

**ST. BERNARD CITY COUNCIL MEETING
JANUARY 8, 2009**

The regular meeting of the St. Bernard City Council was held Thursday, January 8, 2009 in Council Chambers.

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

Roll call showed that all members were present: Mr. Tobergte, Mr. Peck, Mrs. Bedinghaus, Mrs. Brickweg, Ms. Hausfeld, Mr. Meier, and Mr. Zix.

Mr. Walden – Before we begin with the meeting tonight I would like to have a moment of silence for the passing of Jim Rutemueller. Mr. Rutemueller was a former president of Council and served the City in a number of capacities over many years.

The minutes of the December 18, 2008 Council meeting had been approved before the end of the year.

REPORTS OF CITY OFFICIALS

MAYOR, Mr. Burkhardt – (read by Mr. Stegman) The Mayor's Monthly Court Report Receipts for November 2008: Mayor's Court fines were \$1,958.00, and costs of \$160.00. Parking fines of \$526.00 Police Reports \$0.00. Mayor's Court Computerization of \$75.00 and Clerk of Court Computerization was \$250.00. Total to the City was \$2,969.00. State fees: Victims of Crime \$225.00 and General Revenue \$375.00. Indigent Driver's Alcohol Treatment Fund of \$27.00, Indigent Defense Support Fund of \$90.00 and the Drug Law Enforcement Fund of \$63.00. Total to State was \$780.00. Total Disbursements were \$3,749.00.

The Mayor's Monthly Court Report Receipts for December 2008: Mayor's Court fines were \$2,475.00, and costs of \$160.00. Parking fines of \$455.00 Police Reports \$0.00. Mayor's Court Computerization of \$102.00 and Clerk of Court Computerization was \$340.00. Check fee of \$81.99. Total to the City was \$3,450.01. State fees: Victims of Crime \$531.00, Indigent Defense Support Fund of \$150.00 and the Drug Law Enforcement Fund of \$105.00. Total to State was \$1716.00. Total Disbursements were \$5,166.01. I hope everyone had a wonderful holiday season and are ready for a busy and productive 2009.

I would like to thank Santa and Mrs. Claus, the Coca-Cola Polar Bear. St. Bernard and St. Clement Elementary music teachers and students, Patty Hausfeld and Peggy Brickweg, the Recreation Department along with Holiday Activities Committee, the Queen City Hi-Railers and Artic Diamond and the Eagle's for making our City's Christmas gathering such a huge success. The evening was enjoyed by all. The City was once again aglow with decorations that were displayed; I know I drive Vine Street more during the holidays just to see the lights and decorations. A great big thank you to the Service Dept. for another beautiful holiday. Also adding thanks to the Police Dept. for escorting Santa and the Polar Bear, and for the Police Dept.'s window decorations.

We are currently accepting summer employment applications for grass cutters, laborers and pool staff (managers, assistant managers, lifeguards,

and pavilion attendants). Applications are available on line at www.cityofstbernard.org or stop by City Hall and pick one up. Application deadline is March 2nd. If you are interested in becoming a lifeguard please contact the Cincinnati Red Cross or go to www.cincinnatiaredcross.org and go to “take a class” to register for classes. Classes are available at the St. Bernard High School pool beginning February 24th but you must be pre-registered. Please call now because class space is limited.

This year, in an attempt to help keep all citizens informed of upcoming events we have decided to replace the Recreation Bulletin with a yearly calendar. The calendars will be delivered door to door by Recreation, Administration and at large and ward Council members. It will have all the information regarding sport sign-up dates, concerts, meetings, trash collection date changes, holidays and more. Any changes or additions will be posted on the City’s website which is currently being renovated or around town in the bulletin boards located in each ward. If you have any questions please call Elaine Sipe at 242-7770.

Another change this year is the presale of 2009 summer pool passes. If you would like to beat the rush and purchase early you will be able to do so every second Saturday of each month from 10:00am to 1:00pm at City Hall. Pass prices will remain the same as 2008. The only change is the return of the grandparent pass. The pass will be limited to 4 grandchildren (resident or non) per pass at no charge with each additional grandchild costing \$5.00.

AUDITOR, Mr. St. Clair – The December Auditor’s report for the cash balances in our various funds and for the expenditures from those funds are prepared for tonight’s meeting. The receipts report and the summary report of revenue and expense by fund were also distributed to Council and the Treasurer.

Expenditures for the month of December:	\$ 1,522,854.99
Expenditures for the year thru December 31 st	\$13,423,340.86

DIRECTOR OF LAW, Mrs. Kate Bedinghaus – Absent.

TREASURER, Mr. Sipe –

Receipts for the month of December	\$ 1,746,703.08
Receipts for the year through December, 2008	\$15,688,389.55

SAFETY DIRECTOR, Mr. Chatman – Happy New Year to everyone. Mr. President, I promise tonight there are no presentations and no swearing ins or anything like that. As I mentioned in the Dept. Head Meeting earlier this week, I thanked all of the Dept. Heads for their direction, counsel, warning and advice that they gave me in the first year at this position. I also want to share that sentiment with all of you. Throughout 2008 you have all given me in some form or fashion some direction and warnings and things of that nature and I really appreciate it and I’m looking forward to working with you in 2009. While we’re on the subject of thanks I do want to thank the Police Clerks and Dispatchers as well as the Officers for the implementation of the “Food for Fines Program”. The report on that, that I received from the Police Clerk, was throughout the period that that was in effect from Nov. 27th thru Christmas Day. There were 67 violations that were cited that were eligible for the Program. 37 of the violators took advantage of the Program. The result of which are two very large Rumpke containers in the Police Dept. garage that are filled with food. In addition to those who participated

in, by virtue of being ticked for a violation, there were several people who came by and donated food items and I wanted to thank them. They were all anonymous but I wanted to thank them for participating as well.

Earlier tonight we had a brief Block Watch meeting. It was an informational meeting and more information speaking about what was being sought after and what the interest level was for Block Watch or Citizens on Patrol. I admitted in that meeting that had I thought it more thoroughly I would have put the meeting off for Jan. 22nd to give us an opportunity to get through the holidays and get back to the business of conducting business and getting the word out for such an organizational meeting. Having said that, I'm going to ask again to have a meeting on Jan. 22nd, which is our next Council Meeting and in the interim I'm going to give information to the Valley Courier about what we're doing. Give information to Elaine to put on the web site and talk to the Mayor and Elaine and see if such a meeting fits the criteria for Call Command. That meeting time would be 6:45 just prior to the start of Council Meeting.

Mr. Walden – I would like to welcome our new Service Director, Phil Stegman.

SERVICE DIRECTOR, Mr. Stegman – I'm Phil Stegman the new Service Director. I would like to thank Mayor Bill Burkhardt for the appointment. I will not let him or the citizens down. It's going to be nice working with Council.

A little bit of information about myself; I left my job after 30 years of service in welding and construction, customer service and management. I did not retire. I just left it knowing I could help the community move forward. That's how much I love this community. I left on December 12th and have been shadowing Mr. Schrand on my own time, not being paid by the City to learn all I could from him. I would like to thank Ray for all his years of service and his dedication over the years. Now down to business. The first thing we need to do is educate the residents about trash collection day. If they miss the truck or miss their day they need to put it back behind the house, not just leave it on the street. The trash needs to be out no earlier than 6:00pm the day before their day of pick up and must have it out by 7:30am the day of their trash day.

People seeing potholes, sidewalks and curbs in disrepair please call me at City Hall 242-7770 ext. 20.

I have met with the Dial-A-Ride personnel and the service garage. I also had a chance to work on the garbage truck. There are some safety issues I will be working on. I also had a chance to introduce myself to the Senior Citizens Club at their luncheon and their first meeting of 2009.

The arborist will be out on Jan. 26th starting at 9:00am. Weather date will be the 27th. I will be calling the residents who signed up to have their tree looked at. We had 45 people sign up. I have put together the bid package for the Municipal Building roof. The legal notice was in the Cincinnati Enquire on Jan. 7th and will be in Jan. 14th. Bids will be opened on Jan. 21st at 11:00am. Last night I got my first call for snow at 12:45am. We got the Service Dept. right out and the streets looked great this morning thanks to them. This is your tax dollars at work.

I would like to be put on the agenda for the COW meeting on Jan. 15th to discuss the generator for the two buildings with Walt Moeller, also to

discuss the insurance monies and new appropriations for the damaged City property.

TAX COMMISSIONER, Mr. Geiser – Absent.

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

FINANCE, Mr. Zix – No report.

SAFETY, Ms. Hausfeld – Tonight I have the St. Bernard Fire Dept. monthly report for December: Fire Run Activity

Fires	5
Motor vehicle accident response	2
False alarms	11
Other	5
<u>Emergency Medical Responses</u>	
Transported	60
Not transported	19
<u>Inspection Activity</u>	
Fire Drills	2
Commercial Fire Inspections	14
<u>Training Activity</u>	
Administrative Procedures	6
SCBA Fit Testing	6

That concludes their report.

I did want to urge the citizens of St. Bernard who are interested in the, we called it two different things tonight, there was a Citizens On Patrol and there was also a Neighborhood Block Watch Program. In talking with Rodney and a couple of other Council members along with a couple of citizens that were here, this is a very unique way to get the citizens working with the Police Dept. and working with us. Any citizen, I urge that if they are interested in this program, they can call myself. My home number is 641-2937 or they can call Rodney Chatman or any of their Council members. Like Rodney stated he is going to have a meeting on Jan. 22nd at 6:45pm. It is just in the preliminary stages but it is a very worthwhile program to get started here in St. Bernard and to have you the citizens be the eyes and ears for the Police Dept. to help them and to help us with different situations around town.

SERVICE, Mr. Tobergte – The Service Dept. report for December 2008 is as follows: There were 16 trucks and 12 dumpsters placed at residences along with 155 special pickups. 228 tons of garbage made its way to the landfill. There was 14 tons of recycling material, 13.5 tons of cardboard, 6860 pounds of scrap metal along with 19 appliances. The City received \$378.90 for recycling in November. The Service Dept. will working on Monday, Jan. 19th so the regular pickup schedule will be followed for that week.

I would also like to make a motion to go into Executive Session to discuss the purchase of property.

Mrs. Brickweg – I'll second that.

Mr. Walden – We have a motion by Mr. Tobergte, seconded by Mrs. Brickweg to go into Executive Session to discuss the purchase of property after the regular portion of the meeting. The motion passed 7-0.

PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS, Mr. Meier – No report.

LAWS, CONTRACTS AND CLAIMS, Mr. Peck – No report.

BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY, Mrs. Brickweg – Last night the steering committee for the Heritage Ohio Main Street Program met with Jeff Siegler for a question and answer session regarding the City's application for the program. At the meeting they discussed the assets, liabilities and opportunities for St. Bernard. A four year budget for the program was also presented. The majority of the operating expenses will be provided on an in-kind basis by the CIC. Some CIC funds will go towards promotional activities, publications, travel to required conferences and workshops, and main street projects. The Vine Street Business Association will be asked to come up with \$2,500.00 in contributions from their members each year and they hope to be able to raise funds from local industries and property owners with increasing goals each year. The steering committee is asking the City to pay the \$3,300.00 annual Main Street fee and contribute cash towards specific projects on an as needed basis. In each year they will be focusing on marketing St. Bernard and recruiting businesses to Vine Street. The goal for the first year is to fill every empty storefront window with some type of display (ie. local sports teams, St. Bernard history, products produced in St. Bernard, etc.). The goal for year two is to look at façade improvements and in years three & four the goal is to tackle streetscapes. In order to meet these goals the steering committee is asking the City for financial assistance. They are proposing in year one, the City to contribute up to \$5,000.00 in year two \$10,000.00, and in years three and four significant funding for streetscape improvements will be necessary with \$100,000.00 budgeted for year three and \$250,000.00 in year four. I stressed that I realize the City needs to spend money for improvements, but I am not comfortable with just giving the money without anything in writing stating what the money will be used for. Al Kanters said he can provide this in the resolution that will be sent along with the application. Council needs to vote on this resolution in the beginning of February. Al asked to be placed on the Jan. 15th COW agenda to discuss the proposal, budget and the resolution. At this time I would like to make another motion for Executive Session to discuss possible expansion of a company.

Mr. Meier – I'll second that.

Mr. Walden – There was a motion by Mrs. Brickweg, seconded by Mr. Meier to go into Executive Session to discuss the possible expansion of a company. The motion passed 7-0.

HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION, Mrs. Bedinghaus – What I have tonight is the month end for the Dial-A-Ride and the year's end of the number of riders. For December, the total amount was 2,020 and for the end of the year it was 22,869. The number of medical runs for the bus; 16 for the month of December and 219 for the total year.

Mrs. Brickweg – There was no COW meeting before this meeting and therefore there was no report.

COMMUNICATIONS – None.

RESOLUTIONS AND ORDINANCES

Motion by Mrs. Brickweg, seconded by Mr. Meier to read this evenings' Resolutions and Ordinances by title only. Motion passed 7-0.

The second reading of Ordinance No. 67, 2008 as amended.

ORDINANCE NO. 67, 2008. AMENDING SECTION 159.19, COMPENSATION OF ELECTED OFFICIALS, IN ST. BERNARD CODIFIED ORDINANCES CHAPTER 159, EMPLOYMENT PROVISIONS, AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY.

Motion by Mrs. Brickweg, seconded by Mrs. Bedinghaus to suspend with the third reading of Ordinance No. 67, 2008 as amended.

REMARKS

Mrs. Brickweg – At the last Council meeting on December 18th this Ordinance had its first reading. We are reading it for the second time tonight because it did not have enough votes to go emergency. Some on Council thought they were voting on the actual Ordinance and therefore the emergency clause did not take effect. Reading and voting on it tonight will not make a bit of difference; the reason being is no political appointed and elected position's pay can be changed once they assume office. That is the main reason that Ordinance was put on the table for the last Council meeting. Phil Stegman, the new Service Director told Council that he did not want the pay increase that was to go to Ray Schrand, the former Service Director, on January 1st. Phil stated he was against giving someone a pay increase on the first day on the job. After he told Council that last year, Council voted to put an Ordinance on the table to ensure there would be no pay increase in 2009 for the position of the Service Director. I was extremely shocked when Council members, Mike Peck, Cindi Bedinghaus, Kevin Meier and Greg Zix stated they were in favor of giving the 3% raise. Greg has previously stated over and over how we need to watch our spending. Cindi has stated over that the City needs to be more financially responsible and cut the fluff, but yet they both stated they want to give more money to a person that says he does not want it. I really do not get it. Many of these same individuals stated that the money is for the position and not the person. Yet when I asked the question "when a person starts working for our City as a Police Officer, Fire Fighter or Service Worker are they not doing the same job as the person that held the job before them. Is a Police Officer not a Police Officer? I received a few different answers. Walt St. Clair said "The elected and appointed officials do not have a union that represents them so who else is going to take care of it?" Greg stated, "We should be thinking about the position instead of the person." Greg also stated "These positions are somewhat hard to fill and I think we have to make them attractive." I wondered to myself, when has there ever been a hard time filling full time appointed positions. There is always a long list of

individuals applying for these jobs. Why?, the high starting salaries and the thought of a possible future pension. For those that may not know, an individual can hold any OPERS job, for example a Council member, a part time City job, etc. and if they put in 25 years of service at 55 years of age they will receive a monthly pension check from OPERS, based on their top 3 years' salary. Now if this person worked a part time job with or 22 years making for example, \$5,000.00 a year and then they took a full time job making for example, \$75,000.00 for 3 or more years, this person would receive a pension for the rest of their life based on the highest three years, in this example, \$75,000.00 plus added benefits with the pension. So I seriously doubt there is any shortage in people applying for appointed positions. Even if they only work one term they would still have a high salary of three years and be eligible for the pension.

At this Council meeting it was stated over and over that St. Bernard is tied with the Hamilton County Commissioners regarding pay to take politics out of the equation. The more I thought about this the more I wondered exactly how Hamilton County figures raises and starting salaries. Do they start a new hire making the same as the person leaving, like St. Bernard elected and appointed positions do? I contacted all three County Commissioners, David Pepper and Todd Portune replied the following back to me:

“Many agencies that have adopted the County’s pay plan have pay ranges with established minimums and maximums. These ranges are periodically reviewed and adjusted when necessary in order to remain competitive with the local labor market. When a position becomes available, the County’s policy is to bring the new hire in at the minimum of the pay range. A Department Head does have some discretion if the candidate has exceptional skills, in which case a new hire may be offered up to 12% above the minimum of the range. A job offer in excess of 12% over the range minimum requires advance approval of the County Administrator. The salary of Commissioners and other elected officials of the County are established by the State. The County does not link any pay rates to those of elected officials. The County does not use pay steps of COLAS, all pay increases are merit based”.

So as you can see once again some St. Bernard elected and administrative individuals are picking and choosing to benefit themselves in the greatest way. I was accused of playing politics, which in no way, shape or form is true. I truly believe that no individual should start a position at the same pay as the individual leaving the position and no one should receive a raise on their first day of work. In my opinion if anyone is playing politics it is the elected officials who vote to give themselves and their friends' nice salaries and benefits.

Mrs. Bedinghaus – I would just like to make a comment that I have been saying that I would like to see, and I think we did discuss this at the last meeting, a range of pay and that would be relative to a step pay, would be exactly what I would be hoping for, for any new people that come into positions like this. However, this one, it's not established yet, therefore to single out one person, I wasn't in agreement of that. Yes, I have said over and over again that I am watching closely with the economic crisis and I know that I keep making reference to that, but at this point and time I don't think that that was fair to Phil Stegman. But I am for getting a range. I am all for evaluations and merit raises. That's what I have been saying since day one.

Mr. Zix – One thing I did find out, I think the County did not get a raise so it won't matter anyway at this point. They'll stay in the same pay rate. But I'm still going to be voting against this. I strongly believe these salaries were aligned with the County Commissioners so there wouldn't be a pick and choose situation. We wouldn't go out and just pick and choose the position that we did not want to give an increase. We're looking at the position, not the person, to pick and choose the position and say now we're going to give him a raise or not. So I don't think it's fair and that's why I'll be voting against it.

Mrs. Brickweg – Just in response to what Cindi said. The main thing I have the problem with, and I still have a problem with, is when you have somebody come in like Phil and say I do not want the raise, and yet elected officials use their power to vote and go ahead give it anyway it really doesn't make any sense to me. If we have someone who says they don't want it and yet we go ahead and say well take it anyway because we want to give you more money. To me that's not financially responsible.

Mr. St. Clair – Just to refresh Council's memory, the Service Director at one time had step pay, which was called Dept. Head longevity and if that had still been in effect, then Mr. Stegman would not have come in at the same salary that the person that left with had because that person would have had the step pay or Dept. Head longevity as it was called. Council voted that the Service Director should not get that step pay so Council is arguing one way that they shouldn't get a raise when they come in, they shouldn't get the same pay as the person that left, but they took away that person's, that stayed on the job for a number of years and got the step pay, they took that away. Council to me is being somewhat ambivalent here in saying, we don't want to give him the same pay but we took out the steps so that they would get the same pay. This whole issue needs to be discussed and looked at further.

Mrs. Brickweg – Can I just comment on what Walt just said? OK. Basically what I said is, if we're going to follow the County, let's follow the County. So once again we're picking and choosing. We're seeing how they do this, but we're only doing it a certain way. So I guess when we do look at it, maybe that will alleviate the problem you just said. Either we follow the County or we don't follow the County.

Mr. Zix – I don't think we're following the County's pay policy. We're aligning with the County Commissioner's pay. The County is paid this much, we figured how their salary goes up and down. We're just following the County Commissioners' pay, not their pay policy.

Mrs. Brickweg – Well then I have a real problem with that because even if it's at a percentage, your comparing some of our workers to a County Commissioner, someone that works and runs the entire County. No. I don't think so. I think we need to come up with something that is comparable to a city. And like I said when I contacted these Commissioners, one of them, I won't name any names, actually laughed, I mean how convenient that this City would give itself that high of a pay. So obviously there is something wrong here. I understand what you're saying, Greg, you want to tie it this

way but you don't want to tie it that way and that's my whole point. We need to make this fair and fair to this community because we have to make it the right way to do it. You can't tie down a salary and when it hurts somebody this way we don't tie it that way. I think we need to re-look at the whole thing and look at everybody.

Mr. Zix – I agree with Peggy. We have to look at it and I think we agreed to put it in the Finance Committee but I think we're not looking at it fair with two different definitions. We're not aligning with a full blown County Commissioner's salary, we are aligning it 81 or 82%, 7%, 6½ or 7% in Council's case. It's the pay we're aligning with a small percentage of what they make. Yes, I think the Finance Committee is going to look into it and hopefully we'll come up with a suggestion or a recommendation and we can discuss it with all of Council.

Ms. Hausfeld – I'm glad to hear that, Greg, because, and I don't want to see this put on a back burner, I know last year and I'm talking January, 2008 there was the same conflict between, I believe, the Tax Commissioner and the Service Director at that time. There were a few of us that were fighting to keep the rates before versus coming in at a higher rate. Since this stuff has to be done before a person takes office in order to take effect I would hope we're not in January, 2010 and there may be new Council members. There may be new people in the administration, per se, and I don't want to discuss this at that time. I'm not sure quite what the answer is. I agree with what Peggy said as far as Phil stating that he didn't want the raise and we still did it anyway. I was against it back in January of 2008. I was against it at the last Council meeting and I really hope we can come up with a solution that would be fair to not only the people that are taking those positions, but mainly the citizens that are paying for these positions. That's my thoughts on it.

Mr. Meier – Patty, I think that if you want to be fair to everybody then how these positions will be paid needs to be resolved before we have a new person taking the position. If we wait until a new person is coming in then you cannot separate what you're trying to do with the position from the person because they're attached. Speaking of fairness, I think it's unfair to the person coming in to ask them if they would accept a raise or not except a raise. No matter what somebody says, nobody is going to really want to turn down any money. It's kind of crap to come out and say yes I want the money so people have a natural inclination to not say that. The bottom line is you're putting somebody on the spot with what they may want to say, and I'm not speaking for any individuals, but what a person may want to say and what they think they should say when they're in front of the camera in front of the City. It's a really tough spot to put somebody in. I think if you want to address salaries or whenever you want to do it, it needs to be done when we don't have somebody going into a position. I think that's the only fair way of doing this. As far as the vote last year, the problem with that was, people didn't really understand what they were voting on and voted to not let it pass emergency and pushed it into the new year. If we waited to the last meeting of the year when somebody new is coming in to address this issue, it's never going to be resolved. It has to be done ahead of time.

Ms. Hausfeld – Kevin I couldn't agree with you more but I think that's what I just said. That's why I don't want it to be put on a back burner so that we're in the same situation come January, 2010. Correct me if I'm wrong, and I know I'm going to get heck for saying that, but I don't remember any of us asking Phil if he would take a raise or not take a raise. I think he heard what was going on in the audience and got up himself and point blank said what he would take or what he wouldn't take.

Mrs. Brickweg – I just want to comment on that also. Mr. Meier, nobody asked Phil. It wasn't in the Council meeting. He came up and stated it at a COW meeting. What Kevin said is not true. That's not how it went. That's not how it happened with Phil. Phil has been stating that for years, while he was on Council himself, that he didn't believe in that and so that is exactly what he said to all of us and I believe you were at the meeting that since he did believe that and didn't believe on the raise on the first day that that's the way he felt. This is no set up, no putting him on the spot. If anybody kind of put him on the spot, it was being accused of playing politics to the point where Phil would have thought that it was against him what we were saying and I had talked to him and in no way shape or form is it. It's what we've always believed in, what we've been talking about for years as Patty said and nothing gets done. Phil was never asked and Phil was never put on the spot.

Mr. Stegman – Just to throw a few comments in, I'm not taking any of this personal, but I do believe that Mr. Meier had it right along with Patty. This does have to be something that when a person is being asked to take this position that they know forthright what they're going to be paid at the time, not after you say I'll take it and then it be bantered whether I'm taking a raise or taking a cut. There was one problem at one of the Council meetings. I heard the County Commissioners could take a cut and then I would be going backwards. Yes, I don't want to take the raise coming in but yes, I don't want to take a cut. I was told I was going to be making a certain amount when I started this job. No, did I want a raise? No, but by not taking it I'm getting, Walt had said at that meeting, everybody that work together, the Tax, the Service and also Auditor is always paid within the same amount of money. One of the things that did get taken away, and I think Walt nailed it, is the longevity pay did make the steps that we were talking about. They should have never probably been taken away and the structure of the pay should have stayed the same and the years of longevity should be what gave the person that time. Patty, I hope that the next 12 years we don't have to worry about that, about this position. It is something to look at I believe. I still have my notes from back when I was in Council in my briefcase because that was one of the things I was working on in the Finance Committee of putting steps in everybody's, everybody's, whether its Council, all the Depts., everything. It's something that, and Greg you said it was in your committee, I'd be glad to share those notes with you. I mean they're three years old and there would definitely need to be some increases and that but at least it's a start of what we were working on back then. I'm not taking it personal for everybody's comments about me. I don't think it was political. I think everybody was looking out for the betterment of the position and not the individual.

Mr. Chatman – I am very sorry to take this tone. I think it's unfair to have these discussions in front of the individual that is involved and I believe that is what Kevin was talking about. Again I apologize for taking this tone. I think you guys are putting way too much effort into this. It seems to me the simple solution would be to put the steps back in. That way when someone takes the office they get the minimal amount, as was mentioned as the County responded in the correspondence back to Peggy, they start at the minimum of that range. Even in doing so, I believe the steps would eliminate that problem and any controversy related to it. At the same time too we would have to understand, and I think this goes to Peggy's argument, Peggy and those taking that side would have to understand, and I will come up with a fictitious position so that we're not talking about a particular person, if the City had an executive dog walking position and we had two spots open, if there is a contract associated with it that expired on July 1st, if we hired one of those people on June 29th, they would get a certain salary. If the second spot was hired July 4th, that person would come in at the new rate. In essence you would have hired two people with the same amount of experience one week apart from one another, the second person would have started on day one making more than the person who was hired the week prior. I believe that is the argument that Cindi and Greg are making is these salaries are paid to the position and it's not that the second person is in any political good graces or that they like them more. It's just that there needs to be a structure as to when these salaries adjust. What the adjustment was with a particular issue that we had been discussing was, as of 2009 that position pays a certain amount. And, that certain amount just happens to be more than what it was last year and to eliminate any hint of unfairness we simply put the steps back in and be done with it.

The motion to suspend the third reading of Ordinance No. 67 as amended passed 6-1. Mr. Zix voted no.

Motion by Mrs. Brickweg, seconded by Mr. Tobergte to adopt amended Ordinance No. 67, 2008 as read. The motion failed 3-4. Mr. Zix, Mr. Meier, Mrs. Bedinghaus and Mr. Peck voted no.

OLD BUSINESS

Mr. Tobergte – I would like to thank the St. Bernard Kiwanis club and the other organizations in St. Bernard for their hard work during the Christmas season. They made Christmas brighter for many families in St. Bernard. I would like to be placed on the COW agenda to discuss an ordinance requiring the City to advertise for any paid non elected position. I feel that by not letting the residents know about a job opening we are limiting the talent pool to choose from.

Mrs. Brickweg – I just want to remind everyone that Stefen Spinosa from ODOT will be here at next week's COW along with a real estate representative to discuss the City's options regarding the Fire Department building and the Service Department building. Both of these properties are currently listed as a loss on the I-75 Highway expansion.

Mr. Chatman – At the last Council meeting Mike Peck asked me to look into some of the discussion that was taking place in the General Assembly

statewide in regard to County wide fees for 911 in hand system. After several emails and correspondence, the bottom line was that with the question that came from Mike because there was the potential that it could impact municipalities such as ours. But the bottom line is that it will have no impact on our municipality. What had taken place was some political posturing in my estimation. What has happened was there is an authorization for the County to collect 911 fees for the in hand system that is already in place and what has taken place through votes at the General Assembly is just an extension of what is already taking place so everything is going to be the same and remain the same. Hopefully that answers, in a layman's terms, what was going on. It was political posturing what was going on.

Mr. Peck – Thank you Rodney, I just wanted to make sure that we still, the City, still gets those fees. I didn't understand it totally but I wanted to make sure there wasn't going to be any change in that. I appreciate it, thanks.

NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Meier – I just wanted to bring something up just to, I noticed today that, at Bertus and Vine, that there is a new sign on that lot where we took down the building. On the bottom it states, for sale, lease or will build to suit. I've got to confirm that we're advertising that we will build a building before any money or any discussion has been made about where the funds would come from or if we would fund them. I'm not saying that I'm against building and I think in order to really get Vine St. going I think we'll probably have to have some fee to get that started before the private money comes in. As a little bit of a surprise when I drive by and see that we've got a sign up here saying that we will build to suit and not know anything about it, my concern is that we're, again, like what Peggy mentioned earlier tonight with the Heritage, they're looking at asking for an additional \$365,000.00 over the next four years. Not saying whether it's good or in favor of or not in favor of it, but just for to arbitrarily commit to spending money without having more details on how it's going to be spent or what we're going to get for it or anything like that, we're already spending, I think, just a quick calculation since we passed the bond issue, I think we've incurred a little over \$20,000.00 in interest on that and the majority of that is still sitting there. It seems like we've got a lot of money going out, or commitments to things without having the details, so my concern is that we may be advertising that we'd build something and not having had the discussion or the means to actually fund that project.

Mr. Wiedmann – If I may Mr. President, I believe that Mr. Kanters is going to be at the next COW meeting, so Mr. Meier if you would refer that to him at the next COW meeting, he can address these things.

Ms. Hausfeld – Actually Greg, Kevin mentioned that because it jogged my memory. I had a couple of citizens asking me about the fish and chicken place. What was going on with it and things that they notice that there's a lot of plumbing things over there. Their concern was, and this most probably will have to go to Al too, is since the CIC owns it, their concern was who was footing the bill? If we were paying for it like the plumbing and stuff or it was actually being paid by the people that are renovating and

doing that kind of stuff. I told them I didn't know and the only reason I'm mentioning it here is because I sometimes forget so I wanted to make sure I at least got it out. Gerry I don't know if you can even answer or Walt. I know they were supposed to open at a certain date and it's actually past that date if I'm not mistaken.

Mr. Wiedmann – I believe they had some problems with one of the grease traps that they have down there. I don't know where that's at at this point. To answer your question on the other thing, I think I know the answer but I'd rather not speculate. I think I'd be better off not answering that.

Mrs. Brickweg – I just want to remind everybody that the CIC will be having their meeting Jan. 21st at 6:00pm.

AUDIENCE WISHING TO ADDRESS COUNCIL

John Metz, 4419 Kemper Ave. – What Peggy was alluding to is that I have a fund raiser that I've given to a number of people for "Franciscan Haircuts from the Heart". I'm a member of their board. This fund raiser is on the 19th of January all day at the restaurant. I believe you can go to our web site which is www.fhfh.org or it might just be www.franciscansfromtheheart I can't remember what that one is. You can get these from various Council members. They have these now and there are some emails on it. If you have this coupon, 20% of your food bill will go to Franciscan Haircuts from the Heart. What they do is give haircuts to the low and no income in Over-the-Rhine and then throughout the City with a voucher program. Currently there is one across from Old St. Mary's Church and we're moving shortly to St. John's Social Center over toward Findlay Market. If anybody needs a copy of this they can give me a call at 242-1086 and I'll try to get a copy for them. That's my home number. I'll leave a couple more copies here at City Hall. Like I told members of Council if you want to make copies, you want to email them to your friends, do so and they are welcome to make copies and it's all audit.

Mrs. Brickweg – John, would you like to tell them which restaurant it is?

John Metz, 4419 Kemper Ave. – Oh I'm sorry yes, it's Max & Erma's over at Rookwood Commons. All day at Max & Erma's there but you do need one of these coupons for your bill to go to Franciscan Haircuts.

Mrs. Brickweg – The next COW meeting will be next Thursday, Jan. 15th at 7:30pm.

Council went into Executive Session.

Mr. Walden – The January 8, 2009 meeting of the St. Bernard City Council is back in session. Council was in Executive Session discussing the purchase of property and possible expansion of a local business.

Motion by Mr. Zix, Ms. Hausfeld and Mr. Tobergte, seconded by Mrs. Brickweg to adjourn. Motion passed 7-0.