but I'm really tired of hearing about the budget crisis, when we came in well above everyone of those years than what was projected and I'm talking about \$2,000,000.00. We asked the voters to vote for a tax increase so there's more money so they voted for a tax increase, we cut services so there's more money there, but to sit here and keep saying we could not move forward because the budget crisis and we have more money now that we had in a long time and we brought in more money the last three years. I'm really having a hard time with that and I know you don't want to dwell on it but I really don't think there ever was a budget crisis and that's my opinion when I see the amount of money we can bring in. And to add to that, it is the Mayor's job to have a plan, to have a plan for how we're going to move forward, what you want to do and then you come to Council and ask us for the money. I will agree the plan could be much easier if would

get the Council to tell you how much money we would give you to do a plan. But all in all there has to be a plan and that's just my two cents.

Mr. Zix – Most probably everybody said exactly what I want to say but the fact is that the Mayor has brought a plan to us, somewhat of a plan, to bring Bertus St. Park, there's room for all these programs and capacity here in the City for all of these programs that we could do. I think we just have to really focus forward and do them. I think everybody said that but I think the Mayor's doing what he's supposed to be doing, we had money in line items to buy property, it's there, you know, there might be another plan coming up, we're looking at the CHA Housing now, at one step, there might be capacity there, we don't have to convert the whole City, but there might be capacity if we look at it and we understand it. We're on the road, I just think we have to keep traveling.

Council voted 4-3, Mr. Asbach, Mr. Schildmeyer and Mr. Zix voting no to delete some portions of the minutes.

AUDIENCE WISHING TO ADDRESS COUNCIL

Norm Miller, 219 Washington Ave. – At the beginning of this, at the meeting, John had a vote taken of all the Council people concerning Bertus St. Park. What was that all about? And I heard 7 yea's and now we're not talking about Bertus St. Park any more. I thought it was settled now. If we're going to move forward and develop Bertus St. Park with housing, is that not true?

Mr. Burkhardt – Norm, the vote was 6-0 to move forward on the project.

Norm Miller, 219 Washington Ave. – So we're moving forward to put the housing in, are we still going to discuss it and discuss it and discuss it? Are we going to build houses or what are we going to do?

Mr. Burkhardt – We actually gave Joe, the Service Director, and Gerry Wiedman, the Planning Commissioner, permission to go ahead and work on getting test borings done and getting the property to see what it's going to cost to get the property ready.

Norm Miller, 219 Washington Ave. – My point is that Mr. Meier seems to be steady fast on this park business. I would like to ask Mr. Meier, if we put this same park across from your house, how happy would you be about this park when all these residents that lived around this came to this session that we had. It's just a disbelief of what's going on up there if you want to reflect on me, put the park on somebody else's back yard or front yard, just don't put it on my back yard. You want green space, put it somewhere else, just don't put it around me. This green space has been discussed years ago for goodness sake and it's terrible, the people there, you heard the remark that they're making and if you think that it's going to go away putting a green space in the park that's just going to give these guys a place to have their party. You need to put a bed in there instead of benches so they're comfortable. This isn't going to take it away Kevin. These parks, you don't know these parks, you don't live across from these parks, none of you live across from these parks. But the people who voice their opinion this

shouldn't be your opinion at all, you're a Councilman, you represent these people that who are at this meeting. You're bringing up all this stuff, you're bringing up green space, green space, green space. We got so much green space in this town, we got Vine St. Park, we got Ross Park, we got parks all over these side streets, we got two cemeteries that are full of green space, there are good people there. The whole town is green space for goodness sake. So I think you need to get off of the green space, let John take over for goodness sake, let's get this thing done. Vine St. is a priority, all you're talking about is fixing old homes up. If somebody is going to come through St. Bernard, there not going to go Kemper Ave. or Sullivan Ave., they go Vine St. and what do they see? They're not interested in that house that you're talking about that isn't fixed up, Vine St. is full of them that isn't fixed up, you don't even talk about it, you're talking about somebody on a side street for goodness sake. Give the Mayor, like I said before, give the Mayor, if he wants to make a program, lets do it for him, fund it, do something for goodness sake but we're not doing nothing. Vine St. is a disaster, it's been told to you probably by 100 people, it's a disaster for some reason. Hello, did you hear me? Everybody talks and nobody says nothing. Peggy brought up a several months and months ago about this development over here over by UC. It's a beautiful looking place. It's got the front porches on it, you got the back park in the back that you can enjoy. Another guy brought up the Library that Mr. Schildmeyer said that passed on. The police station, use the NuMaid property, we own it, put the police station down there with the fire dept. and the service department, it's a good idea and give the Library the property there at the police station, it's already built. Nobody even, you just look out and space, I could, Hello, do something for goodness sake. You don't see it, we see it in the audience, it's just ridiculous the way you guys, meeting after meeting and there's nothing out of any of the meetings, it just seem like a waste of the people sitting up here.

Ms. Hausfeld – Mr. Miller, believe it or not my Committee has done a lot this year. Some of that stuff that's been in my Committee has been in there for nine years and nobody has ever touched it. If you heard my report tonight, one of my things were developing the business district, developing not just Bertus St. Park. We as a whole, I'm talking as a City whole need to develop a lot more than just Bertus St. Park and you said none of us here live across from a park. I live across from Tower Park. This past summer, I had residents complaining about the same activity that was going on up at Park Place was going on at 2:00 in the morning over at Tower St. Park. I brought it to Joe's attention, there was a light out, he fixed it, the Service Dept. fixed it for me, I brought it to the Police Dept.'s attention and they started monitoring it more and more and I talked to a resident not too long ago and to my knowledge and from what he said, the problem was taken care of. Now what most probably happened is they went to another park and it's not going to, just like getting rid of Vine St. Park is not going to take care of the problem. We have to work on that too. Not only developing Bertus St. Park, but we need to work on the problems that are going on at Bertus St. Park as well because all they're going to do is move to another park. Or move to another green space as you call it.

Mr. Meier – Norm, I'll try to address some the issues that you brought up if I can remember all of them. We've got two issues; one is new houses and the second one is an issue with undesirable activities going on within the City.

These are two separate and distinct issues. One of the reasons that they say that we've got this undesirable activity and the children of St. Bernard can't even use the equipment in the park. It doesn't seem logical to me then if our kids use the equipment or can't use the park, it doesn't seem logical that we just blow up the park and take it away. That, you can put houses there, but as Patty was saying, the people that are causing the problems that does not address that issue. As far as the green space, I live right next door to green space. Every once in a while we have a problem down there, I'll call the police dept. and they've always been down there taking care of it. We have to take of our City. We can't just in today's market, people are not buying houses. John was talking about putting \$200,000.00 houses on there. You're not going to sell a \$200,000.00 house with three of them on that corner. We've only had one house in the City over \$200,000.00 sold within the last year, they have one for sale right now that doesn't even have a contract on it. If we can't sell what we currently have, why would we want to put more? If we can't fill up the lots that we have, why do we want more and more lots. Let's at least do something with the property. If houses are needed there in the future it's not saying we can't do that. You mentioned Vine St., last fall we talked to the CIC came down here and we talked about working on Vine St. What we proposed was investigating private people including Dr. Romanos mixing ideas, kind of sifting through them and bringing the best options back to Council. Shortly after that Dr. Romanos came here and made his presentation. At that time it was decided to go forward with Dr. Romanos suggestion. That basically took the whole idea of what we were working on in the CIC with Vine St. out of our hands because Council had committed with going with Dr. Romanos and had funded it for \$16,000.00. Now that that didn't happen it's back into the CIC doesn't do anything. Well, gosh guys, we tried doing something, everybody said we don't want to go that route, we want to go with Dr. Romanos. Now that he's not performing we want to go back and the CIC didn't do their job. Well if you wanted him to do it, let him do it. But you can't change horses in mid stream like we did. I think we've got new houses in the City, undesirable activity are two separate and distinct issues. If you take away the park the people that are causing the problem are going to move somewhere else, you'll move it into someone else's neighborhood. We need to deal with that. If we need new houses, sure if we've got a place to put them, Schlanser's is empty, there's a spot right there, 618 E. Ross is empty, we've got a spot right there. We've got a lot of vacant houses in the City, we need population, well the City didn't have a problem ten or fifteen years ago. We didn't have any more new houses then that we do now. We need to fix up what we've got. If we take care of the housing stock that we have now we won't have problems on into the future like some of the surrounding communities that we have.

Mr. Zix – To go back to what I said before about traveling that road, you know, Council is up here and we make laws and we administer money and it's there. The Mayor is bringing some good ideas to us, we got some good ideas out there too. Norm, I think we're really trying, it's not as easy as it looks sometime but I think we're doing a lot of work in the background, we're trying, we're trying to get things together, we're trying to move forward. There's space and capacity to do it all I think but let's travel down that road, let's you know, always keep traveling down that road that we're on right now.

Mr. Estep – And I agree and a couple of those things, Schlanser's, the building that we purchased and tore down, we got rid of a lot of undesirable up there and it's not quite big enough to put a home on that, I think it's like 150 by 48 wide, with the setback and everything else. We're still in the first phase up there. If we can get the next part of that purchased, maybe we can move that forward. On the Bertus St., and maybe somebody is confused or maybe I didn't make it clear enough. I don't mean to just bulldoze that and build three homes up there and I think the procedure and the process we go through would be to do that environmental study, have it surveyed and ply it off in lots like they did at Angels Way and that's green space and if people want to buy those lots they purchase the lots, they build the home, whether it's a \$110,000.00 or \$250,000.00. We're not, I just thought out the number of \$200,000.00 because I thought it was pretty comparable to the Angels Way project. We had to do a lottery up there not too long ago, people were lined up to get new homes. I don't know how many people that want to buy a home that is 80 years old and always be putting in new facets and fixing and there's some people that may want that, there's nothing wrong with that. There are some people as we saw in Angels Way who are willing to put a little bit more into a home to get a nice home up there. So we're just going to see if we can do the next step, clear that out, plot it off and then we got close to an acre up there, we have green space up there and we'll do something with that. As far as the problem, it will move and you know when we have two or maybe three police on duty on that shift, they're trying to fun from Bertus St. to Vine St to Ross Ave. to Tennis Ln. to Baker St., they're running all over this City and I think the more we condense some of our areas and I would lay a lot of money that there's probably more calls to the police at Bertus St. than there are at the Pavilion in ratio to the number of people that visit that because the pavilion is supervised and it's managed and there is a price to get in. We've even charged to use the Pavilion to play basketball and that cut on an undesirable element and the more we take control and we have a supervised or structured environment, the fewer problems we're going to have. They'll never go away, they'll find another spot to pop up here and there. Patty mentioned Tower Ave. Park. We did have problems. One of the first things we had to do over there is take down the basketball rims and backboards and that cut that problem considerably. Again, I'm not trying to railroad and ramrod something down Council's throat. I need your support. I can't do anything without you putting money in that line item and us working together. Do I have a ten step plan, all written out, no, but I think we have some good ideas from not only the Administration but some of them come from Council and we'll get there. I think we've made more progress in the past year because now we have some money in these line items and we're starting to see it come. It's going to get better.

Mrs. Brickweg – Norm, I wish I would have brought it with me, I did receive an email this morning, a very detailed email, Gerry and I have been going back and forth with Dr. Romanos as I announced at the COW meeting last week, they had gone ahead with their study. I thought we were OK time wise because he originally said he was going to start the study the Winter Quarter which they just started the beginning of January but they did start it earlier and actually it looks like he does have some really good ideas. I was going to print up the email and bring it and I can get it to you and maybe

next week I can explain more, about what they are doing. Gerry maybe you can help me, I just read it this morning, but they're doing a three part study. The first part of the study is already completed. They're studying other communities similar to St. Bernard but those communities are the ones that are thriving and making changes. Then they're going to do some here, they're going to meet with Gerry and I and they're going to meet with other people to see what we have, what we don't have and the third part of the study is to try and put it all together. They are concentrating on Vine St. The other thing, when I talked to the one developer, he even said that it might not be a bad idea to have this study and if we agree and we see what this study has we'll be a step ahead when we go to a developer, The one group that I suggested that he does meet with is the CIC. It's one step at a time and I wish I had printed the email and brought it tonight but I didn't, but they are working on it and I know it seems like a long process and I agree with you 100%. I wish I could see some action, see something going on but I will get this email to you and I'll try to update everyone else next week.

Mr. Estep – I did something similar, I contacted the president of Model Management, he's a close friend of mine and asked him for some names and before I overstepped my bounds I wanted to know who Council has and who they have coming and his suggestion was maybe not to hire a developer. He said you may be better off to contract or to do a supplemental contract or even an hourly wage or hourly rate like they're doing in Lockland with Crane. I think we're all bringing some ideas to the table and we're going to get somebody out of this.

Ken Davis, 2141 Blankenbecker – I have a question in regards to the time frame as far as the implementation of the study. Do we have a time frame on that?

Mrs. Brickweg – He said that the full three part study will be done by the end of this quarter and if I can remember from my son telling me correctly, his exams are like March 11th, 13th, somewhere around there and so right now he's looking to put together the meetings, like I said he just contacted me this morning, I'm going to get with Gerry and they plan to have, now he did say he might have a problem getting his students together right before the end of the quarter, that it might have to be in the Spring Quarter for them to meet with us, but that there will be a meeting where they will be presenting it to us. And he also said and maybe this will help and I think he said there are ten boards from the original study that they had showed to Council and he's to bring those to the City so people can review them and maybe the citizens can see kind of some of the ideas, so I guess he'll bring those when Gerry and I meet with him.

Ken Davis, 2141 Blankenbecker – Will they also be making recommendations as far as acquisitions of property?

Mrs. Brickweg – I don't really know. The email just said basically they are going to look at the cities that are making it and then look at what we have and what we don't have and then tell us what we need. I mean they are looking at the business district and quite often in his report he said they really concentrate on the economic development of St. Bernard. So possibly that would be part of it but I'm not 100% sure.

Ken Davie, 2141 Blankenbecker – Have we ever considered doing anything with the possible acquisition of like Keiner's property? It's been for sale for a long time.

Mrs. Brickweg – I know I brought that up when we were discussing the Bertus St. property because some people suggested maybe senior housing at Bertus St. But I think that's something we might want to look into. It's a good site if we could get the whole block for senior housing.

Ken Davis, 2141 Blankenbecker – I would just like to tell Council, hey look I know at times it can be very tough up there making decisions that you people make. But I do think making acquisitions in real estate is the right course to go. Many cities have been doing it for a long time. I don't want to compare us to a dinosaur, but it's kind of like the residency requirement. I stayed here my entire life up until the point that I retired, three years after I retired from the police dept. But we gotta quit being the dinosaur and if you're the last to keep doing things, OK, I don't know what you would call yourselves other than the fact that you're the dinosaur. Residency was the last, we were the last city to act on residency and it seems like it's been like pulling teeth as far as buying real estate, you know in this City and I've said it for a number of years, Bill Burkhardt will back me up on this, that redevelopment, if we didn't go into the business district, it was eventually going to effect the residential district. I've had conversations with Norm. Norm Miller agrees with me. But I'm glad to see that we're finally doing it, certainly and I hope that it continues.

Forrest Hudson, 4297 Redwood Ter. – I applaud Kenny for bringing up that residency issue I retired to stay here, that was my choice, I don't want to leave, my wife and I made an agreement that we would stay here. We raised our kids here. What I do have a couple of points on is; about two or three meeting ago I asked Council a question or the Administration a question. How many empty lots does the City actually own in this town? How much property does the City actually own? No one has supplied that information and we've gone several meetings now. OK, I think that's public information, I don't think its something that should be up on a shelf but I think maybe if we looked at how much we own, maybe it would make us want to move on it, maybe it would make us want to do something OK. Moving on, Vine St. is the gateway to our community, we need to concentrate on our business district to attract people, you know it's fine, you know, to buy these pieces of property, you know, Sullivan Ave., you know to do something with Bertus St. Park, but I haven't seen Vine St. change other than a couple of coats of paint, maybe an awning, maybe some aluminum siding, that's been it, you know, since back in the '60s. The only major thing that we've done is Chili Time, maybe? Is that the only building that's been built? Had some remodeled, you know. We could use a UDF in town, a new one, you know, maybe something with some pumps in the ground, you know, start up that way, start looking, you know there was some property that was just sold here on Vine St., you know, maybe someone from this City is going to be looking at buying up those two pieces, you know, I don't think anyone with the exception of maybe Kevin or Gerry is aware of building codes and contractors and what it takes but I think maybe we ought to look at getting involved in you know a city manager, economic

development director, look at the wonderful things that are going on out in Lockland, you know, now Reading is jumped on board, you know, they were just in the Valley Courier, Reading is jumped on board and they're getting that, what was the name of that grant from the State? They're getting all these grants from the State to purchase all these old properties and rehab them. We need to move on. I hope that somebody in the near future can provide that information about the lots.

Doug Roll, 155 Church St. – I like to look at the town and say, how can we be more efficient and effective and I think those two words are key. I think the Mayor, by making this decision with Bertus St. Park has given you guys the facts, it will take away some problems, it will also relocate the people to central areas, which is what you need to do. It's efficient and effective. We have one great big park in this town and if everybody was there, if somebody calls with a problem and says we got a problem with the park, that's where the Police go. It's efficient and effective. The Mayor has given you guys a plan, it's the first redevelopment plan I've heard in about three years. I think he also said that this maybe a spring board to Vine St., concentrate on this, if you want to do it, do it. If you don't want to do it, don't do it, go on with something else. He's given you guys a plan, my advice is to get it done, it needs to be done, that park needs to disappear, we have another park for St. Clements and all the other kids to play just right down the street. Get the houses built, people will buy those properties, get it done, hopefully it's a spring board, if it doesn't become a spring board and this is the only thing that's done in the next 12 months, then everybody when November comes, you know what to do.

Sarah Spradlin 324 E. Ross Ave. – I just want to come up on a positive note, I just want to say thank you to Peggy and to Jonathan and to Chief Moeller and to the St. Bernard Police Dept. and some of you other guys too, I don't know who did what but I do know that these are the people that actually got in contact with me and stuff. The speeding on Ross and everything on Ross has gotten better since I came here the first time so I just wanted to thank you guys and I hope everything continues to get even more better but I just wanted to thank you guys, so that's all.

Norm Miller, 219 Washington Ave. – Peggy, this is going to sound strange to you but I'm going to commend you for the effort that you put on the development of this City. It seems like you're the only one that gets up and speaks to what we're doing and what we're not doing, so don't think that I'm crazy yet, I think you're doing a good job with it.

Mr. Burkhardt – The next COW will be Feb. 8, at 7:30p.m.

Council then went into Executive Session.

Motion by Mr. Burkhardt, seconded by Mr. Meier to authorize Mr. Wiedman to look into the acquisition of property. Motion passed 7-0.

Motion by Mr. Burkhardt, seconded by Mrs. Brickweg to adjust the minutes and to hold back the video tape.

REMARKS

Mr. Schildmeyer – I'm not real clear on that because we went through this before with the whole TV set up and everything and it was discussed that we wouldn't do that. Period

Mr. Burkhardt – This is an extreme situation that a person's, the whole exchange, you know how it went and you can say what you want about the TV, they won't edit the tape for that specific section so we have to pull the whole tape and at this time I make that motion that we pull the whole tape.

Mr. Zix – I guess that's the motion on the minutes also, if anybody mentions that, that will include all mention of that throughout the meeting?

Mr. Walden – Yes, that is my understanding.

Mr. Burkhardt – Anything concerning that situation would be erased, that would be my motion.

Mr. Asbach – We had citizens talking censorship and that's exactly the point we are at right now, so we're going to catch grief one way or another.

Mr. Burkhardt – That's fine, in this situation, I'll take the grief.

Mrs. Brickweg – I wanted my entire thing taken out so that it would have made sense. I don't know, but if I said that I decided that I wanted all of the things that I said stricken from the record then nothing else would make sense so just an idea, I don't know.

Mr. Meier – I think we should be more concerned with the individual.

Mr. Zix – I would just like to go on record to say that this is a very good reason why we shouldn't even have these on TV any more.

Motion to adjust the minutes and withhold the video tape passed 4-3. Mr. Asbach, Mr. Schildmeyer and Mr. Zix voting no.

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

These minutes are not the official record of Council Meetings. The official record is the audio tape.